

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO W. MCNEIL LOWRY

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, as I presented the Interior appropriations bill this week and engaged in our annual debate on the NEA, I thought often of my dear friend, W. McNeil Lowry, who was the Ford Foundation's first director of its arts and humanities program. Mac was a pioneer and major national force in the effort to improve the professionalism of theater in this country and he worked very successfully for many years to build private and public support for the arts. Mac died this spring and all of us are in his debt. I miss him greatly. The editorial by Peter Zeisler from the American Theatre magazine on his life and contributions "They Broke The Mold," says it all. The editorial follows:

[From the American Theatre, July/Aug. 1993]

THEY BROKE THE MOLD

(By Peter Zeisler)

When the history of the performing arts in 20th-century America is written, a very long chapter will be devoted to the extraordinary accomplishments of W. McNeil Lowry.

In his role as the first director of the Ford Foundation's Arts and Humanities program and subsequently as a vice president, Mac truly did "bestride the narrow world like a colossus." Using the prestige and resources of the largest private foundation in the world, he effected the incredible expansion of theatres, dance and opera companies, and symphony orchestras that took place throughout the country between the late '50s and the early '70s. As important as the grant support that he initiated was, his most lasting contribution will remain the development and enunciation of a credo concerning the role of the arts in this country. He showed us, by word and deed, how the nonprofit world of the arts could—and should—be organic and essential to the fabric of our society.

With Mac's death a few weeks ago, the mold was indeed broken. One wonders when—if ever—one individual will have the vision, courage and dedication, as well as the resources, to nurture and transform our nation's performing arts so profoundly.

Almost a decade before the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts signaled the federal government's recognition of the arts, he had already developed the arts programs at the Ford Foundation. When Mac announced a program to enable theatre to establish extended residencies for actors in 1959, he explained, "The Foundation's action demonstrates its conviction that the theatre in America is a cultural rather than a commercial resource, and one which ranks in importance with music or the visual arts." Largely through this and other actions of the Ford Foundation, the theatre was increasingly accepted as an art form and not simply as an appendage of the "entertainment industry."

Other programs for artists were to follow: a travel and study program for directors; production support to playwrights whose plays were being produced in nonprofit theatres; grants to poets and novelists for year-long residencies at theatres; a program of awards to teams of theatre designers and architects to collaborate on new forms for theatre spaces.

Mac spent three years exploring with theatre professionals around the country how best to overcome the provincialism, isolation and haphazardness of communication among theatre people nationally, and in 1961, the Foundation announced the establishment of "a Theatre Communications Group that will facilitate the exchange of artists and other theatre personnel, and enable members to study each other's methods, with the ultimate aim of making the theatre more professional in training, creation and production."

Shortly thereafter, the Foundation awarded its first major underwriting to nine theatre companies—a total of \$6.1 million, an enormous sum in those days—representing a major commitment to the development of the nonprofit professional theatre. Concurrently, Mac retained the services of subscription expert Danny Newman, who worked through TCG to assist theatres in developing new and ongoing audiences. He took steps to augment the pool of skilled administrators by creating an Administration Intern Program that was to develop and train many of today's leading managers in all the performing arts.

And still the list of accomplishments goes on. While prodding and challenging trustees to develop stronger and more effective boards of directors, he also developed the concept of a "cash reserve program to stabilize and improve the financial position of the theatre, opera and dance companies." This program, and the discipline it imposed, was of crucial assistance to scores of performing arts organizations and is still in operation, independent of the Ford Foundation, at the National Arts Stabilization Fund.

But Mac's interest and encouragement was not limited to large "mainstream" organizations; he was an early champion of Ellen Stewart's Cafe La Mama and the leading experimental theatres of the '60s, as well as the emerging black theatre movement in New York and Los Angeles. Wherever Mac saw an opportunity to demonstrate how the theatre could reflect and speak for a community, wherever there was a way to strengthen these institutions administratively and fiscally, the Ford Foundation moved to fill the void. Between 1961 and 1976, two years after Mac retired, Ford awarded more than \$287 million to support the American theatre.

Yet what he made available to further the nonprofit professional theatre is only a small part of his legacy. He also helped stabilize and extend the seasons of many symphony orchestras; his assistance to the New York City Ballet was of crucial importance to achieving its preeminent status; his championing of new work in the opera field was of the utmost importance to the New York City Opera and the Chicago Lyric.

Mac's success as a philanthropist was due to his uncanny ability to listen. His career

started in journalism, and he had a reporter's eye and ear. The Ford Foundation arts programming was always based on what he heard and sensed from the field, rather than what he thought the field "should" do. A fierce believer in the vision of the artist, Mac invested his money in people. "A true theatre," he believed, "never starts with a building but with the fanatical determination of one driving talent."

For me, Mac's loss is incalculable. He was my mentor, friend and—on more than one occasion—co-conspirator (always undicted!) for more than 30 years. His wise counsel was crucial to Tyrone Guthrie, Oliver Rea and me as we made plans to launch the Guthrie Theater.

In the early '60s he functioned as a one-man national switchboard, his antennae sensing what was happening throughout the country. Forming TCG was really a natural extension of Mac himself—he was theatre's communications groupie!

His vision, his courage and his daring changed the face of the arts in America. We will be reaping the benefits of his wisdom for generations to come.

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS M. DELUCO

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding member of the Italian community within my 17th Congressional District of Ohio, Francis M. DeLuco. Mr. DeLuco's commitment to hard work and tradition gained him the 1993 Italian Man of the Year.

Mr. DeLuco's involvement with the Italian-American community has characterized him as a well respected and admired gentleman. He has given his precious time by working with St. Anthony Church Italian Mardi Gras celebration; St. Lucy Church 50th Anniversary celebration; and also, numerous Arco Veterans Club functions, as he serves as a charter member.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. DeLuco has maintained his Italian heritage in a variety of traditions. First, from 1960 to the present day, Mr. DeLuco has offered the area of Youngstown with superior Italian entrees from the family business, DeLuco Catering. His favorite preparations include homemade ravioli, lasagna, and my personal favorite Paloma Easter bread. Second, Mr. DeLuco has made an annual family event of superb wine making. A practice passed down from his father-in-law, Rodger Diorio, Mr. DeLuco welcomes the participation of the entire family.

Mr. Speaker, the tribute to Mr. Francis M. DeLuco is most deserving due to his community service, and I am proud to represent the Italian Man of the Year for 1993.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

SERIOUS PROBLEM WITH TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL SEEN

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this House is scheduled to consider the transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994, H.R. 2490. As chair of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, I must inform my colleagues that there is a serious problem in this legislation as reported by the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee.

To address this problem, the leadership of the Public Works and Transportation Committee will be offering an amendment to strike \$305 million in unauthorized highway projects from H.R. 2490. These funds were added to the bill by the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee in direct violation of rule XXI of the House and over the objections of the Clinton administration.

Earlier this year, my good friend and colleague Chairman WILLIAM NATCHER of the full Appropriations Committee said, and I quote, "There will be no legislation in an appropriations bill. None." Until recently, this was true, but the violations of rule XXI in H.R. 2490 are so numerous that the House must take action.

Mr. Speaker, besides the violations of rule XXI, the most disturbing part of the transportation appropriations bill is the distribution and criteria used to select the 58 projects which comprise the \$305 million in unauthorized spending. Only a select handful of Members have had any input into this process, with the result that the \$305 million is being allocated unfairly to a small number of States. For example, Michigan is slated to receive \$109 million, which is more than one-third of the total amount of this unauthorized spending.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, because the existing highway aid formula was ignored in this process, 30 States will receive no money whatsoever from this \$305 million.

Tomorrow, during the House debate, it is my intention to offer an amendment that would put this money back where it belongs: into the basic highway programs authorized in 1991, overwhelmingly supported by both Houses of Congress, and supported by the States and localities that actually put this money to work rebuilding America.

To illustrate just how damaging the authorized projects provision now in H.R. 2490 will be to States throughout the country, here is a list of what each State would gain from the \$305 million as currently allocated in the transportation appropriations bill, and as would be corrected in the amendment I will offer with the ranking Republican member of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, BU SHUSTER.

State	H.R. 2490	Mineta-Shuster amendment and existing highway program
Alabama	\$2,000,000	\$5,057,277
Alaska		3,968,986
Arizona		4,039,988

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

	H.R. 2490	Mineta-Shuster amendment and existing highway program
Arkansas		3,183,908
California	14,860,000	27,789,012
Colorado		3,897,941
Connecticut		6,293,209
Delaware		1,305,166
District of Columbia		1,773,823
Florida	10,000,000	10,839,555
Georgia		8,272,730
Hawaii		2,265,079
Idaho		2,094,648
Illinois	3,900,000	11,232,152
Indiana	35,575,000	6,074,432
Iowa	2,500,000	3,954,445
Kansas	950,000	3,612,309
Kentucky	13,850,000	4,526,199
Louisiana		4,828,722
Maine		1,581,794
Maryland		4,820,712
Massachusetts		19,764,100
Michigan	109,300,000	8,040,927
Minnesota	16,250,000	4,436,113
Mississippi	1,000,000	3,469,495
Missouri	1,600,000	6,677,287
Montana		3,070,094
Nebraska	2,400,000	2,603,098
Nevada		1,957,168
New Hampshire		1,531,849
New Jersey		9,147,714
New Mexico	2,500,000	3,344,623
New York		17,116,687
North Carolina	14,500,000	7,322,327
North Dakota		1,967,014
Ohio	11,800,000	10,647,762
Oklahoma		4,105,262
Oregon		3,726,969
Pennsylvania	9,368,000	13,093,835
Rhode Island		2,000,000
South Carolina		3,941,088
South Dakota		2,111,432
Tennessee	2,900,000	6,199,557
Texas	19,650,000	19,446,680
Utah	12,432,000	2,372,784
Vermont		1,399,780
Virginia	14,078,000	5,960,214
Washington	3,750,000	6,133,423
West Virginia		2,982,316
Wisconsin		5,531,175
Wyoming		2,124,597
Puerto Rico territories		1,524,700
Total	305,000,000	305,000,000

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop violating House rules, undermining national policy, and giving in to backroom political dealmaking. I urge my colleague to support the Mineta-Shuster amendment. This is the only way to return to a national policy that the American people will respect.

FISCAL YEAR 1994 INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the fiscal year 1994 Interior Appropriations bill last Thursday, I inadvertently voted "no" on the Sharp-Klug-Swett-Upton amendment cutting funding for the Energy Department's Fossil Energy Research and Development Program for oil shale R&D when it was initially considered in the committee of the Whole. I intended to vote "aye" on Roll No. 325.

Also, I was unavoidably detained when the same amendment was voted on in the House later that day. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye" on Roll No. 336.

AMERICAN LEGION ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL SERVICE BILL

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of H.R. 2010, the "National Service Trust Act," several Members expressed their concern over the position that the American Legion held concerning national service. I thought that the analysis of the bill conducted by the American Legion would be of particular interest.

The comparison follows:

A COMPARISON: THE NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM VERSUS THE MONTGOMERY GI BILL

On April 30 President Clinton announced this national service initiative. This program would allow individuals age 17 or older to perform specified community service tasks, either full or part time, in exchange for at least a minimum wage salary and \$5,000.00 a year for a two year period to meet educational expenses. Participants would receive health care and child care, an annual stipend and auxiliary aids and services as needed. All this would be provided without facing the burden of a large monthly loan payment after graduation.

The intentions of the program are fair and laudable. The goal is to allow people to take low-paying community service jobs without worrying about loan repayment schedules and receive meaningful compensation for their efforts. The National Service Program (NSP) will be combined with a new system or direct student loans which allows the students to repay the loan based on their income. Together, the two programs give American youth a choice of two avenues to pursue higher education.

According to the October 21, 1992 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education, the 1992-1993 average cost of tuition, fees, board and room at a four year public college or university is \$8071.00. The \$5000 per year national service program educational award, plus the community service job salary, plus the annual stipend allows the student to adequately meet his needs. Day-to-day expenses would be the student's responsibility. But, the law allows him to receive up to 200% of the annual VISTA subsistence rate from federal sources, and a supplementary or matching figure from the state. If the student meets certain other, somewhat lenient criteria, he can receive up to \$7400 per year in wages and stipends. Post-service stipends for VISTA volunteers range from \$95.00 per month for each month of service, to \$5000.00 annually. The option is even available for the student to receive the \$5000 per year educational award (not the stipend) before completing the community service job. This would allow use to the benefit before having met the necessary requirements. Thus far, this is still a laudable program, but begins to become more than fair; generous is a better term.

Considerable thought has gone into the development of certain, but not all, requisite criteria for this program as evidenced by the boundaries established for its use. Students using the program have five years to either perform their 1700 hours per year for up to two years of National Service, or complete their two years of education of training,

whichever they choose to do first. And, they may perform more than one 2 year term of National Service but may receive only one \$10,000.00 educational award. The service they perform will be in an area where the need is greatest as determined by state and local authorities, and the student may withdraw from the program and still receive subsistence, a portion of the stipend and a partial educational award. No procedures are yet identified for those who receive the educational award and then renege on the agreement to serve.

The program even allows participation by persons from other service programs such as the Peace Corps, Civilian Conservation Corps, ACTION, VISTA, and the Older Americans Volunteer Program. Initially, however, since the first year quota for National Service applicants is limited to 25,000, volunteers from other programs will be accommodated on a quota basis. Ultimately, more than 150,000 are expected to avail themselves of this program. In addition, they may use the National Service Program to augment the educational and training programs for which they were eligible in their previous volunteer service.

In view of these rather lenient eligibility requirements, the National Service Program is not only generous, but may be regarded as beneficial and rewarding. It has been referred to by some as the "civilian GI Bill".

The President's vision of this program draws upon the inspiring model of the GI Bill of Rights, which put millions of World War II veterans into college classrooms and made them the best educated and most productive workers in American history. In fact, the original GI Bill has been regarded as one of the finest pieces of legislation ever enacted by Congress. The Harvard Business Review in 1992 stated the veterans' enthusiastic response to the Bill signaled a shift by the world from an industrial based society to a knowledge based society.

Others have noted that the progress made GI Bill educated veterans in the workforce and the professions has dramatically changed the image of veterans. Before the GI Bill, veterans were considered homeless derelicts because so many were unable to find work upon returning from previous wars.

Since 1944, more than 20 million veterans and dependents have participated in GI Bill education and training programs totaling more than \$70 billion. It has been estimated that during the lifetime of the average veteran the U.S. Treasury receives from two to eight times as much in income taxes as it paid out to the veteran in GI Bill education benefits.

In the past the GI Bill has encountered some loss of funds through overpayments. Exact amounts of losses in GI Bill benefits are elusive because the majority of them occurred in the post-Korean War and early Vietnam era GI Bills. We do know however, that funds paid to both schools and to the veterans themselves were as a result of failure to report attendance and changes in enrollment. Today's continuous monitoring by the Debt Management Service of the Veterans Benefits Administration shows overpayment at \$112 million by the end of 1992. Since the institution of monthly certifications by both the veteran and the school, the losses have been dramatically minimized and the overpayment rate has dropped significantly since the mid 1970's.

A March 1993 financial audit of the Guaranteed Student Loan Program done by the General Accounting Office indicates accountability measures were employed but

were inadequate. The GAO evaluation indicates that as of September 30, 1992, the Department of Education reported that since fiscal year 1966, it had guaranteed approximately \$142 billion in student loans, paid about \$35 billion in interest subsidies and disbursed about \$19 billion in gross default payments. Actions are underway to improve program oversight.

Over the years the GI Bill has been modified for use by more recent generations of GI's to serve the same purposes. However, while the educational outcome of the bill is still intact, entry into its eligibility has changed significantly.

Under the current Montgomery GI Bill (MGIB), enrollment is not automatic. A participant must agree to pay \$1200.00 during the first year enlistment of active military duty to be eligible for the program. For 12 months \$100.00 a month is deducted from a participant's wages. At the completion of the three year enlistment the participant is entitled to \$400.00 a month for 36 months as a full-time student. This figure is about 42 percent of the national average cost of tuition to attend a state supported university. This money is intended to cover tuition, fees, board, room, books and living expenses. If the participant is a part-time student, the entitlement is reduced. There are no provisions for health care, child care, subsistence or a stipend. If the veteran is married with children and financial obligations, the veteran and spouse must find employment to remain solvent, invest in a private health care program and seek their own employment opportunity while in school, and after he graduates.

Veterans anticipating use of the MGIB must serve their period of enlistment honorably, must have a high school diploma, or the equivalent, must use it at either an accredited college or university or a Department of Veterans Affairs sanctioned training course, and do so within 10 years of discharge from the service. A careerist may use the MGIB while on active duty but must schedule class attendance around duty requirements. His readiness in his primary military specialty takes precedence over personal training or formal educational objectives. Frequently readiness means deployment to far flung geographical areas throughout the world. This means educational continuity is disrupted and G.I. Bill funds spent in advance are irrecoverable.

The veterans may not use MGIB funds to repay old education or any other kinds of debts, may not use the MGIB in concurrence with any other federally financed program, may use the MGIB only after making contribution into it and after three years of service, and must meet specific educational qualitative standards to continue to receive the benefits. If the participant has family responsibilities, he is expected to meet those as well. Nothing is given to him. He earns MGIB benefits in advance, he pays into it and obtains eligibility through his service to federal and national commitments.

The National Service Program clearly exceeds the benefits derived from the Montgomery GI Bill. After considering these two programs and the social and professional factors that now diminish military service, such as family separation, military pay freezes, limited cost-of-living allowances, eroding retirement benefits, unpredictable terms of service and duty in Iraq, Somalia or Bosnia, military service is less attractive than National Service. If given a choice of living in a tent and eating MRE's somewhere in Africa or living in an apartment and play-

ing basketball everyday in a city park with children, it is obvious what the choice will be of American youth. Moreover, the caliber of the young military recruit of the future will most probably be less than it is today.

We are already seeing a decrease in the qualifications among those being recruited by today's army. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recently stated there were drops reported in the percentage of high school graduates among new recruits and a substantial decline in the numbers of young men considering enlistment in the last two years. The reasons cited were reduced career opportunities and the arduousness of military life. Furthermore, pay comparability between the armed forces and the civilian sector is still a goal, not a reality. Why then would a young person choose military service over national service? It is likely he would not.

Probably a more balanced view between the two programs can be seen when one does a side-by-side dollar value comparison. When the values are evaluated and we consider that some benefits derived from participation in other programs such as VISTA, the Peace Corps, ACTION program and others, are transferable for use when a young person enlists in the National Services Program, the breadth and value of opportunity is nearly incalculable.

MONETARY BENEFITS

	NSP	MGIB
Initial investment	(4)	\$1,200
Amount of education award	\$10,000	\$14,400
Minimum wage salary (\$5.00 hr, 1,700 hrs.)	8,500	(4)
Stipend provided (\$95.00 mo, 24 mo.)	2,280	(4)
Reimbursement for expenses incurred	Yes	(4)
Child care value	26,700	(4)
Health care value	2,880	(4)
Total program value	\$30,360	\$14,400

¹ 24 months.

² 24 months (estimated).

³ 36 months.

⁴ None.

Options to the above costs must also be considered. For example the National Service Program allows both a doubling of the stipend and the minimum wage salary in certain circumstances. Those would add an additional \$10,780.00 to the value of the National Service Program. It also should be recognized that the NSP value is spread over twenty four months and the MGIB program value is spread over thirty-six months. Even if the NSP were divided between 12 months of national service and 24 months of education, the NSP would be valued at more than the MGIB.

Reimbursement for transportation expenses are also offered by the NSP. This can mean a minimum outlay of personal funds to sustain one's self in the performance of national service duties. Most employees in any other civil occupation would be expected to fund their transport to and from work at their own expense. If more fortunate, however, they could be paid a small transportation differential. The veteran subsisting on the MGIB receives no such benefit.

Another, perhaps more germane, question The American Legion is concerned about is program management. According to the general principles outlined for the program is the establishment of a national level corporation to serve as the unifying, administrative structure. Presumably, they will set goals and objectives, approve suborganizations at state levels, set the guidelines for program users and monitor the two sub components, the National Service Program and the Volunteer Program divisions.

While screening selection and assignment of applications to service work will initially

receives the highest visibility, dispersal of funds from this multi-million dollar initiative will be equally important, but less visible. It is this latter point that is also of concern. Lines of fiscal accountability are not clearly established in the program, nor are appropriate safeguards against fraud, waste and abuse.

Unlike the MGIB, this program does not have clear and stringent application criteria and lacks constraints that will assure the service will be performed to the satisfaction of program objectives, either before or after the educational award is made.

Also unlike the MGIB, very specific eligibility criteria to assure that those who really need this program are accepted into it. The program purpose is defeated if its benefits to individuals who can afford the time or funds to make their own investments into their futures.

This is not to say a "means test" is required. It is simply common sense and rational, that the persons who have the motivation to perform the national service and can least afford to pay their own way through formal education or vocational education, are selected as beneficiaries.

Now let's talk about efficiencies. It is both instructive as well as informative to examine the student loan and assistance programs that are already available. And, one need not demonstrate scholastic or athletic prowess in order to avail themselves of some of them. These are programs that are in addition to the educational and volunteer requirements of programs like VISTA, the Peace Corps, the Montgomery GI Bill, ACTION and EXCEL.

Cost of attendance loans: Includes tuition, fees, room and board. This is campus-based aid.

Expected family contribution: This is a joint family/school cooperative loan. The school portion is campus-based aid.

Independent student loan: This is available for students over the age of 24 who have no parental financial tie. This is campus-based aid.

Merit scholarship: This is a grant based on achievement, not on need. This is campus-based aid.

Need-Based Aid: This is offered through loans, grants or work-study programs. School contribution varies. Federal funds contribute.

Need-Blind Admissions: Application for admission overlooks students ability to pay. This is campus-based aid.

Pell Grant: This is for undergraduates with demonstrated financial need. This is federally funded.

Perkins Loans: This is a low interest loan program made to institutions for needy students. This is federally funded.

Stafford Loans: This is a low interest loan program from commercial banks. The federal government pays the loan interest while the student is in school.

Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grants: A grant program offered directly by schools. This is federally funded.

Title IV Program: This is a combination of some of the above programs and aid programs from the Department of Education. This is federally funded.

So, while its helpful to know of the availability of these programs, its even more curious why there is need of another program. The Legion questions first of all, whether it is necessary to offer a new program only to add health and child care benefits, and a service oriented job; or is it necessary to provide a new program simply to inspire volunteerism.

Community service programs using paid or unpaid volunteers have likewise, been around for years. If the individual's primary motivation is to do public service, and education is secondary, several programs exist that are federally funded. Six of them are overseen by the Commission on National Community Service. These programs were funded in FY 1993 at \$191.5 million. These programs include: Conservation and Youth Service Corps; Serve-America; Higher Education; National Service Demonstration Programs; Civilian Community Corps; and Civilian Community Corps Defense Downsizing Projects.

Another seven community service programs are overseen by ACTION, an independent governmental agency specifically chartered to administer service activities. These programs were funded in FY 1993 at \$339.1 million. These programs include: VISTA; RSVP; Foster Grand parents; Senior Companion Program; Student Community Service Program; Special Volunteer Program; and VISTA Literacy Corps.

Finally, seven other programs exist that bring together a combination of community service opportunities and participation benefits. These programs were funded in FY 1993 at \$876 million. These programs include: The Peace Corps; Community Service Learning Program; National Health Service Corps; Senior Community Service Employment Program; National Guard Civilian Youth Opportunities Pilot Prgm.; Points of Light Foundation; and HOPE VI.

Education programs and paid or unpaid volunteer programs have coexisted for years as either separate entities or interdependent programs. The question therefore is: What is the goal of the National Service Program? If it is to offer educational opportunities to young people, whether needy or not, why can't a simpler method be employed to amend an existing student loan or grant program to add the provisions of the National Service Program?

If the objective is to recruit more volunteers to participate in essential community service programs to help solve serious social ills in towns and cities, why can't an existing community service program be amended to add these inviting benefits? It seems as though the taxpayers of the United States now have a solution and only need a problem to solve.

The last concern of The American Legion that gives us pause, is the choice of a House Congressional committee that will serve as the jurisdictional authority for the National Service Program. This program has been referred to the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies under the Committee on Appropriations. This subcommittee appropriates on the order of \$89 billion of revenue to 15 different agencies of the government. It is made up of ten members from various states and who have differing interests.

Of major concern is that the National Service Program is estimated to cost \$394 million for first year funding in FY 1994. By the time the program is four years old it is estimated it will cost at least \$3.4 billion a year. This includes not only money for education grants, but includes child and health care, wages, stipend costs and the funds just to administer the program as well. Some government officials and certain outside observers have estimated it even higher.

The Administration estimates the total cost per participant, including loan forgiveness, would be similar to that in the VISTA program, which last year cost \$16,000.00 per

participant. Since students would be able to remain in the program for two years, the cost per student would rise to \$32,000.00. As the program matures it is estimated to cost \$22,667.00 per year per student by the time the program is five years old. However, as you can see by the estimates on page 7, program dollar value exceeds that in the first year.

The students it will benefit in the first year are estimated to total 25,000. By the fourth and subsequent years approximately 150,000 total students are scheduled to be maintained on the service rolls of this program alone. This is in addition to the more than 580,000 volunteers on whom the government spent \$1.5 billion in FY 1993 for existing and continuing community service and education programs. Because the loan forgiveness amount of \$5,000.00 per year is far more generous and exceeds other forms of federal tuition assistance, the 7.1 million people who benefit from all other existing programs are likely to clamor for similar assistance.

Where the subcommittee will obtain its funding to meet the requirements of the National Service Program is yet to be determined. The American Legion fears a large, unaffordable portion of it will come from the Veterans Affairs appropriation.

Now that we have prepared a comparison between the National Service Program and the MGIB, The American Legion believes there is less fairness, equity and balance between the two programs than originally thought. It appears as though there is an imbalance and the National Service Program is in competition with and created at the expense of the Montgomery GI Bill.

Before closing this discussion it is appropriate to take a moment to make one more point about the concept of national service. The linkage of national service with the armed forces is a natural one. The military has a long tradition of service to communities, states and the nation. It has often been in the forefront in carrying out social change such as equal opportunity, integration in the workplace and participating in programs for the disadvantaged. The military services have developed in millions of young men and women the attitudes, values, beliefs and characteristics that the nation will expect to be fostered by civil national service. In addition, military units, to include the National Guard and the reserves, have a long history of community ties and sacrifice. That tie has come in many forms other than defending national security. It is shown repeatedly in disaster relief and crisis response actions following local or regional catastrophes. It can be said that the military forces of the United States have never failed to respond to a call for national service.

In our view, military service represents the most selfless form of national service to the nation. No civil national service program could ever compare to the risks, hazards and sacrifices endured by our men and women wearing the uniform of their country.

The American Legion is not denouncing the national service program. Indeed, we have always supported such educational initiatives. And this program is more than generous to the nation's youth. It is simply unfair and imbalanced. As our National Commander, Roger A. Munson, stated; "We do think it is a strange set of priorities however, when those who are currently providing a national service to their country are entitled to less benefits than those who have yet to serve their nation. What do we say to the brave young men and women who served with distinction in Desert Storm and who at

this very moment are on-duty in Somalia, serving at sea and stationed in Europe, Korea and elsewhere? It is only right and just that we more adequately recognize the highest form of national service—service in the armed forces of the United States."

If in fact, voluntary enlistment, divestiture of independence, family separation and deployment to regional or foreign locations under austere or even hostile circumstances is the epitome of national service, then the military service member should have a choice of education programs after his enlistment is complete. Service with active duty, national guard or reserve units for specified periods of time deserve the same benefits as the proposed National Service Program. The two should not compete—they should compliment one another.

To be completely fair, impartial and balanced the two programs can coexist. If they cannot, one of them surely will wither and diminish in use and appeal. Today's veteran deserves a choice when he completes his enlistment—education from the MGIB or the National Service Program. After all, America's civilian youth have choices without the sacrifice. Why not reward the military veteran who has already made his sacrifice?

FOND MEMORIES OF LOWRY FIELD

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as Lowry Air Force Base fades into history, I would like to share with my colleagues a brief elegy, "The Boys at Lowry Field (During the War Years)," penned by Flora Gasser. Lowry Air Base, named after hometown hero Francis B. Lowry, who was shot down over France during World War I, was dedicated in early 1938. The base was constructed on the grounds of the Agnes Phipps Memorial Tuberculosis Sanatorium at the eastern edge of Denver and was one of a series of installations built in and around Denver during the World War II era.

As Denver historians Stephen Leonard and Thomas Noel later wrote, these bases "transformed Aurora from a drowsy suburb, known for its jackrabbits and rattlesnakes, into Denver's most populous bedroom community." In fact, Aurora is now Colorado's second most populous city.

Flora Gasser's poem follows:

THE BOYS AT LOWRY FIELD

(During the war years)

It's not just a wartime base closing,
It's beyond those barracks we see,
Those so young, homesick air-men,
Are what will live in our memory.
You say them everywhere with that friendly smile,
Those so numerous boys in blue,
We took them into our hearts,
And into our families too.
It's not the silent grounds we'll see,
Where the bugles will ring no more,
It's the boys, the wonderful boys,
Who were to leave for a foreign shore.
They made their time in our town,
Though the clouds were dark, more gay,
And the memory of those endearing boys,
Will never from our thoughts ally.
The drums of war beat on for them,

And their units then moved away;
While we prayed that those boys in blue,
Would come safely home one day.

Only stick and stone will now remain
And echoes of what went on before,
Of young voices, laughter, marching feet,
Of those who stormed Normandy's shore.

TRIBUTE TO THE CREW OF THE U.S.S. "LAKE ERIE"

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the sailors who make up the crew of the Navy's newest Aegis Class Cruiser, the U.S.S. *Lake Erie* [CG 70].

As elite members of the pre-commissioning crew, these fine sailors have worked long and hard to breath life into this remarkably capable national asset.

Mr. Speaker, the Battle of Lake Erie, for which this great ship is named, was fought on September 10, 1813. This now famous naval engagement marked the turning point in the War of 1812 in the West and led to the recapture of Detroit by American forces. The Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial is located on South Bass Island, off Port Clinton, in my congressional district.

This newest ship of the line enters service armed with the Aegis system, an unprecedented defensive combat capability against high performance enemy aircraft and surface-to-air and submarine-launched missiles. It's radar will enable it to control all friendly aircraft in it's operating area and still have the capability for surveillance, detection, and tracking of enemy aircraft, missiles, or surface targets from the sea.

Its vertical launch system together with surface-to-air and Tomahawk missiles, its superior surveillance suite, and its integrated command and controls system, will ensure that this man-of-war can effectively target any potential adversaries' vulnerabilities while protecting our own forces, whether the battle takes place in open blue waters or within littoral regions of our world.

But most important, Mr. Speaker—the crew of the U.S.S. *Lake Erie* is part of the United States Navy team—the best-trained, most well-equipped, and most capable sailors ever put to sea.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Capt. William H. Parks and the crew of the U.S.S. *Lake Erie*; to welcome them, their families, and their ship to the active fleet. Godspeed to the personnel of the U.S.S. *Lake Erie* as they assume the watch protecting America's vital interests.

TRIBUTE TO ANNA SACCHINI

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Anna Sacchini who was

nominated as the sixth annual Youngstown Italian Festival's Woman of the Year. Mrs. Sacchini has shown her dedication to the Youngstown community through years of tireless service in a variety of organizations. Her commitment to the Italian-American community in particular has been especially notable and has made her one of our most respected and admired citizens.

After emigrating from Italy to the United States in 1925, Anna married Mr. Umberto Sacchini and settled in Youngstown. After settling down with her husband on the east-side of town, Mrs. Sacchini became involved in the Italian community, helping recent immigrants prepare their applications for citizenship and explaining unfamiliar American cultural traditions and customs. From this beginning developed a lifelong commitment to helping and promoting the Italian-American community in Youngstown.

Mrs. Sacchini's next accomplishment was the founding, organization, and day-to-day management of the Eastside Pilgrimage Club in which she oversaw trips to religious sites throughout North America and Canada. In addition, Mrs. Sacchini joined Our Lady Mount Carmel Church and became active in numerous clubs and organizations including the Italian-American War Veterans Auxiliary, the East Side Italian Women's Pearl Street Mission Club and the Second Ward Italian-American Political Club, where her energy and dedication to the Italian-American community are legendary.

Not only is Mrs. Sacchini's community activism legendary, but so is her cooking. Indeed, so renowned is Mrs. Sacchini's food, that she is now a supplier to the U.S. Navy. After receiving a request for homemade cookies from an ensign on a U.S. Navy vessel, Mrs. Sacchini agreed to supply the lucky sailor with her best baked confections. She also regularly bakes bread and pizza and even makes her own pasta, often sharing them with friends and neighbors.

Mr. and Mrs. Sacchini have two children: Joseph L. Sacchini and Sylvia Gustinella and three grandchildren: Joseph J. Sacchini, Thomas J. Gustinella, and Mrs. Linda Gustinella-Smrek. Mrs. Sacchini also has two great grandchildren, Michael Francis Smrek and her namesake, Anne Marie Smrek, ages 3 and 1 respectively.

Mrs. Sacchini's adulthood spanned most of the era before "career woman" became an acceptable term. If times were different, she would have undoubtedly met the challenges of a career as successfully as she met those of motherhood and community. Nevertheless, her activism has left an indelible mark in the community and respect for her achievements is widespread. It is through her efforts that the Italian-American community in Youngstown has achieved its greatness and has recognized the importance of preserving the Italian customs and heritage we hold so dear.

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. THOMAS M.
HEDDERSON, USN

HON. SUSAN MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a man who has had a distinguished military career and to thank him for his honorable service to our country. Capt. Thomas M. Hedderson will retire from the U.S. Navy on September 1, 1993, after 26 years of service.

As a native of Brooklyn, NY, Captain Hedderson graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1967. He was commissioned as an ensign and began his successful career as an officer when he was first assigned as a communications officer on the U.S.S. *Wallace L. Lind*. His training continued and his assignments progressed, including stints as weapons officer aboard the U.S.S. *Charles H. Roan*, combat systems officer aboard the U.S.S. *Farragut* and instructor in antisubmarine warfare at the Fleet ASW Training Center Atlantic.

As his career developed, so did the complexity of his tours of duty. He was selected for the Navy's Material Professional Program and was assigned to Naval Sea Systems Command as a combat systems engineer. After that, he was assigned to the Pentagon, where he worked in the maintenance directorate in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Production and Logistics. Later, he returned to the Naval Sea Systems Command. He now serves as special assistant for material professional policy on the staff of the Chief of Naval Personnel and under the Navy's Director of Acquisition Career Management. On top of all this, Captain Hedderson was awarded 13 commendations and medals, including the Meritorious Service Medal.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to have this opportunity to honor Capt. Thomas M. Hedderson. He has had a distinguished career and has demonstrated considerable commitment to our Nation. I would also like to take this chance to thank his wife, Carol, and their son, Michael, who supported Captain Hedderson's career. It is an honor to have this opportunity to thank Capt. Thomas M. Hedderson for his dedication and service.

A POLICY OF EAST ASIAN
ENGAGEMENT: I

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, last week President Clinton presented his views on U.S. economic policy toward East Asia to an audience at Waseda University. The President charted a course of active engagement in the world's most dynamic economic region. He described the opportunities which exist for the United States in East Asia, and gave a balanced assessment of the source of trade problems.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the President's address will be of great interest to our colleagues.

President Clinton's address follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO STUDENTS AND FACULTY OF WASEDA UNIVERSITY, WASEDA UNIVERSITY, TOKYO, JAPAN

Thank you very much. Mr. President, thank you for that introduction. I foolishly came out here without my earphones, so I don't know what he said to make you laugh—(laughter)—or what he said about Robert Kennedy. So I should give a speech about how we need to train more Americans to speak good Japanese. Perhaps someday an American president will come here and give a speech to you in your native language. Then I will know we are really making progress in reaching across the barriers that divide us.

It is a great pleasure for me and for the First Lady to be here at this distinguished university today. Waseda is a center of true academic excellence and a training ground for many of Japan's most distinguished leaders. I am proud to be the first American President to visit here.

But as has already been said, 31 years ago another American whom I admired very much, Robert Kennedy, spoke in this hall. It was a very different time. The modern economies of Japan and Asia were just emerging. It was the middle of the Cold War. Fierce arguments raged here, as in other nations, about where the future lay—with communism or democracy, with socialism or capitalism. On that evening in 1962, those arguments spilled onto this stage. When members of the student-communist movement heckled Robert Kennedy, he challenged their leader to come up and join him. In his characteristic way, Kennedy transformed a diatribe into a dialogue and cold-mindedness into an open debate.

That is what I hope we will have here today. The exchange that followed was heated, but it demonstrated the best of the values of freedom and democracy that our two nations share. Three decades later, on this day in this place, the times are very different, but no less challenging. The need for vigorous and open dialogue remains.

The time has come for America to join with Japan and others in this region to create a new Pacific community. And this, to be sure, will require both of our nations to lead, and both of our nations to change.

The new Pacific community will rest on a revived partnership between the United States and Japan, on progress toward more open economies and greater trade, and on support for democracy. Our community must also rest on the firm and continuing commitment of the United States to maintain its treaty alliances and its forward military presence in Japan and Korea and throughout this region.

Is it appropriate? I believe it is—to address these issues here in Japan. The post-Cold War relationship between our two nations is one of the great success stories of the latter half of the 20th century.

We have built a vital friendship. We continue to anchor this region's security and to fuel its development. Japan is an increasingly important global partner in peacekeeping, in promoting democracy, in protecting the environment, in addressing major challenges in this region and throughout the world. Because our relationship has been built on enduring common interests and genuine friendship, it has transcended particular leaders in each country and it will continue to do so.

History has decided the debate that raged here in 1962—a debate over whether communism works. It didn't. Its ruins litter the

world stage. Our two nations have proved that capitalism works, that democracy works, that freedom works. Still, no system is perfect. New problems and challenges constantly arise. Old problems deeply rooted in cultures and prejudices remain.

To make the most of this new world, we both must change. As Robert Kennedy once noted, "Progress is a nice word, but its motivator is change, and change has its enemies."

The Cold War passed from the world stage as the global flow of information pierced the Iron Curtain with news of other ways of living. And the world moved steadily toward a more integrated global economy. Money, management and technology are increasingly mobile today. Trillions of dollars in capital traverse the globe every day. In one generation international trade has nearly tripled as a percentage of global output. In the late 1980s increased trade accounted for well over half of the new jobs in the United States.

Meanwhile there have been huge changes in the organization and the nature of work itself. We are moving away from an economy based on standardized mass production to one dominated by an explosion of customized production and services. The volume of information is increasing at an astonishing rate. Change has become the only constant of life. And only firms that are flexible and innovative with very well-trained people are doing very well.

The new global economy requires little explanation here in Japan. You have pioneered the modernization of Asia. Now from Taipei to Seoul, from Bangkok to Shanghai, Asian economies are growing at dramatic rates, providing jobs and incomes, providing consumer goods and services to people who could not have even dreamed of them just a generation ago.

To be sure, Asia's progress is uneven, there are still millions in abject poverty. Four of the world's last five communist regimes and other repressive regimes continue to defy the clear laws of human nature and the future. But the scenes of life in this region paint an unmistakable picture of change and vitality and opportunity and growth.

A generation ago in Singapore, bumboats floated up to Boat Quay to unload their cargoes of produce and cloth which were sent out into a labyrinth of smoky shophouses and small family markets. Today such scenes are joined by those of container ships steaming into Singapore's modern port—one every six minutes—disgoring their goods into mechanized warehouses and modern supermarkets. In China's Guangdong Province, young entrepreneurs are leaving safe jobs in state-owned enterprises to start their own companies. To describe their daring spirit the Chinese have coined a phrase that literally means "to plunge into the sea."

Such images help to explain why Asia likely will remain the world's fastest growing region for some time. Its imports will exceed \$2 trillion U.S. dollars. This growth will help to make a tripolar world, driven by the Americas, by Europe, and by Asia.

In years past, frankly, some Americans viewed Asia's vibrancy and particularly Japan's success as a threat. I see it very differently. I believe the Pacific region can and will be a vast source of jobs, of income, of partnerships, of ideas, of growth for our own people in the United States—if we have the courage to deal with the problems, both of our nations have within and beyond our borders.

Already over 40 percent of American trade is with this region. Last year, over 2.3 million American jobs were related to the \$120

billion we exported to Asia. Millions of Asian Americans in the United States today embody our nation's devotion to family values, to hard work, to education. In so doing, they have helped to strengthen our cultural ties and our economic ties to this region.

Today, our nation is ready to be a full partner in Asian growth. After years of difficult transition, our private sector is embracing the opportunities and meeting the challenges of the global economy. Productivity is on the rise. Attempts to pierce overseas markets are more intense than ever. Many of our manufacturing service and financial firms are now the high-quality, low-cost producers in their fields.

At last, our governmental sector in the United States is also moving in the right direction. After years of being urged by Japan and by other nations to do something about the massive American budget deficit, we are on the brink of doing something about it. After years of being urged to do something about improving our education system and making our manufacturing and other sectors more productive and more competitive, we are doing something about it.

We are nearing the adoption of a bold plan to reduce our public deficit by \$500 billion over the next five years, and to increase our investments in education, in technology and in new jobs for the American people. We are moving to reform our health care system, the world's most expensive, to control costs and provide quality care to all of our people. We are moving to give incentives to the millions of Americans who live in poverty so they will move from poverty into middle class working lives. We, too, are moving to reform our political system, to reduce the costs of our political campaigns and the influence of lobbyists on our lawmakers.

We are moving to face one of our most painful social problems, high rates of crime and violence, with new initiatives to put more police officers on our streets, give better futures to our young people in depressed areas, and keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals.

But it is not enough for the United States to change within. To increase the jobs, raise the incomes and improve the quality of life of the American people, we must also change our relationships with our partners and ask them to do the same.

Our first international economic priority must be to create a new and stronger partnership between the United States and Japan. Our relationship with Japan is the centerpiece of our policy toward the Pacific community. Our two nations account for nearly 40 percent of the world's output. Neither of us could thrive without the other. Producers in each of our countries are consumers for firms in the other.

We are also joined in our efforts to address global economic problems. We work closely in an effort to move toward a new trade agreement. And I hope Japan will join in the initiative I proposed just two days ago in San Francisco. A meeting of the senior G-7 economics and labor and education advisors to look into a new problem with the global economy. Stubbornly persistent unemployment in the richest nations of the world, even where there is economic growth, rooted in the inability of so many of these nations to create new jobs.

The economic relationship we have has always benefited both our nations, Americans buy huge volumes of Japanese products. American companies in Japan employ thousands of your citizens. Joint Ventures between Japanese and American enterprises

advance the economic and other interests of people in both nations. Japanese companies have opened many manufacturing firms, sales offices and other facilities in the United States.

In the 1980s when my country went on a huge debt binge, massively increasing public and private debt, Japanese purchases of much of that debt helped to keep our economy going and helped to prevent our interest rates from exploding.

Still, our economic relationship is not in balance. Unlike our relations with all other wealthy nations, we have a huge and persistent trade deficit with Japan. It usually exceeds \$40 billion with a deficit in manufacturing products in excess of \$60 billion, in spite of the fact that in recent years our manufacturing productivity has increased very greatly.

It is impossible to attribute this trade imbalance solely to unfair Japanese barriers from governmental policies to a unique distribution system. Indeed, it is in part simply a tribute to Japanese abilities to produce high-quality competitively-priced goods and to the skill of Japanese businesses in piercing so many overseas markets including our own.

Yet, it is clear that our markets are more open to your products and your investments than yours are to ours. And it is clear that governmental policies consistently promoting production over consumption, exports over domestic sales and protections of the home market contribute to this problem. The trade deficit is on the rise this year even with the market rise of the yen against the dollar. Though American purchases of Japanese products have remained fairly constant, Japanese purchases of American products have dropped markedly as a consequence of slow growth here in your economy with no offsetting government policies to stimulate demand.

This problem has, as all of you know, fueled resentment in our country both from workers and from businesses who have worked hard to streamline their operations, reduce labor costs and increase productivity and now want the benefits that can only come from being able to compete and win in a global economy. Our people understand when our nation has a huge trade deficit with an emerging economy like China. The same was true just a few years ago with Korea and Taiwan. But both those nations have moved closer to trade balance with the U.S. as they have become more prosperous. The same has not happened with Japan.

This persistent trade imbalance has not just hurt American workers and businesses; it has hurt the Japanese people. It has deprived you as consumers of the full benefit of your hard and productive work. For example, partly because of restrictive economic policies, the average Japanese family pays more than twice as much of your income for food as the average American family. And many other consumer products are far, far more expensive here than elsewhere, with these differentials going far beyond what can be accounted for by the transportation costs of bringing products to this market.

Our relationships with Japan have been durable not only because of our security alliance and our political partnership, but because our economic relationship has actually served our interests and yours. I believe we must change this economic interest to improve the lives not just of the American people, but of the Japanese people as well. It would be wrong for me to come here as President to ask you to embrace changes that

would only benefit the people who live in my country. I believe that the changes I advocate will benefit both of us or I would not be here pushing them.

During my April meeting with Prime Minister Miyazawa, we agreed to build a new framework for trade on macroeconomic, sectoral and structural issues. Now, I don't know how that translates into Japanese, but the average American has no idea what that means. (Laughter.) What it means is that we are going to try to deal honestly with the differences we have over our nation's economic policies. We want to talk about the specific sectors of the economy where we believe that more trade is warranted. We want to talk about structural differences between our two countries that operate as effective barriers to finding greater balance and greater volume of trade.

Our governments have made progress in these last few days in crafting the basic principles of this new framework. And we will persist until we can produce a sound agreement that is in the interests of people in both countries.

What the United States seeks—let me make clear—is not managed trade or so-called trade by the numbers, but better results from better rules of trade. Openness like this cannot simply come from pressure from the United States. That is one reason I wanted so much to be here with you today. A new openness can only come ultimately when Japanese leaders and Japanese citizens recognize that it is in your interests to pursue this course.

So today I would send this message to all of you and to the people beyond the walls here in this hall: You have a common cause with the people of America—a common cause against outdated practices that undermine our relationship and diminish the quality of your lives.

The ideas I propose are beneficial to both of us because they will increase the number and lower the costs of the products you are able to buy, the services you are able to access, and they will, thereby, reward the work, the education and the skills that you bring to daily life here in Japan. You are entitled to no less, and it will be a part of your role as a great nation for the foreseeable future to have that sort of open relationship.

We should take these steps together for ourselves and for future generations. I am optimistic that the people of Japan and the people of the United States can hear the same message and move toward the same goal.

Japan has, after all, a proud heritage of embracing bold change when the times call for it. Much of the success you have enjoyed in recent years comes from a phenomenal ability to adapt to the changing contours of the global economy. And over 120 years ago, the leaders of the Meiji Restoration embarked on a series of rapid and successful initiatives that transformed a feudal Japan into a modern society, making it more open to the West and the broader world without sacrificing the uniqueness of the Japanese culture.

On this campus today, there is a statute honoring one of the great statesmen of that period: this school's founder, Count Okuma. In his exhaustive narrative of the Meiji Restoration, Okuma attributes the period's reforms—and I quote: "to thoughtful and far-sighted Japanese leaders." And he concludes, "Even as the spirit of liberality has animated the Japanese race during the past half-century of its remarkable progress, so it will ever impel its march along the paths of civilization and humanity."

To keep the country's doors wide open is a national principal to which Japan has attached the greatest importance from its earliest days. I believe and hope that spirit still prevails, and that a stronger Japan-U.S. economic relationship, driven by mutual wisdom, can power our new Pacific community well into the next century.

The second building block of that community must be a more open regional and global economy. That means that, together, we must resist the pressures that are now apparent in all wealthy countries, to put up walls and to protect specific markets and constituencies in times of slow growth. We must resist them because the only way wealthy countries can grow richer is if there is global economic growth and we can increase trade with people who, themselves, are growing more prosperous.

An essential starting point is the successful completion of the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. I am committed to doing that by the end of this year, and I hope that your government is also.

I believe we should also work to reduce regional trade barriers. That is what we in the United States are attempting to do in negotiating an agreement with Mexico and Canada. Not to close North America to the rest of the world, but to open it up. And perhaps we should consider Asian-Pacific trading areas as well.

The most promising economic forum we have for debating a lot of these issues in the new Pacific community is the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation, APEC. The 15 members of APEC account for nearly half of the world's output and most of the fastest-growing economies. This fall, we will host the APEC ministerial meeting in Seattle. I will speak at that meeting to signal America's engagement in the region. But I hope we can go beyond it. I am consulting with the leaders of APEC at this moment on a proposal that they join me in Seattle in an informal leadership conference to discuss what we can do to continue to bring down the barriers that divide us and to create more opportunities for all of our people.

In addressing common economic challenges we can begin to chart a course toward prosperity and opportunity for the entire region. Of course, the purpose of meetings like this is not simply more meetings and communiques, it is to improve our people's lives. Not just the lives of those who dash around financial districts in Tokyo or New York with cellular telephones in their pockets, but the millions of people in my country and the billions of people on the Earth who work hard every day in factories and on farms simply to feed their families and to give their children a better life than they have enjoyed.

It will make a world of difference to them if our leaders can set pro-growth policies, dismantle trade barriers, and get government out of the way. Expanded trade and more open economies will not only enrich people, they also empower them. Trade is a revolutionary force that wears down the foundations of despotic rule. The experiences of the Philippines, Taiwan, Korea, and others prove that the move toward more open economies also feeds people's hunger for democracy and freedom and more open political systems.

This then should be our third priority in building a new Pacific community—to support the wave of democratic reform sweeping across this region. Economic growth, of course, can occur in closed societies, even in

repressive ones. But in an information age, it cannot ultimately be maintained. People with prosperity simply crave more freedom.

Open societies are better able to address the frictions that economic growth creates and to assure the continuance of prosperity. A free press roots out corruption.

This spread of democracy is one of the best guarantees of regional peace and prosperity and stability that we could ever have in this region. Democracies make better neighbors, they don't wage war on each other, engage in terrorism, or generate refugees. Democracy makes it possible for allies to continue their close relations despite changes in leadership. Democracies virtues are at the core of why we have worked so hard to support the reforms and the reformers in Russia, which is now on a path toward becoming one of the Pacific's great democratic powers.

The movement toward democracy is the best guarantor of human rights. Some have argued that democracy is somehow unsuited for Asia or at least for some nations in Asia—that human rights are relative and that they simply mask Western cultural imperialism. I believe those voices are wrong. It is not Western urging or Western imperialism, but the aspiration of Asian peoples themselves that explain the growing number of democracies and democratic movements in this region. And it is an insult to the spirit and hopes and dreams of the people who live here to assert that anything else is true.

Each of our Pacific nations must pursue progress while maintaining the best of their unique cultures. But there is no cultural justification for torture or tyranny. We refuse to let repression cloak itself in moral relativism. For democracy and human rights are not occidental yearnings; they are universal yearnings.

These, then, are the economic essentials for this new Pacific community—one in which most of you, being so much younger than I am, will spend far more of your lives in than will I. A better U.S.-Japan relationship, more open economies and trade, more democratic governments—these things will make your lives better. I will pursue these goals vigorously. You will see that commitment reflected in what our administration does. Together we can make this decade and the coming century a time of greater security, democracy, prosperity and personal, family, community and national empowerment.

So, today, on this holiday of Tanabata, a holiday of joining together and hopeful wishes, let us wish for a new Pacific community build on shared effort, shared benefit and a shared destiny. Let us write out our brightest dreams for our children on pieces of paper as bright and differently colored and numberless as are the peoples of the Asian Pacific region. In the spirit of this holiday, let us fly those dreams from bamboo poles that are as high as our hopes for the era, and then, together, let us dedicate ourselves to the hard work of making those dreams come true.

Senator Kennedy was right when he said that change has its enemies. But, my friends, we can make change our friend.

A POLICY OF EAST ASIAN ENGAGEMENT: II

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, last week President Clinton addressed the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea. He presented his administration's continuing commitment to preserve the peace and maintain the balance of power in East Asia, with an appropriate sharing of responsibilities by our friends and allies. Such a policy is in the best interests of the United States. It should also be reassuring to many in the region who have feared that the end of the cold war would only lead to the end of American involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our colleagues will be interested in President Clinton's approach to the world's most dynamic region.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA, SEOUL, KOREA

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, leaders of the National Assembly, members of all political parties here present joined together in our common devotion to democracy.

It is a great honor for me to be here today with my wife, with the United States Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, with other military and political leaders from our government in this great hall of democracy.

I first visited your beautiful capital city five years ago. Since then, Korea's energy and culture have shown themselves in many new ways, your bustling capital has continued to grow. Your economy has continued to expand. Your nation hosted the Olympics and has taken its place as a full member of the United Nations. You have established new ties to Russia and to China. But no achievement is more important than the consolidation of your democracy with the election of a bold democrat, President Kim Young-Sam.

Geography has placed our two nations far apart, but history has drawn us close together. Ours is a friendship formed in blood as our troops fought shoulder to shoulder in defense of freedom. Then as Korea's economy became the miracle on the Han, we built an economic partnership that today exceeds \$30 billion in fairly well-balanced trade. Today, Korea's democratic progress adds yet another bond of shared values between our two peoples.

When President Truman sent American troops to Korea's defense 43 years ago, he said he aimed to prove that, and I quote: "Free men under God can build a community of neighbors working together for the good of all." Our efforts together since then have benefited all our peoples—not only the people.

Our relationship has made this region more secure, more prosperous, and more free. Now with the Cold War over and profound changes sweeping throughout your country, this whole populous region, and indeed throughout the world, we must create a new vision of how we, as a community of neighbors, can live in peace.

I believe the time had come to create a new Pacific community built on shared strength, shared prosperity, and a shared commitment to democratic values. (Applause.)

Today I want to discuss the fundamentals of security for that new Pacific community and the role the United States intends to play. I had the opportunity just a few days ago at the G-7 summit in Tokyo to travel to Waseda University to talk about the economic aspects of that new partnership. And I think clearly all the economic reforms that we can make will benefit a great market system like Korea.

But we must always remember that security comes first. Above all, the United States intends to remain actively engaged in this region. America is, after all, a Pacific nation. We have many peoples from all over Asia now making their home in America, including more than 1 million Koreans. We have fought three wars here in this century. We must not squander that investment.

The best for us to deter regional aggression, perpetuate the region's robust economic growth, and secure our own maritime and other interests is to be an active presence. We must and we will continue to lead.

To some in America there is a fear that America's global leadership is an outdated luxury we can no longer afford. Well, they are wrong. In truth, our global leadership has never been a more indispensable or a more worthwhile investment for us. So long as we remain bordered by oceans and powered by trade; so long as our flag is a symbol of democracy and hope to a fractious world, the imperative of America's leadership will remain.

I believe there are four priorities for the security of our new Pacific community. First a continued American military commitment to this region. Second, stronger efforts to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Third, new regional dialogues on the full range of our common security challenges. And, last, support for democracy and more open societies throughout this region. (Applause.)

The bedrock of America's security role in the Asian Pacific must be a continued military presence. In a period of change, we need to preserve what has been reliable. Today we,

Those agreements work because they serve the interests of each of the states. They enable the U.S. Armed Forces to maintain a substantial forward presence. At the same time they have enabled Asia to focus less energy on an arms race and more energy on the peaceful race toward economic development and opportunity for the peoples of this region.

The contribution Japan and Korea made a defray the cost of stationing our forces underscores the importance of that presence to both of those countries. There is no better example of that commitment than our alliance with your nation. As the Cold War recedes into history, a divided Korea remains one of its most bitter legacies. Our nation has always joined yours in believing that one day Korea's artificial division will end. (Applause.)

We support Korea's peaceful unification on terms acceptable to the Korean people. And when the reunification comes, we will stand beside you in making the transition on the terms that you have outlined. But that day has not yet arrived. The Demilitarized Zone still traces a stark line between safety and danger. North Korea's million men in arms, most stationed within 30 miles of the DMZ, continues to pose a threat. Its troubling nuclear program raises questions about its intentions. Its internal repression and irresponsible weapons sales show North Korea is not yet willing to be a responsible member of the Community of Nations.

So let me say clearly, our commitment to Korea's security remains undiminished. The Korean peninsula remains a vital American interest. Our troops will stay here as long as the Korean people want and need us here. (Applause.)

We lost tens of thousands of America's best in Korea's mountains and mud and sky. But Korea lost millions. That sacrifice affirmed some old truths: vulnerability invites aggression. Peace depends upon deterrence. We cannot forget those lessons again.

And so it is throughout the region. Our commitment to an active military presence remains. Our mutual agreement with the Philippines to close our bases there should not be cause for Asian alarm. The larger picture tells a different story. We have obtained increased access for our forces throughout Southeast Asia to facilitate our presence, and if necessary, to project our forces beyond the region.

Here in Korea we have frozen American troop withdrawals and are modernizing Korean and American forces on the peninsula. We have deployed to Japan the Belleau Wood Amphibious

The second security priority for our new Pacific Community is to combat the spread of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. We cannot let the expanding threat of these deadly weapons replace the Cold War nightmare of nuclear annihilation. And today, that possibility is too real.

North Korea appears committed to indiscriminate sales of the SCUD missiles that were such a source of terror and destruction in the Persian Gulf. Now it is developing, testing and looking to export a more powerful missile with a range of 600 miles or more—enough for North Korea to threaten Osaka, or for Iran to threaten Tel Aviv.

We have serious concerns as well about China's compliance with international standards against missile proliferation. And since both you and we are attempting to engage China in a more extensive trade relationship, I hope together we can have a positive influence against that development.

The Pacific nations simply must develop new ways to combat the spread of biological, chemical, and missile technologies. And in the coming weeks, the U.S. will propose new efforts aimed at that goal. But no specter hangs over this peninsula or this region more darkly than the danger of nuclear proliferation. Nearly 160 nations have now joined to resist that threat through the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty—the most universally supported treaty in all history.

Now, for the first time since that treaty was open for signatures, one of its members has threatened to withdraw. Our goals remain firm. We seek a nonnuclear Korean peninsula and robust global rules against proliferation. That is why we urge North Korea to reaffirm its commitment to the Nonproliferation Treaty, to fulfill its full scope safeguards obligations to the International Atomic Energy Agency, including IAEA inspections of undeclared nuclear sites, and to implement bilateral inspections under the South-North Nuclear Accord. (Applause.)

Our goal is not endless discussions, but certifiable compliance. North Korea must understand our intentions. We are seeking to prevent aggression, not to initiate it, and so long as North Korea abides by the U.N. charter and international nonproliferation commitments, it has nothing to fear from America.

The U.S. has worked to bring North Korea back within the fold of nuclear responsibility. But your nation, too, has a critical role

to play. The future of this peninsula is for you and North Korea to shape. The South-North Nuclear Accord you negotiated goes even further than existing international accords. It not only banishes nuclear weapons from the peninsula, it also bans the production of nuclear materials that could be used to make those weapons. We urge full implementation of this pathbreaking accord which can serve as a model for other regions of nuclear tension.

Even as we address immediate concerns such as proliferation, we must also have a vision of how we will meet the broader challenges of this era. That is what I sought to create during the recently concluded G-7 talks. For example, by proposing new ways to focus on new problems, such as the slow pace of job creation in the G-7 countries. And it is why I have proposed a NATO summit so that we can adapt that institution to new times and new challenges.

In both Asia and Europe the dominant unitary threat of Soviet aggression has disappeared. In both regions, the end of the Cold War has allowed a host of problems to emerge or to reappear, such as ancient ethnic rivalries, regional tensions, flows of refugees and the trafficking of deadly weapons and dangerous drugs.

In Europe these changes require us to adapt an existing security institution—NATO. In the Pacific no institution exists. Moreover, since the Asian Pacific face a unitary threat, there is no need for us to create one single alliance. The challenge for the Asian Pacific in this decade, instead, is to develop multiple new arrangements to meet multiple threats and opportunities. These arrangements can function like overlapping plates of armor individually providing protection and together covering the full body of our common security concerns.

Some new arrangements may involve groups of nations confronting immediate problems. This is the model we pursued to address North Korea's nuclear program. Our two nations worked not only with each other but also with Japan and with others who could bring their influence to bear.

Other arrangements may involve peacekeeping, such as the massive and promising U.N. effort to support reconciliation in Cambodia. Still others may pursue confidence-building measures to head off regional or subregional disputes.

We also need new regional security dialogues. This month's ASEAN post-ministerial conference in Singapore, which the United States will attend, offers an immediate opportunity to further such a dialogue. Korea can play a vital role in the region's new arrangements, for it stands at the center of northeast Asia, within two hours by air from Singapore, Tokyo, Beijing and Vladivostok.

The many economic discussions within the region also can play a role. By lowering barriers to trade and investment,

The goal of all these efforts is to integrate, not isolate, the region's powers. China is a key example. We believe China cannot be a full partner in the world community until it respects human rights and international agreements on trade and weapon sales. But we also are prepared to involve China in building this region's new security and economic architectures. We need an involved and engaged China, not an isolated China.

Some in the U.S. have been reluctant to enter into regional security dialogues in Asia. They fear it would seem a pretext for American withdrawal from the area. But I see this as a way to supplement our alliances

and forward military presence, not to supplant them.

These dialogues can ensure that the end of the Cold War does not provide an opening for regional rivalries, chaos and arms races. They can build a foundation for our shared security well into the 21st century.

Ultimately, the guarantee of our security must rest in the character and the intentions of the region's nations themselves. That is why our final security priority must be to support the spread of democracy throughout the Asian Pacific. Democracies not only are more likely to meet the needs and respect the rights of their people, they also make better neighbors. They do not wage war on each other, practice terrorism, generate refugees or traffic in drugs and outlaw weapons. They make more reliable partners in trade and in the kind of dialogues we announced today.

Today, some argue democracy and human rights are somehow unsuited to parts of Asia, or that they mask some cultural imperialism on the part of the West. My ear is drawn instead to more compelling voices—the Chai Ling who proclaim democracy's spirit at Tiananmen Square; to Aung San Suukyi whose eloquent opposition to repression in Burma has stirred the entire world; to Boris Yeltsin who is leading Russia toward becoming a great democratic power on the Pacific; and to your own President Kim and others in this multi-party assembly who have helped democracy flower here in the land of the morning calm.

You are truly an example to people all over the Asian Pacific region because you have had the courage to confront the issues of political reform and economic reform; to ask the hard questions of yourselves; to have the public debates necessary when people honestly seek to improve and open.

To be sure, every nation must retain its own culture, and we will all struggle about what it means to define that. But Korea proves that democracy and human rights are not western imports. They flow from the internal spirit of human beings because they reflect universal aspirations.

Now we must respond to those aspirations throughout this region. We must support the nongovernmental organizations that seek to strengthen Asia's building blocks of civic society, such as open elections, trade unions, and a free press. And we must deploy accurate news and information against Asia's closed societies. I have proposed creating an Asian democracy radio for this purpose, and I look forward to its establishment in the near future.

Two hundred seventeen years ago, America's founders declared the rights of self-government to be God-given, and therefore inalienable. Today, here on Asian soil, let us together reaffirm that declaration—not only as an article of faith, but as a sturdy building block in our region's shared security.

This, then, is our nation's vision for security in the new Pacific community: a continued United States military presence, new efforts to combat proliferation, new regional security dialogues, and vigorous support for democracies and democratic movements. These elements of security can help create a Pacific region where economic competition is vigorous, but peaceful; where diverse nations work as partners to improve their shared security; where democracy, as well as balanced military strength, takes its place as a guardian of our security.

We will not realize every aspect of that vision overnight, nor will the new Pacific community come to pass without great effort.

But neither of our nations is a stranger to hard work.

I think, in particular, of the image of your great long-distance runner, Hwang Yung Cho, who endured that final steep hill in Barcelona to capture the gold in the marathon in the 1992 Olympics. His energy and perseverance captured the spirit of the Korean people who have not only endured, but prospered through a long, hard, and challenging history. We respect that spirit. We honor your values. We have stood shoulder to shoulder with you in days past, and so it shall be in the days ahead. The struggle for freedom and democracy and opportunity is, indeed, a marathon. Let us run the race together.

NATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO KEEP THE BAN ON HOMOSEXUALS IN THE MILITARY

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed my colleagues many times in opposition to President Clinton's decision to lift the ban on homosexuals serving in the military. I have participated in several debates, special orders, and many media interviews on this topic. On every occasion, I have outlined concerns expressed by the entire national security community regarding the gay ban.

According to the Christian Science Monitor, the American Security Council's National Campaign To Keep the Ban on Homosexuals in the Military has been in the forefront of the opposition to President Clinton's directive. The National Campaign's efforts have been featured in a variety of media outlets. These include the New York Times, NBC Nightly News, and the McNeil/Lehrer News Hour. The ASC campaign has already invested over \$750,000 in purchasing television and radio advertisements in support of the homosexual ban. These spots will become increasingly prevalent in the weeks ahead.

The Chairman of ASC's National Campaign To Keep the Ban on Homosexuals in the Military is Adm. Thomas H. Moorer USN (Ret.). Admiral Moorer is a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as a former Chief of Naval Operations. In addition to myself, the congressional cochairman of the national campaign are Representatives CLIFF STEARNS, JOE BARTON, BOB DORNAN, and SAM JOHNSON.

I want to emphasize that the national campaign is definitely bipartisan. The administrative cochairmen of the campaign are Rear Adm. Robert H. Spiro, Jr., USNR (Ret.), and ASC Chairman John M. Fisher. Admiral Spiro has had an active role in the Democratic Party, and served as Under Secretary of the Army during the Carter administration.

The national campaign believes the Clinton compromise presents many legal, administrative, and national security problems. Because of this, they are actively promoting the Military Readiness Act (H.R. 667) which would codify a homosexual ban into a permanent law.

I was honored to be one of the original sponsors of this important legislation, which has now been cosponsored by 104 law-

makers. Once again, this effort to codify the homosexual ban is bipartisan. Cosponsors of H.R. 667 include such prominent Democratic lawmakers as Congressmen CHARLIE WILSON, GREG LAUGHLIN, TOM BEVILL, RALPH HALL, CHARLIE STENHOLM, MIKE PARKER, BILL BREWSTER and BUD CRAMER.

I have been very pleased to be part of the National Campaign to Keep the Ban on Homosexuals in the Military because of its outreach efforts to so many prominent private sector organizations. In cooperation with ASC's national campaign, I have had the opportunity to meet with senior leaders of many respected national security and veterans organizations.

Key leaders in organizations such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Reserve Officers Association, the Association of the U.S. Army, the Navy League, the Retired Officers Association, and the American Security Council have told me that they are adamantly opposed to the President's so-called compromise. Among the many reasons these organizations are opposing the President's directive is because of its detrimental effect on morale, readiness, unit cohesion, recruitment, and retention.

The views of the national security community were summarized recently by Roger A. Munson, the National Commander of the American Legion. Commander Munson said the Clinton compromise is unacceptable, and he fully supports codifying the ban into law. According to Commander Munson:

A 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy does not alter the fact that homosexuality is incompatible with military service. It does not solve the problem but only makes it worse. If homosexuals are permitted to enter the military under the proposed compromise but required not to declare themselves, the whole structure will be based on "a big lie". This would cause even greater suspicion and mistrust among our troops. Discipline, morale and unit cohesiveness would suffer. Such disruption of the military environment would be seriously detrimental to the readiness of the services to perform their prime mission, the defense of this country.

For many months the National Campaign To Keep the Ban on Homosexuals in the Military has been working to educate the American people about the importance of maintaining the current ban. Through their national petition campaign, they have also provided the American people the opportunity to demonstrate their personal support for the ban. The campaign now includes

The campaign has sponsored many diverse activities in addition to their television and radio advertisements. These include a nationwide telephone bank to build grassroots support for the ban; testimony of congressional committees; and a media outreach program including numerous appearances on television and radio talk shows.

Other activities have included a lobbying campaign to generate telephone calls and petitions to the U.S. Congress; as well as a nationwide effort to issue, pass, and sign petitions and resolutions in support of enacting into a law a new ban on homosexuals in the military. In fact, in the next few days, the national campaign will be distributing to lawmakers the names and addresses of citizens from every congressional district who signed their nationwide petition.

The American Security Council's campaign also assisted the House Republican Research Committee in conducting a confidential survey of all active duty flag and general officers in the U.S. Armed Forces. Of the 1,040 generals and admirals surveyed, responses were received from 621 officers. Polling professionals have said this is an overwhelming response for a voluntary survey.

The results showed almost unanimous opposition to President Clinton's directive from among the senior leadership of our Armed Forces. The survey found that 96.9 percent of the officers support the ban on homosexuals. Only 5.9 percent agreed with the contention of homosexual advocacy groups that this is an issue of civil rights, while 88.7 percent of the officers saw it as a question of national security.

As part of the national campaign, the American Security Council also compiled a comprehensive report on the significant increases in military health care costs that can be expected if the ban is lifted. The ASC study predicted the potential medical cost to the military over the next 5 years could total close to \$4.6 billion.

In the weeks ahead, many of my colleagues will see radio and television advertisements produced by ASC's national campaign. Variations of these spots have already appeared in major cities across the Nation.

The most recent television ad sponsored by the campaign quotes Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, USA (Ret.) as saying, the introduction of an open homosexual into a small unit destroys the very bonding that is so very important for the unit's very survival in time of war.

The television ad goes on to state:

Military life is tough. In combat, maintaining discipline and morale is a matter of life and death. Privacy is at a premium.

President Clinton has lifted the ban on homosexuals in the military, while at the same time keeping the rules that prohibit homosexual conduct. And if that's not confusing enough, consider that military commanders will have their hands tied on what they can—or cannot—investigate. For instance, soldiers who frequent gay bars will no longer be investigated.

It's no wonder that 97 percent of the military's top leaders who were polled earlier by Congress said—privately—that they oppose the Clinton experiment.

The military cannot publicly oppose a plan supported by their Commander-in-Chief—only Congress can, and you need to let Congress know how you feel.

TRIBUTE TO NICHOLAS SPANO AND FAMILY DAY

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to pay tribute to Nicholas Spano, a man from my 17th Congressional District in Ohio who has come up with a wonderful idea for families to get together.

Mr. Speaker, Nick Spano's idea was for a Family Reunion Day, a day set aside for fam-

ily reunions and get together. Last year, Nick contacted my office in hopes of meeting with me to discuss the idea, I was away at my own family reunion. But upon hearing of his idea, I realized that it was an exceptional one. As I said, I was unable to attend the first family reunion celebration held on the courthouse square in Warren, OH, but by all accounts it was a huge success.

Mr. Speaker, this year on August 1, another celebration of Family Reunion Day will take place in Warren. I have a very good idea that it will be an even bigger success than last year. I happen to believe very strongly in this event. We have heard so much recently about family values, that I wonder if anyone in Washington means it. Well, I know that in Ohio family values are very important. Gathering together with your relatives is the core of any celebration. Family Reunion Day is something that I would like to see take place every year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mr. Spano for his efforts in creating this marvelous event, and I would like to invite all families in the northeast Ohio to participate this year on August 1.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA NATIONAL AWARD WINNERS, MCKEAN COUNTY, PA

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate five McKean County, PA recipients of the U.S. Department of the Interior Volunteer Service Award for Outstanding Commitment to the Stewardship of America's Public Lands and Natural and Cultural Resources. Boy Scout Troops 449 and 495 of Lewis Run and Troop 560 of Port Allegheny, the McKean County Conservation District and Mr. James W. Johnson of Custer City, now honored with this national award, were State winners in this year's Take Pride in Pennsylvania.

All residents of McKean County can take pride in their beautiful part of the Commonwealth. Nestled in the heart of the Allegheny Mountains, the rural landscape of McKean County is distinguished with miles of thick, fruitful forests; deep valleys graced by streams and ponds and dappled with many small communities. Many State forests and parks are found in McKean County, attracting thousands of visitors annually who enjoy hunting, fishing, camping, boating, and other outdoor activities.

Due to their hard work in maintaining these resources, McKean County Boy Scouts dominated the youth category of Take Pride in Pennsylvania. Boy Scout Troops 449 and 495, under the leadership of scoutmaster Bill Getz, each won first prize because of their outstanding involvement and dedication to projects such as the initiating of a camporee, improving wildlife habitats, and the restoration and building of hiking trails. Scoutmaster Francis Cummings and his troop 560 took first prize in recognition of their commitment to a recycling program which they started over 20 years ago.

In 1992, the troop reached a remarkable total of 2 million pounds of collected recyclable products.

The McKean County Conservation District sponsors educational field days, which promote an awareness of the importance of preserving and conserving the environment. Among the group's other projects, the McKean County Conservation District has established the Kinzua Bridge Historical Trail, World Conservation Camporee, a 50-mile conservation hike and a chestnut reintroduction project.

Mr. James Johnson has shown an outstanding commitment to his conservation education programs by generously offering his time and talents to young people, and by helping to finance efforts to make others aware of the challenges our natural environment faces. His individual dedication and his ability to motivate and coordinate group efforts have been vital to the conservation effort.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize these five recipients of the national Take Pride in America Award for their outstanding achievements in keeping Pennsylvania beautiful. Their efforts should serve as excellent examples to all of us to do all we can as individuals and in a community effort to conserve our natural resources and preserve the beauty of the American landscape.

STOP BUREAUCRATIC TURF FIGHTS OVER TERRORISM REWARDS

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to bring an end to months of irresponsible turf fights between the FBI and the State Department over who would have to pay for rewards for information leading to the arrest and prosecution of individuals responsible for the February bombing of the World Trade Center in New York. This sorry episode underlines that the U.S. Government remains psychologically, and in some cases, legislatively unprepared to cope with the arrival of international terrorism on American shores.

In a hearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee last week, State Department and FBI witnesses admitted that neither agency had yet offered a reward for information on the World Trade Center bombing. Each agency has existing legislative authority to do so, and both witnesses agreed that such a reward should be offered.

The FBI claims that while it is the agency with primary jurisdiction over acts of terrorism within the United States, it is unable to use its terrorism rewards program because of insufficient funding. The State Department, which has primary jurisdiction over acts of international terrorism, admits that it has sufficient funds in its own terrorism rewards program. However, the Department claims it cannot offer a reward for the World Trade Center bombing because its legislative authority prohibits rewards for international terrorist acts that occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

Five months have passed while this intellectual and legalistic argument has raged between the two agencies. My bill would remove the State Department's excuse for inaction by deleting the reference to the territorial jurisdiction in which an act of international terrorism occurs against Americans or American property.

I will be working to ensure that this legislative correction is made during Senate consideration of the House-Senate conference for the State Department authorization bill, which passed the House last month. Still, I would urge the executive branch not to wait for congressional action, but to work quickly to resolve this disagreement administratively.

To the extent that information may exist abroad that would aid in the arrest or conviction of terrorists linked with the World Trade Center bombing, the administration should realize that its failure to act is not just a regrettable bureaucratic disagreement. This is an issue of American lives, and should be given the priority it deserves.

**SPRING HIGH SCHOOL HONORED
WITH BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS
AWARD**

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn that a high school located in my congressional district—Spring High School, in Spring, TX—was one of just 260 secondary schools nationwide to be honored recently with a prestigious Blue Ribbon Schools Award. I congratulate Spring High School for achieving this high honor.

This award, just one of many that have been presented to Spring High School in recent years, recognizes the hard work and dedication of Spring High School's principal, Gloria Marshall; its faculty; its student body; and its parents. All of them have worked together to make Spring High School an outstanding institution in which faculty members are motivated to teach, students are motivated to learn, and parents are motivated to take an active role in their children's educations.

Mr. Speaker, blue ribbon schools are judged to be highly effective in meeting local, State and national education goals, including the national education goals. These schools also display, today, many of the qualities of educational excellence that will be necessary in our schools of tomorrow.

To be eligible for a Blue Ribbon Schools Award, a school must have strong leadership; it must have a clear vision and sense of mission that is shared by everyone connected with the institution; it must have an outstanding and highly motivated faculty; it must have an appropriate and up-to-date curriculum; it must have policies and practices that ensure a safe environment that is conducive to learning; it must have strong parental interest and involvement; and it must help all students succeed, regardless of their abilities or disabilities.

After satisfying all of these rigorous criteria, State departments of education and other edu-

cation organizations nominate schools within their jurisdictions to the U.S. Department of Education. A 105-member panel of educators and other professionals reviews the nominations, selects schools for site visits, and makes recommendations to the U.S. Secretary of Education, who formally announces the list of Blue Ribbon Schools Award winners.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations and best wishes to everyone at Spring High School for achieving this tremendous honor. I am confident that the educational excellence that is the hallmark of Spring High School today will remain a hallmark of that fine institution for many years to come.

**INTEREST IN THE EDVILLE
RAILROAD**

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the district work period in July, I met in the town of Carver with officials of the town and citizens who are interested in getting a wonderful Massachusetts institution known as the Edville Railroad running again. The Edville Railroad has been an important part of life of southeastern Massachusetts for many years, and only recently shut down. I am working with people in the town and in the surrounding area to get it going again, and one of the reasons we are all working so hard to do so is made clear in the accompanying letter, which was written by a young woman who illustrates what the Edville Railroad has meant to so many Massachusetts residents.

At the meeting I attended, Michelle Russell was present and I volunteered at the time to share her letter with my colleagues because of the example she sets for other young people by her advocacy and involvement, and because this is an example of what the people of a community can do when they pull together on a project that is important to them. The selectmen of the town of Carver and other residents of the town and neighboring communities are showing exactly the right spirit in this effort and I am proud to be able to work with them.

The letter follows:

DEAR EDVILLE, my name is Michelle Russell and I'm 12. I really like all your shops, statues, lights, and special effect that you have. Please don't shut down your village, because a lot of people go to Edville as a family tradition like our family. My family has been going since my parents got married (20 years ago). And I've been going for 11 years.

If it cost too much to run maybe you could cut down on lights, close earlier, have fund raisers or higher the costs of getting in. With all these adjustments, our family would still go because it's a family tradition. We all love your village and would really miss it and it might take a while to find a new Christmas tradition.

Your Best customer and Fan,

MICHELLE RUSSELL.

P.S. I'll do anything to save Edville and if it is possible could you write back to me?

IN MEMORY OF MARY JUDD

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, the State of Vermont lost one of its great citizens, and I lost a very dear friend, when Mary Judd of Troy, VT, died of cancer after a courageous struggle with that disease.

Physically, Mary was a small woman. But in terms of compassion, intelligence, courage, and human decency she was a giant of a human being and, in many ways, a role model for many of us.

Mary represented the best of what Vermont is all about. She was down-to-earth, hard-working, and straightforward. She loved her farm, which is located on some of the most beautiful land in America. I remember with great pleasure several wonderful community events that were held there. Her love for agriculture and the rural way of life made her, and her husband Bob, into leaders in our State for the preservation of family farming.

Mary's compassion extended into her work with hungry Vermonters. She helped distribute food to those in need, and did all she could to improve life for the poor. She was especially appalled that our Nation's agricultural policies were such that farm families themselves were often in need of surplus food.

Mary Judd is gone, but she remains an inspiration to all of us who had the pleasure of knowing her. She will not be forgotten.

**TRIBUTE TO DR. MARIO BAUZA,
THE FATHER OF AFRO-CUBAN
JAZZ**

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the passing of and to pay tribute to Dr. Mario Bauza, a man of great musical talent and inspiration, who was the creator of a vibrant and unique style of music known as Afro-Cuban Jazz. Dr. Bauza died on Sunday, July 11.

Mr. Speaker, Mario Bauza came to our country from his native Cuba in 1930 at the age of 19. He had begun his musical training at the Municipal Academy of Havana at the age of 7, and was a seasoned oboist and a clarinetist for the Havana Philharmonic Orchestra when he made his first trip to New York, in 1926, to record traditional Latin danzones for RCA. As a Cuban of African ancestry, Mario Bauza was struck by the relative freedom from racism that African-American musicians in Harlem enjoyed. As a talented and ambitious young musician, he was drawn by the jazz sound and the opportunities for work he discovered in New York.

Mario Bauza played with a number of different groups during his early years in New York. He taught himself to play trumpet to fill a vacancy in the band of his fellow Cuban Antonio Machin, and soon became an accomplished soloist. Sitting in on trumpet one

evening with another band, he was discovered by Chick Webb, who immediately asked him to join his band, and made him its musical director a year later. Mario Bauza also played with Cab Calloway's band, where he befriended and aided a young trumpeter who would later become famous as Dizzy Gillespie.

After playing in and directing an assortment of Cuban and jazz bands, Mario Bauza began to talk of creating of a new sound by combining these two musical styles. In 1941 he gained an opportunity to advance his ideas when he became music and personnel director for the Machito Orchestra, a Cuban band headed by his brother-in-law and boyhood friend, Machito Grillo. Mario Bauza began by hiring jazz-oriented musicians to fill vacancies left by departing Cuban band members. After hearing two of these musicians improvising with the Cuban song "El Botellero" during a performance break one evening in May 1943, Mario Bauza decided to experiment further with the song during the band's rehearsal the following day. "Tanga," the fiery new work that he created, was the first Afro-Cuban Jazz song.

Over the succeeding decades working both in the Machito orchestra and in a new band he formed with the Machito orchestra's great female vocalist Graciela, Mario Bauza continued to create and popularize the Afro-Cuban jazz sound. In addition to "Tanga," Mario Bauza composed such classics as "Cubop City," "Wild Jungle," "Kenya," "Imitations," and "Cubanola." His most recent recording, "My time Is Now," was released just this month.

Mr. Speaker, the music Mario Bauza created has brought tremendous joy to people of all backgrounds around the world, and has been a unifying source of pride for Hispanics throughout our Nation. I hope my colleagues will join me now in appreciation of Mario Bauza for the lasting gift of great music he gave to us and to the world.

CITIZEN COSPONSORS OF THE
FAIR ACT

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, Representative GOODLING and I introduced the Fiscal Accountability and Intergovernmental Reform (FAIR) Act to help State and local governments ameliorate their most crushing financial burden: Unfunded Federal mandates.

We feel this legislation is necessary to safeguard against a tendency within our institution and among Federal agencies to resort to more and more Federal requirements without providing the funds to implement them.

Like the National Environmental Policy Act, this measure will require Federal agencies to analyze the economic costs of new regulations before they are adopted.

And, like the 1974 Budget Reform Act, our bill will require that legislation cannot be considered by the full House or Senate without an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office of the cost of compliance to State and local governments and the private sector.

News of this legislation is spreading among those it will help most: Our cities' mayors. Mayors from every State and territory have been writing in support of the FAIR Act and urge swift congressional action.

Support for mandate relief is building on numerous fronts. The New York Times recently ran a series of articles focusing on how our Nation's regulatory policies have strayed from their original purpose.

Mayors from 114 cities in 49 States wrote President Clinton urging the White House to focus on how policymaking has gone awry. And finally the National League of Cities has made unfunded Federal mandates one of its top five political priorities in Washington.

In the next several weeks Representative GOODLING and I will be entering into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of hundreds of mayors from both parties and each State who have agreed to be citizen cosponsors of our FAIR Act initiative.

The time has come to make the Federal Government accountable for the actions it takes on behalf of our cities and States.

Today I am entering in the RECORD the names of 12 citizen cosponsors who are urging us to take meaningful Federal mandate reform action.

CITIZEN COSPONSORS OF THE FAIR ACT, JULY 10,
1993

1. Florence Rhoads, mayor, San Mateo, CA.
2. Robert Nolan, mayor, Upland, CA.
3. Gary Boyles, mayor, Fontana, CA.
4. Diann Ring, mayor, Claremont, CA.
5. Thomas Wilson, mayor, Laguna Niguel, CA.
6. Peter McHugh, mayor, Milpitas, CA.
7. Joseph Mullins, mayor, Melbourne, FL.
8. Thomas Lynch, mayor, Delray Beach, FL.
9. Robert Bennett, mayor, Livonia, MI.
10. Gerald Richards, mayor, Allen Park, MI.
11. Lee Namey, mayor, Wilkes-Barre, PA.
12. Mary Ellen Summerlin, mayor, Port Arthur, TX.

THE MICKEY LELAND TELE-
COMMUNICATIONS AND EDU-
CATION ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
ACT OF 1993

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to direct the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to conduct a 6-month study to identify and to make recommendations concerning the use of existing satellite technology to bring educational programming to children living in remote areas of Africa.

I am offering this legislation in memory of my good friend and colleague, the late Mickey Leland. As most Members in this body know, Mickey devoted much of his life to improving the quality of life for children in Africa. I've come to share not only his love for Africa but his concern for its children.

Africa continues to have one of the lowest per capita income rates and highest starvation rates. As a result of recent hearings held by

the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance on satellite technology. I am convinced that this technology could easily be harnessed to bring much-needed quality educational services to these children. Satellite technology can provide access to the vast educational resources of the world and help ensure that the next generation of African children have the tools they need to better their futures.

My bill simply instructs NTIA to identify existing governmental and nongovernmental resources and programs which could be promptly and economically used to acquire and distribute educational programming via a satellite network to Africa.

The international and humanitarian benefits of such a program are enormous. Such a program would not only bring communications to some of the most remote areas in the world but would provide the children of these regions with fundamental educational programming. I feel strongly that such a program would be a fitting legacy for Mickey's work on behalf of African children.

COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS
WITH TERRORIST COUNTRIES

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of introducing a bill that is designed to address the increasing threat of terrorism to the United States.

Unfortunately, as we were reminded only this past week, the evil intent of terrorists is limited only by their perverse imagination. President Clinton responded appropriately and effectively to a dastardly attempt by Saddam Hussein to assassinate former President George Bush and other senior former United States officials during their recent visit to Kuwait. As was demonstrated in the Gulf war and now by this action of President Clinton, the United States must stand prepared to defend itself and those values it holds dear.

Regrettably, Saddam Hussein's actions and those carried out by other terrorist states have been facilitated by the greed of certain Western businesses, which have sought to profit from the death and destruction that these governments seek to inflict on the world. We still do not know the full story of how Western corporations collaborate with governments such as those of Iraq, Iran, North Korea, or Cuba, but we know enough to be concerned. As just one example of this commerce in evil, I would ask that a list of those corporations which supplied nuclear weapons technology and material to the Government of Iraq be included in the RECORD. This list includes corporations of nearly every industrialized country and from a number of advanced industrializing countries as well.

My bill is designed to accomplish a simple purpose: To have the Department of Defense examine its contracts on an annual basis and publish a report on those contractors which do business with our Government, but also conduct business relations with countries determined to be engaged in terrorist activities by

the Department of State. My bill would not prohibit defense contracts to such corporations. But it would let the public know about those corporations which seek business with the United States and also do not hesitate to commerce with terrorist countries.

The provisions of the bill are easy to summarize. It states that before entering into a contract with the Department of Defense to provide goods or services to the Department, a person must report to the Secretary any commercial transactions with any terrorist country or with any national of a terrorist country. The Secretary of Defense is, in turn, required to submit to the Congress an annual report on those persons conducting commercial transactions with terrorist countries and nationals of terrorist countries.

In the bill, a terrorist country refers to those countries which the Secretary of State has determined to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism.

This simple step will not in itself stop terrorism, but it will put corporations across the globe on notice that the United States is carefully monitoring those who seek business with our Government and still traffic with terrorists.

THE BENEFITS OF PUBLIC TRANSIT

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, for too long our Nation has neglected the need to invest in the transit systems that are vital to both our metropolitan and our rural areas. Transit has been neglected, in great part, because too many people have failed to look at the big picture of what transit means to economic growth, the environment, and energy conservation.

Instead, many people measure the value and effectiveness of transit through a current profit-and-loss statement. This type of measurement, sometimes known as incremental cost per rider, ignores the major and significant benefits to society, now and in the future, from promoting the use of transit.

Today, I am submitting for the RECORD, a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal from the American Public Transit Association, the international trade association representing the public transit properties of our Nation, which provides an excellent description of the benefits of transit. The APTA letter ably refutes a recent Wall Street Journal article which failed to accurately portray the importance of transit investment.

Transit provides essential transportation for the elderly, for the disabled, and for many low-income citizens. It also supports accelerated economic growth while producing huge energy conservation benefits and congestion reduction. These advantages will become more valuable with each passing year.

I commend the American Public Transit Association for this excellent statement.

APTA RESPONDS TO CRITICAL REPORT

WASHINGTON, July 9.—The American Public Transit Association today responded to a re-

port in the June 29, Wall Street Journal that criticized ridership on some rail systems.

The text of the APTA response follows:

JULY 7, 1993.

Mr. NED CRABB,

Letters Editor, Wall Street Journal, New York, NY.

TO THE EDITOR: Rail transit is an American success story by any measure. By focusing his report ("Despite Huge Outlays, Transit Systems Fail to Lure Back Riders," June 29) only on recent, recession-dampened patronage and citing statistics from the discredited Pickrell Report, Frederick Rose showed an empty understanding of the full range of benefits that rail delivers to metropolitan areas.

Transit investments carry real economic punch, as cited by New York's Regional Plan Association. It concluded that "rail (transit) is working because it is reshaping metropolitan areas, attracting business and residential sub-centers around rail stops, and increasing jobs and services *** in downtowns." For example \$15 billion in private development has accompanied Washington D.C.'s Metrorail system.

In 1972, Portland's downtown air was so dirty that it violated federal health standards one out of every three days. Today, with the popular light rail system carrying 25,000 riders per week day, there are no violations.

Expansion and use of rail transit is the secret to curbing urban traffic congestion, estimated to be costing drivers \$40 billion of lost time a year. It's a fact that a subway train full of commuters means 900 fewer cars on the road.

The cost of rail should be considered against the true cost of auto travel. The World Resources Institute says a \$300 billion-a-year silent subsidy is fueling the explosive growth of driving. The worst example may be the artificially low price of gasoline. It costs less today than it did in 1950, accounting for inflation. What an incentive to drive alone to work.

If there is a single factor hampering the growth of transit ridership these days, it is the weak economy. Since most people use transit to go to work, high joblessness rates in cities take their toll on patronage. The antidote includes the 6,000 new jobs that will be created by \$100 million in transit investment.

One more thing. In his enthusiasm to disparage rail transit, Mr. Rose apparently overlooked a fact that refutes his slant: U.S. rail ridership actually grew 39 percent in the 15 years leading up to 1990.

Sincerely,

JACK R. GILSTRAP.

HONORING FRED LODGE ON THE
OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT
FROM UNITED AUTO WORKERS,
LOCAL 887 AND THE INTER-
NATIONAL UNION, UAW

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend, Fred Lodge, upon his retirement as a member of the United Auto Workers [UAW] Union Local 887 and the International Union, UAW. Brother Lodge is being honored for his 40 years of dedicated service to the men and women of Local 887.

Fred began his union career in 1954 when he was elected shop steward at North American Aviation [NAA]. Displaying talent and leadership, he quickly progressed to positions of increasing responsibility. He was soon elected to committeeman and began his service as member, vice-chairman and finally chairman, Main Plant Grievance Committee.

During this period, he also served as a member of the NAA Rockwell Inter-Corp Bargaining Council. Fred is well-known for his leadership in preparation and presentation of contract proposals. Throughout the UAW he gained widespread recognition for leading the Local 887 in its contract negotiations with the aerospace industry.

Between 1955-1963, he was elected delegate to every UAW Convention held during this period. In addition to his distinguished service to the members of Local 887, in 1964, he was appointed to the International Union, a post he held until 1981. Known as an astute negotiator, between 1964 and 1981, he participated in over 50 separate sets of negotiations on behalf of Local 887 members. During this same period, he participated in every case Local 887 had under consideration before an arbitrator.

In addition to his untiring dedication, ability and knowledge, Fred is also recognized for his compassion. True to his ideals of equality and justice, Fred participated in the Civil Rights movement, marching with Martin Luther King and Walter Reuther. In keeping with those ideals, throughout his career, he worked to obtain equity for minorities.

In 1964, Brother Lodge was appointed to serve as Region 6 Retiree Representative, where he actively participated with Local 887 retiree chapter education and recreation services. During his tenure as retiree representative, he was directly involved in the creation of the Federation of Retired Union Members [FORUM] in California. This organization served as a model and is now used nationwide by the AFL-CIO. His memberships in various senior organizations are numerous, including: the National Council of Senior Citizens; the Congress of California Seniors; and the Advisory Board for Member Health Access.

Born in Pueblo, CO, in 1931, Brother Lodge moved to California at the age of five. He resides in Hawthorne with Mary, his lovely wife of 43 years. They have five children and seven grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, for over 40 years, Fred Lodge has been a strong advocate for our Nation's working men and women. On July 24, 1993, UAW Region Six will honor Brother Fred Lodge with UAW's Community Services-Douglas A. Fraser Award for his exemplary service to fellow union members and the community. It is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting this fine individual for his outstanding contributions to the advancement of organized labor.

**DR. JOYCELYN ELDERS SHOULD
BE CONFIRMED**

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate President Clinton for an excellent nomination for Surgeon General of the United States, pediatrician, Dr. Joycelyn Elders.

Dr. Elders has been an outstanding director of the Arkansas State Department of Health, concentrating on the terrible public health problems facing the poor, the uninsured, and the neglected. She has been bold and aggressive in fighting against AIDS, in trying to prevent low-birth weight babies, educating against teen pregnancies, improving her State's level of childhood immunization and the quality of its drinking water.

We need a Surgeon General like Dr. Elders. The Nation faces an epidemic of public health care problems. Her experience, compassion, and expertise is needed immediately.

I hope that the confirmation process can proceed so that this key Federal health position can be filled with this very special candidate.

**IN HONOR OF THE MATHEMATICS,
ENGINEERING AND SCIENCE
ACHIEVEMENT (MESA)**

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize one of the country's oldest programs to assist students from historically under-represented groups earn math-based degrees. The Mathematics, Engineering, and Science Achievement [MESA] is one of the most successful programs in the Nation in producing science professionals of color. The program serves over 16,000 African-American, native American, and Latino students throughout California.

For over 20 years, MESA has worked with dedicated educators, professional organizations, and industry supporters to produce math and science professionals. Students enter MESA in the second grade and continue through high school in the MESA Secondary Program [MSP]. MESA's Minority Engineering Program [MEP] offers academic assistance to students in higher education who are pursuing engineering degrees. The program is so successful that it has served as a model for similar programs in 14 other States. Indeed, 73 percent of MESA students enroll in 4-year colleges.

Several important features contribute to MESA's exceptional achievement. The program is academically based as many faculty sponsors of MEP are deans on their campus. Students with aptitude are supported to excel throughout their academic career. And most importantly, MESA is built on a cooperation between public school districts, higher education institutes, and industry. Corporations

such as PG&E, IBM, Pacific Telesis, Hewlett-Packard, Chevron, and Northrop contribute funds, executives, equipment, scholarships, and summer jobs, to assist in MESA's efforts.

The California Legislature also recognizes the value of this program, opting to maintain the funding level for MESA despite the State's tight budget. In addition, support among public agencies and private and corporate foundations continues to grow. This year alone, MESA received moneys from McDonnell Douglas, the National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering, Pacific Telesis Foundations, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and others.

MESA is a program which opens doors to minorities. Students succeed because the program creates a supportive atmosphere and because minority models serve as mentors in the program. Students eagerly rise to meet the challenges before them and carry their enthusiasm with them throughout their educational and professional careers. The achievements of MESA inspire the students, parents, industry partners, and staff to continue this dedicated efforts. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting the women and men of MESA and their inspiring achievements.

THE U.S. MARITIME CRISIS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. John Lillie, the chairman of American President Co., that underscores the terrible problems facing the U.S. maritime community.

Mr. Lillie and the Shipbuilders Council each focus on very important aspects of the problem:

First, American shipyards are not building commercial ships, presumably because foreign governments subsidize their shipyards.

Second, American shippers are seeking foreign flags, because lack of U.S. assistance makes it more profitable to do so.

Third, American sailors are losing jobs, because foreign flags provide opportunities for foreign sailors.

A strong merchant marine is a matter of both national and economic security.

The U.S.-flag merchant fleet, which is the primary means of transporting vital military and critical raw material cargo in the event of national emergencies, the U.S. shipyard industry, which designs and constructs all Navy vessels and is a mobilization base in the event of national emergency, and domestic producers of marine equipment, which are essential to the construction of commercial and naval vessels serve essential national security functions.

The U.S. shipbuilding industry is encumbered in the international ship construction market by significant subsidies and anti-competitive practices that impede the ability of U.S. firms to compete on a fair and equitable basis.

The U.S. shipbuilding industry encounters costs of production due to regulatory meas-

ures required by the United States that exceed the standards imposed internationally.

The U.S.-flag merchant fleet has dwindled in size to the point that U.S.-flag vessels now carry less than 4 percent of the ocean-borne trade of the United States.

The U.S. shipyard industry currently has no orders for new construction of large commercial vessels and several major shipyards are experiencing severe financial conditions, and is laying off thousands of employees.

Skilled labor to crew the U.S. merchant marine and to construct new vessels is at a precariously low level.

The U.S.-flag merchant fleet, the U.S. shipyard industry, and the domestic marine equipment suppliers have decreased in size to the point that the bulk sealift capability and vessel construction and repair mobilization capacity of the United States are dangerously inadequate.

AMERICAN PRESIDENT CO., LTD.,

Oakland, CA, July 16, 1993.

Hon. RONALD V. DELLUMS,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know American President Lines, Ltd. faces a very competitive environment in serving our commercial and military customers through our international transportation services.

As an international ocean carrier, we are forced to acquire our ships at world market prices. To do otherwise would burden us with insurmountable cost disadvantages and make it impossible to compete against foreign carriers. Worldwide acquisition of ships at competitive prices occasionally puts us at odds with the Shipbuilders Council of America, whose U.S. shipyard constituency would prefer that U.S.-flag carriers be limited to ship construction in U.S. yards. The issues surrounding this economic debate have been in existence for many years and are very much a part of the current maritime reform process.

Last week, however, a newsletter of the Shipbuilders Council of America mischaracterized the motives and actions of American President Lines, Ltd. (APL) in its recently announced shipbuilding program, and added an element of confusion to current maritime reform efforts. It is important to me, personally, and to my company that these inaccuracies be addressed and corrected. Moreover, I would like to express APL's view that a more cooperative approach to maritime reform and ship construction issues by U.S. shipyards, collectively and individually, is a critical predicate to Congressional and Administration efforts to revitalize the U.S. maritime community.

Like you, Mr. Chairman, American President Lines has been extremely concerned by the rapid decline of the U.S. maritime community in recent years. The pace of this decline appears to be accelerating for both ocean carriers and U.S. shipyards.

In the absence of an Administration program and policy to address America's critical need for U.S. sealift and ship construction, Congress has stepped in over the past two months with a series of bills designed to address the need for a successor promotional program to the 1936 Merchant Marine Act; to address the tax inequities facing U.S. international ocean carriers; and to modernize and assist U.S. shipyards as they attempt to re-enter commercial ship construction markets which they abandoned following the end of the construction differential subsidy (CDS) program in the early 1980's.

I am aware that you have been integrally involved on each of these fronts, both as a result of your concern for adequate U.S. controlled sealift capacity as Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and as a member whose district encompasses a major port and is home to many shipping and shipyard interests.

The principal challenge we face in crafting a maritime policy for the United States is to unite and coordinate the interests of the various elements of the maritime community. In its current precarious state, our industry can no longer afford fractious infighting and maneuvering. Nor can one segment be allowed to stifle development of other segments of the maritime community, i.e., we can no longer allow linkage between carriers and shipyards which inhibit either group's growth or health.

With these thoughts in mind, and having devoted a great deal of personal time and effort to reaching out to various shipyard executives in the United States, I was enormously concerned when I reviewed the July 1, 1993 issue of the Shipyard Chronicle, a trade association publication of the Shipbuilders Council of America (SCA). In its lead article this SCA publication purported to report on the details of a recently announced new shipbuilding program by American President Lines, Ltd. The ostensible purpose of this article was, I presume, to strengthen the Shipbuilders Council's arguments that foreign shipbuilding subsidies—in this case Germany and Korea—have prevented their U.S. members from constructing containerships for U.S.-flag carriers.

In fact, the article was fraught with misleading allegations and, of most concern, called into question the integrity of American President Lines.

The SCA article, and other statements attributed to its President John J. Stocker, suggest that APL's new-build financing package mandates that its six new ships be registered under foreign flag. This assertion is absolutely incorrect. To the contrary, APL affirmatively retains full discretion and the express right under its financing package to document these vessels under the U.S. flag. Mr. Stocker's allegation at best is poorly researched and incorrect and can only confuse and prejudice the process of maritime reform. In fact, APL has said many times in the media and before the Congress that it hopes a program is passed and signed into law which allows APL to operate these new ships under U.S. flag.

APL is unaware of any German or Korean government subsidies to the shipyards where its six new vessels are being constructed and is unaware of any financing subsidies, other than an option to finance the German built vessels on standard OECD terms. In fact, commercial market interest rates make the OECD option more expensive today than ordinary commercial terms available to APL to finance the purchase of the vessels.

In addition, the SCA article notes that "APL had invited U.S. yards to submit bids on the containerships, but had given them only 17 days to respond . . . which was an unrealistic time frame." This statement is both inaccurate and offensive in that it implies that APL was not dealing with U.S. yards in good faith. All shipyards, including the U.S. yards, were given virtually the same amount of time to respond to the bid. While all the foreign shipyards submitted bids for the APL program, the U.S. shipyards responded with letters detailing a number of reasons why they were unable to participate. Significantly, these letters focused on the U.S.

yards' lack of "off-the-shelf" designs, construction capacity, and ability to assemble financing. This July 1 article and prior Congressional testimony by Mr. Stocker seem to imply that there was a lack of good faith in APL's reaching out to the U.S. yards, and that the requests to bid were "perfunctory". In fact, APL determined that in spite of the lack of recent commercial construction experience in U.S. yards it was important to give them an opportunity to develop bids alone or in combination with foreign yards. I can assure you that APL's motives in soliciting bids from U.S. yards were entirely proper—and to allege otherwise is, in my view, a misplaced effort to gain some phantom advantage for the SCA's subsidy or other legislative initiatives.

Mr. Chairman, I will continue to work with you and your colleagues on the Armed Services Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to promptly address the issues and challenges we must meet in order to reinvigorate America's maritime community. I am hopeful that we will be able to work more productively with U.S. shipyards and avoid fractious and misplaced efforts to gain competitive advantage at the expense of other segments of the maritime industry. The time has long passed when America and the maritime industry can withstand such intramural and unproductive feuding.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. LILLIE,
Chairman.

TRIBUTE TO KRISTIN DODSON

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, Kristin Dodson, like many preteens, never gave any thought one way or the other to the question of abortion. However, one day while attending mass at her local parish, a guest priest talked about crisis pregnancies and the debate over the issue of choice. In the context of this discussion he questioned whether or not his sermons actually made a difference, especially to young people. On that day it did. Kristin's mother, Judi, remembered Kristin coming home from church and going straight to her room. When she emerged several hours later, Kristin asked her mom to read a story she had written in response to that day's sermon. The following is the text of this story:

I'M SORRY

(By Kristin Dodson, age 12)

As the sixth week goes by, I'm still wondering if my mommy is going to murder me. I wonder how she can even think of that. Can't she feel my heart beating? Can't she have the strength to at least let me be born, even if she doesn't want to keep me? Whenever I hear her talk about it, I cry. It was as if she heard me once, I was saying, "mommy, mommy, please don't do this to me. I'm just a baby, not even born yet, like you used to be. I have the right to live." I heard her say, "I'm sorry," and pat her tummy.

As the tenth week goes by, I have a heart beating, and I am almost fully developed. I'm still wondering if she is going to murder me. Sometimes I'm not even sure if she's my mom, because I couldn't imagine my mom thinking of murdering me. She's been talk-

ing about it a lot more. The sad thing is, is that she doesn't have anyone to hold her hand, and try to tell her not to do it. I don't think she even thinks about me, or cares about me. I wish I could only be born so if this happened again, I could tell her what I hear, felt, and thought. If she does do it, I wonder how such a nice caring person could even think about murdering a poor innocent baby, like me. What did I do wrong? I feel so bad inside. I feel like crying again.

Whenever I hear my mommy talking about it I felt sick and sad and cry. Sometimes I think she is going to explode from all the tears I let out. As the fourth month goes by, I hear my mommy crying a lot and I wonder why she doesn't just forget about it, and let me be born, but I guess it just doesn't work that way.

As the sixth month goes by, I think it's going to happen. My mommy just talked to the doctor. I heard her say, "poor thing." I cried again. I heard them say "six and a half months," that really scared me. Couldn't they have done it a long time ago, they wouldn't have had to waste that much of my body. But I guess it doesn't really matter anymore because it's going to happen. And there is nothing I can do about it. Still, its a lot to waste, I mean a whole human living body.

My mommy is talking about moving because she doesn't have very much money and people keep on hassling her about what she is about to do. I just wish my mommy could have made the right choice.

I think its the day. I can hear my mommy weeping and I can hear the metal knives and tweezers clanging together. "Ow! Ow! Mommy, why do you have to do this to me?" The last two words I heard were, "I'm sorry."

SHEILA LEITER—DISTINGUISHED PROFESSIONAL, DISTINGUISHED AWARD

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a woman who has shown extraordinary enthusiasm, professionalism, and success in her role as a civil servant.

Sheila Leiter received, in 1991 and 1992, a Commissioner's Citation from the Commissioner of Social Security for outstanding achievements associated with her work as Area Director for the Social Security Administration in Metropolitan Los Angeles.

Receiving the Commission's Citation is no small feat. However, this year Mrs. Leiter has gone a step further to become a Distinguished Service Award recipient. This award from the Department of Health and Human Services is among the highest honors granted civil servants by the U.S. Government. I would like to quote the words of praise submitted by Sheila's administrative superiors that were read to assembled guests at the Department on the day of the awards presentation:

"An example of her dedication and caring leadership was shown during the period of the recent Los Angeles riot and its aftermath. During the height of the rioting, Ms. Leiter kept in continuous touch with each of her facilities, eventually closing down all offices and sending all employees home to ensure their safety.

Even after all offices closed, Ms. Leiter herself remained on duty in her office, located in the heart of the troubled area, to address innumerable issues, including transmission of employee payroll, issuance of Social Security and Supplemental Security Income checks to the public, and assessment of damage to Social Security Administration facilities. She also provided continuous updates on the crisis to the regional office, the central office, and the Disability Determination Service and helped the Department of Health and Human Services in setting up a 'command post' in her service area. Immediately following the crisis, Ms. Leiter visited all her offices to offer her support and ensure that employees could air their concerns and frustrations. She arranged for speedy employee access to counseling services. Ms. Leiter has fought aggressively since the crisis to secure more resources for her offices to allow them to rebound successfully. Her efforts resulted in more summer aids, overtime, travel funds, furniture and equipment so that offices can better serve the public and offer an improved environment for the employees."

I join with Sheila Leiter's friends and family in congratulating her for these outstanding accomplishments. In addition, I would like to thank her for all that she has done for the people of the Los Angeles area and, especially, for her years of loyalty—and of achievement—in her service to this country.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 22, 1993, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 23

- 9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
To closed business meeting, to continue to mark up a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994. SR-222
- 10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nomination of David Laurence Aaron, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Department of State. SD-419

- Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nomination of M. Joycelyn Elders, of Arkansas, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. SD-430

- 2:00 p.m.
Armed Services
To closed business meeting, to continue to mark up a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994. SR-222

- Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine school financial management programs. SD-430

JULY 27

- 9:00 a.m.
Office of Technology Assessment
Board meeting, to consider pending business. EF-100, Capitol

- 9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on the status of the Department of Energy's superconducting super collider program. SD-366

- Energy and Natural Resources
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development on the status of the Department of Energy's superconducting super collider program. SD-366

- Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine the General Services Administration's management of Federal property. SD-342

- 10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Superfund, Recycling, and Solid Waste Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the State and local community involvement in superfund cleanups. SD-406

- 11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to review the report of the National Academy of Sciences' Committee to Review the Health Effects in Vietnam Veterans of Exposure to Herbicides. SD-G50

- 2:15 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
Clean Water, Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1114, authorizing funds for programs of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, focusing on the issues of watershed planning and enforcement. SD-406

JULY 28

- 9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to examine the status of the Department of Energy's superconducting super collider program. SD-366

- Energy and Natural Resources
To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development to examine the status of the Department of Energy's superconducting super collider program. SD-366

- 10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Fastener Quality Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-592). SR-253

- Judiciary
Courts and Administrative Practice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to revise the Federal rules of civil procedures. SD-226

JULY 29

- 9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings to examine the Department of Energy's efforts to cleanup its nuclear weapons complex, focusing on the scope and cost of the cleanup program, the technological and managerial problems it faces, the standards governing the cleanup effort, and how priorities are set among competing cleanup projects. SD-366

- Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on tribal college telecommunications and facility needs. SR-485

- 2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 150, to provide for assistance in the preservation of Talliesin in the State of Wisconsin, S. 278, to authorize the establishment of the Chief Big Foot National Memorial Park and the Wounded Knee National Memorial in the State of South Dakota, S. 492 and H.R. 240, bills to provide for the protection of the Bodie Bowl area of the State of California, S. 845, to provide for the addition of the Truman Farm Home to the Harry S. Truman National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, and S. 855, proposed Alaska Peninsula Subsurface Consolidation Act. SD-366

JULY 30

- 9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine Federal government contracting procedures. SD-342

AUGUST 2

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the status of the Department of Energy's civilian radioactive waste program. SD-366

Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1216, to resolve the 107th Meridian boundary dispute between the Crow Indian Tribe, the Northern Cheyenne Indian Tribe, and the United States and various other issues pertaining to the Crow Indian Reservation. SR-485

Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity on the implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act (P.L. 102-367), and the Indian Employment Training and Services Demonstration Act (P.L. 102-477). SR-485

AUGUST 3

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the Veterans Administration mental health programs. SR-418

AUGUST 5

3:00 p.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Indian Affairs on the implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act (P.L. 102-367), and the Indian Employment Training and Services Demonstration Act (P.L. 102-477). SR-485

CANCELLATIONS

AUGUST 3

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-366

AUGUST 4

Indian Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources'

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 318, to provide for the energy security of the Nation through encouraging the production of domestic oil and gas resources in deep water on the Outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico, and S. 727, to establish a California Ocean Protection Zone. SD-366