HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, May 20, 1994*

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O gracious God, as You have blessed every person with the full measure of Your grace and given unto us all the bounty of Your spirit, so lead us this day in the ways of peace. We pray for peace in our hearts that we will be freed from selfishness or covetousness or envy, that we will replace any enmity with goodwill, any hatred with charity, so we may lead lives of generosity and kindness. May there be peace in our world so the weapons of destruction will become the tools of construction, that the nations will sense their shared destiny in a new spirit of hope and trust, one with another. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HEFLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CONDOLENCES TO THE FRIENDS AND FAMILY OF JACQUELINE KENNEDY ONASSIS

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with Members of the House of Representatives, on both sides of the aisle in extending our deepest condolences to the friends and family of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis.

In 1963, Jacqueline Kennedy's steadfast strength and courage, perhaps more than anything else during that fateful week, led this Nation through a tragic episode in American history. Over the years, her dignity in crisis became a symbol of our national character; and her elegance and style changed the look of America.

Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis combined intellectualism with social tradition—professionalism with style and grace—and created, perhaps ahead of her time, a standard for contemporary American women.

Few people have such a profound impact on their time as did Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. Her dignity, elegance, and courage are forever etched in our collective memory as part of a unique period in American history that reflected the best of what we are as a nation, and who we are as a people. Generations to come will remember her as a standard of American culture and character.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak for every Member of this House when I say that we join the Nation in mourning Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis, and remembering what she meant to this Nation.

NINETY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on this date 92 years ago, the Republic of Cuba was created, after a century long struggle, marked by the courage and determination of Cuban patriots who sacrificed all for liberty and democracy.

Sadly, the Cuban people today find themselves struggling once again against the forces of oppression. Only this time, not against an imperialist foreign power, but against the totalitarian dictator who betrayed his country, and has enslaved the Cuban nation for 35 years, Fidel Castro.

The Castro regime's repression of the Cuban people continues unabated after many decades. However, the patriotic spirit of Jose Marti, Antonio Maceo, Maximo Gomez, and all the other Cuban patriots who fought for Cuban independence, remains alive in the hearts and souls of all Cubans, both inside and outside the island, who still struggle for the liberation of Cuba from the claws of Castro's ruthless regime.

Mr. Speaker, that fighting spirit will soon define the end of the Castro dictatorship and signal a new dawn of freedom and democracy for the sovereign nation of Cuba and its people.

FAIR TREATMENT FOR THE U.S. CAPITOL POLICE FORCE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Capitol Police are one of the finest police communities in the entire Nation, yet they get no respect from the Congress of the United States. They are paid thousands of dollars less than other Federal employees. Their grievances are thrown in the wastebasket. They say there is age discrimination, racial discrimination, and sexual harassment, and no one really cares. They believe the Speaker does not care and the leaders of the Congress do not care.

In fact, it costs $50,000 just to train 1 police officer, and the Capitol Police are so fed up, in the last 60 days 40 Capitol Police officers left the force and said, "We are sick and tired of being treated like second-rate citizens." Shame, Congress. The only time the Capitol Police think they are getting a fair shake is when Congress has a police emergency. They want us to cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 84, and Congress, we deserve to at least give our Capitol Police some support.

IN THE PASSING OF JACQUELINE KENNEDY ONASSIS, CAMELOT HAS LOST ITS GUINEVERE

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, in the early 1960's I was asked as a student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, to be the head of the student for Kennedy in southern Nevada. I was so proud that I was asked to do this as an active member of the Young Democrats, and I worked very, very hard. Even though I cannot consider myself a knight in Camelot, I certainly considered myself a squire or maybe only a page, but I worked very, very hard in that election to get then-Senator Kennedy elected President.

For the next 3 years I watched in awe, in admiration, as the Kennedy administration moved forward on many programs that I as a Democrat held so near and dear. We certainly admired President Kennedy and his wife, Jacqueline Kennedy, and were happy to see the progress of this administration. We were happy when they coined the name Camelot, because again, we felt we were part of that noble cause to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

bring their justice to all mankind and America in general.

We lost that ray of light last night when Jacqueline Kennedy died, and we will remember her forever. That light has gone out, and we feel so bad about it, but her memory will go on forever. We have certainly lost our fair Guinevere.

URGING DEMOCRATIC FRESHMEN A–Z COSPONSORS TO SIGN THE A–Z DISCHARGE PETITION

(Mr. ZELIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, in 1992 the voters told us loud and clear that they wanted change. They brought new blood to Congress and new blood to the White House.

Last year, 112 new Members came to this House: 112 freshmen were sent here with a voter mandate for change; 112 freshmen campaigned against Congress; 112 freshmen pledged to end business as usual.

All 44 freshman Republicans have cosponsored the A–Z cut-spending bill, and all have signed the A–Z discharge petition. Twenty-four freshman Democrats are cosponsors, but only one took the heroic step of signing the discharge petition.

The American people are tired of the same old excuses about why Washington can't cut spending. The American people know that low taxes come from low spending.

The American people know that there is Government waste. The American people are willing to accept some sacrifice.

A–Z ends business as usual. A–Z brings fiscal responsibility to Congress. A–Z makes Congress accountable to the people. but most importantly, A–Z fulfills the 1992 voter mandate for change.

I urge the 24 Democratic freshmen who cosponsored A–Z to join all 45 of their Republican freshmen colleagues. End the hypocrisy now. Sign the A–Z discharge petition today.

You promised the voters change. The American people are waiting and watching.

□ 1010

A SOLUTION TO THE HAITIAN PROBLEM

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the President has not ruled out an invasion of Haiti. Sanctions are going to take effect there tomorrow. The clock is ticking, the deadlines are upon us. We have an outpouring of refugees coming out of that country into the waters of the Caribbean like we have not seen in more than 3 years. The country is in grinding poverty. It is described as a public health disaster by recent visitors. It is an environmental and it is a human calamity.

Mr. Speaker, there is a solution. Under OAS and U.N. auspices, a safe haven in Haiti on Haitian soil for humanitarian relief and as a base for Aristide loyalists can be found in the Ile de la Gonave right here close to the Haitian mainland. That is a 280-square-mile island, it has over 80,000 people on it, it has very few military and it is virtually totally defensible against any military invasions from Port-au-Prince because they have no capability to go across the water. One Coast Guard cutter, no invasion, the OAS and the United Nations, we can begin to restore humanity and democracy in Haiti.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S BIZARRE HAITIAN POLICY

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, each chapter of this administration's policy toward Haiti is more and more bizarre.

As a Congressman from Florida, I keep thinking it cannot get any worse.

Floridians have footed the bill for illegal Haitians, legal Haitians, HIV-infected Haitians, economic refugee Haitians, and asylum-seeking Haitians.

The Florida taxpayer has picked up the tab for failed Federal policy, changed Federal policy, and no Federal policy.

To underwrite this nightmare the people of Florida have anted up for welfare, food stamps, education, housing, incarceration, transportation, and hospitalization.

Now, most outrageously, Floridians and United States taxpayers will pay thousands of their hard-earned dollars to charter foreign cruise ships to process the new flood of Haitians at sea.

While we debate mothballing our navy, the White House is paying for foreign cruise ships. What further insult can we add to an already injured American taxpayer?

FIGHTING VIOLENT CRIME SHOULD BE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S NO. 1 PRIORITY

(Mr. SCHIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the President of the United States placed a great deal of emphasis on the fight against violent crime. I think the President is entirely correct to place that priority.

Unfortunately though, the administration's budget proposal for the Department of Justice does not adequately reflect that priority. Quite the contrary.

The administration proposes reductions in the staffing of the DEA, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of the criminal division of the Department of Justice and of the criminal prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney's Office. At the same time, the administration proposes to increase the number of personnel in the antitrust division of the Department of Justice.

Of course, I have no objection to prosecuting antitrust violators too, but the President did not say publicly that that was our priority.

I invite Members of the House from both sides of the aisle to join me in a letter to the Appropriations Committee asking them to make the priority in the budget for the Department of Justice fighting violent crime. This letter will be sent next week.

CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY OF JACQUELINE KENNEDY ONASSIS

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, words which are always associated with the late Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis are style, elegance and grace, and intelligence, and indeed, Mrs. Kennedy Onassis did exhibit all of those traits admirably through her public life, and then in more recent years in her private life.

But there is another word that could be associated with her and should be, and that is the word "courage." She showed estimable courage in 1963 when many of us watched on television as she organized and presided over the funeral of her husband, the assassinated President of our land. She also showed courage in recent months when she fought her lymphoma with nobility.

Ultimately it succeeded in killing her. but I think all of us can learn from the lessons which she and her family have taught us, and we take this opportunity to extend condolences to the children, to the grandchildren and to the family.

TEACH CAPITALISM HERE IN THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, having had the privilege to hear the Prime Minister of India speak before Congress 2 days ago, we should all take a moment to reflect on how this country can best take advantage of the opportunities opening up throughout the world.

As the free market struggles to take hold in many countries like India that

formerly relied on state-dominated economies, the United States has an opportunity to serve as the great academy of the free market.

Rather than spend billions on foreign assistance projects of dubious merit, Congress can help to establish programs in our local communities that bring young entrepreneurs and business leaders to this country to learn first-hand how a large market economy functions.

Some programs such as these already exist, and I believe that Congress should seek to expand these in the years to come. This would be one important step in moving our international policies from aid to trade. it would also enable us to cut substantially our foreign aid budget, establish trade ties with emerging markets and support market-oriented democracy throughout the world.

BREAST CANCER AND SCIENTIFIC FRAUD

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to confront a killer of American women and a federal system which allowed women to be duped.

Some 46,300 women will die of breast cancer this year. It robs Americans of our mothers, our sisters, and our daughters.

American women were recently appalled to learn of scientific fraud conducted in one of the largest federally funded breast cancer research projects.

It is highly offensive that a trusted researcher would falsify data to get around the specific protocols designed to ensure appropriate and worthwhile information.

What is worse in this situation, however, is that the National Cancer Institute knowingly conceal this information from thousands of women whose potential life and death decisions were based on this false information.

It is time that we, as the guardians of the public trust, fully investigate and take action to ensure that women will never again be faced with treatment decisions based on false information. It is time to restore American women's confidence in the research they have entrusted to us.

OUTRAGEOUS BONUSES AWARDED BY SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, the huge bonuses awarded by the Social Security agency are outrageous to taxpayers in central Illinois.

$32 million in bonuses from an agency with the track record of the Social Security Administration would certainly lead many American voters to be skeptical.

Some of these bonuses appear to be greedy and excessive.

Many of us find this hard to believe when the Clinton administration rolls into town bemoaning the greed and excesses of the past two administrations.

Yet, the largest single bonus went to a Clinton administration appointee. Lawrence Thompson, the second ranking agency executive, was on the job less than 3 months when he got a $9,256 bonus.

This is another example of how the Clinton administration wants it both ways.

They are asking the American people to believe they are cleaning up the mess in Washington, DC, when they are really part of the problem.

MOURNING THE DEATH OF JACQUELINE KENNEDY ONASSIS

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a deep sense of sadness and sorrow over the passing of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. Our prayers are with her children, her grandchildren, and other members of her family.

Many of us came of age when this beautiful and gifted woman and President Kennedy held the attention of a hopeful nation. In Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis, we had the most gracious First Lady to occupy the White House in modern times. She was the epitome of grace, charm, intellect, and beauty. Anyone who can remember the week of November 22, 1963, cannot forget how she led us through that difficult period following the assassination of President Kennedy.

Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis represented the very best of America. She was a source of inspiration to millions of Americans. For many of us, her passing means the loss of a dear and special friend.

Mrs. Onassis was always charming and generous. She was a great supporter of the arts and historic preservation. Many historic buildings in New York City, Washington, DC, and all around the country are standing because of her tireless efforts.

Mrs. Onassis will be missed by millions of Americans. Her passing is a great loss.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES TO IDENTIFY WELFARE CHEATS

(Mr. LAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this week a woman in New York was arrested and charged with welfare fraud. Not an usual circumstance in itself, but investigators found that over a 7-year period this woman collected benefits she was not entitled to using at least 15 different fake ID's, each with her real photograph on the front and each entitling her to public assistance. In 1991, the woman was using eight different names at once and claiming 46 children—all fictitious. Between 1987 and 1993 she received a total of $450,000 in illegal benefits, making this possibly the largest case of welfare fraud in New York's history.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 3723, calling upon the Secretary of HHS to conduct a feasibility study on the use of biometric technology as a means to identify welfare applicants and prevent just such incidents.

New York and California are conducting experimental programs on a limited basis using finger-imaging to identify welfare cheats. If the New York program is expanded statewide, it could save the taxpayers $46 million a year. Governor Cuomo has called for the expansion of this project. California projects a $20 million savings in its program over 5 years.

Reducing welfare fraud will cut costs and ensure that this assistance goes to those who honestly need help, not those who cheat the system and the taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to join the 64 bipartisan cosponsors who have already signed onto H.R. 3727.

□ 1020

IN MEMORY OF JACQUELINE KENNEDY ONASSIS

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis evokes flashes of memory, first and foremost November 22 and its aftermath, her grace, her dignity, her strength.

But as we watched television last night and this morning, my wife and I, there were also memories of those days before November 22, their excitement, their sense of decency, and their sense of the worthiness of public service. Some might call those memories illusion. I would call them hope.

May that hope not pass on with Jackie Kennedy; instead, may it be rekindled.

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT LADY

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to a great lady who passed

away last night in my hometown of New York. I mean, of course, our former First Lady, Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis.

To those of us growing up in the 1960's, Jacqueline Kennedy, along with her husband, President John F. Kennedy, personified a new generation of energy, spirit, and hope. Indeed, my very first calling to become involved in politics and government was in great part inspired by the Kennedys.

To me, Jacqueline Kennedy represented a kind of royalty in America, in a good sense. She was truly queen of our country during the short period she served as First Lady.

Who could ever forget her televised tour of the White House or her pillbox hats or the Jackie Kennedy hairdos? Who could ever forget the dignity and grace with which she conducted herself during the terrible period after the assassination?

I had the pleasure of meeting Jacqueline Kennedy only once, in 1980, when she came to my home community in the Bronx to campaign with me for TED KENNEDY. I did not know what to expect, but found her charming, personable, and gracious.

In her later years, she was very much a part of the New York City spirit, involving herself in a number of causes. We were very proud that Jacqueline Kennedy, born in New York, chose New York City for her home.

She will truly be missed but never forgotten. And my condolences go out to her children, grandchildren, and all of her family.

PROVIDING FOR EXPANDED DEBATE TIME FOR CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4301, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4301 in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union pursuant to House Resolution 429, debate time for amendments Nos. 16, 17, and 18 printed in part 1 of House Report 103-509 be expanded from 10 minutes per amendment, equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed, to 20 minutes per amendment, equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILBRAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 429 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4301.

□ 1027

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4301) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes, with Mr. RAHALL (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, May 19, 1994, amendment No. 2 printed in part 3 of House Report 103-509 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 429, it is now in order to debate the subject matter of the Trident II D-5 missile.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a general debate that would govern the discussion of two amendments, one amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], and another amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

In my capacity as chair of the Committee on Armed Services, I would like to make a few comments regarding both; first, with respect to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], relating to Trident backfit.

First, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Dicks amendment would give the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the bill's prohibition on backfitting the D-5 missiles into the first eight Trident submarines if the Secretary determines that forgoing the backfit would result in a significant risk to U.S. national security.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you some brief background. The committee recommended prohibiting the retrofit of the Trident II D-5 missiles into eight Trident submarines stationed in the Pacific and now carrying the Trident I C-4 missile. At one time the navy had planned to outfit those submarines with newer, more accurate D-5 missiles, but the end of the cold war, the tighter fiscal constraints have caused the Navy to postpone its plans for backfit.

Although the Navy officially would like to reserve the right to backfit eight Pacific Tridents at some point after year 2000, it has neither planned, Mr. Chairman, nor budgeted for that eventuality.

□ 1030

On the contrary, the Navy is beginning to plan the budget costs associated with the alternative backfit. That is extending the life of the C-4 missile. The committee recommendation would thus prohibit the activity that is not currently part of the Navy's plan. Let me just make a few bullet points to support the committee position in the hopes that my colleagues would follow the lead of the committee and oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

First, the prohibition on backfitting D-5 missiles into C-4 submarines merely codifies current Navy plans.

Second, current Navy inventory objective for D-5 missiles does not, Mr. Chairman, does not include enough missiles to backfit the eight Trident C-4 submarines based at Bangor, WA.

Three, the Dicks amendment essentially renders the backfit prohibition in the bill meaningless by giving the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the prohibition on the basis of national security. We do not need to postpone this decision any longer, Mr. Chairman. The cold war is over. The cold war is over.

Fourth point: Postponing a clear up-or-down decision on the backfit undermines the ability of the administration to plan a procurement strategy for the buyout of the D-5 missile and to plan for extending the service life of the C-4 missiles.

The greater range, payload, and accuracy of the D-5 missiles is no longer required in the post-cold-war era, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

By the Navy's own recent estimates, the alternative to backfit—that is, extending the service life of the C-4 missiles already deployed—is expected to be significantly less expensive than conducting the backfit. Mr. Chairman, the administration has no money in this bill, fiscal year 1995, to deal with these purposes. But the House Committee on Armed Services stepped up to this issue and established this prohibition.

Now, we spent hours and days and weeks and months debating how to intelligently and rationally handle our fiduciary responsibilities, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the taxpayers' dollars. By the action of the House, the Armed Services Committee canceling the backfit would save at least $3 billion in a post-cold-war environment.

How can we do less, Mr. Chairman? We do not have adequate resources to address myriad human problems that need to be dealt with by the Congress

of the United States on behalf of the American people. Why do we need to put into motion the potential of backfitting a D–5 highly accurate cold war weapon when the cold war is over, potentially to the tune of $3 billion? The Navy has not budgeted for it, the Navy has not planned for it, and I would suggest that my colleagues follow the leadership of the Armed Services Committee, reject this amendment.

In the few moments I have remaining, let me speak very briefly to the amendment that will be offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], who would terminate the D–5 warhead.

Several quick points: In a post-cold-war environment, the reduction in the nuclear threat jusifies a smaller Trident D–5 force structure. As we approach the nuclear nonproliferation negotiations, we must take actions that are consistent with that, and purchase of new D–5 sends the message to the nonnuclear weapons nations that we are inconsistent on our approach to this issue. How can we say to other nations, "Don't cross the nuclear threshold and begin to acquire, develop and acquire heinous nuclear weapons," when we continue to pursue accurate warheads that serve no useful purpose but to endanger the lives of our children and our children's children?

Our national security interests are best served by reduction of weapons in Russia and a strong nonproliferation regime. Making an additional Trident D–5 buy at this time when we are building to a level which is more than sufficient for our defense purposes threatens to trigger military acquisition programs in Russia and in other countries.

We have a window of opportunity to shut down the old arms race, Mr. Chairman, to prevent a new one from emerging. Continuing to buy the D–5 thwarts that goal. We will save $3 billion in scarce resources if we adopt the amendment to end the D–5 acquisition.

Halting the D–5 procurement now would fit in with our arms control on the START–I and the START–II regimes to reduce the strategic nuclear warheads down to some 3,500.

Finally, we have an adequate number of D–5 missiles, 348, over 6 years of procurement to handle the 10 Trident submarines that are scheduled to be fitted with the D–5 and to meet any testing needs.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we ask that you oppose the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], on the grounds that I have already enumerated. We can save the resources, the cold war is over, we need to send the appropriate message.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] because that also saves resources; at a time when we are downsizing our military budget in a scarce-dollar environment, we need to be rational and thoughtful.

The post-cold-war challenges us to think anew. Let us not continue to carry the baggage of cold war thinking into this new debate. Old paradigms no longer work.

With those remarks and observations, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of a program that is critical to our national security, the Trident-II, D–5 sea-launched ballistic missile program. Specifically, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] terminating production of the D–5 missile in fiscal year 1995. I also rise in support, however, of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] to give the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the bill's prohibition on backfitting the D–5 missile into the first eight Trident submarines if the Secretary determines that foregoing the backfit would result in a significant risk to national security.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of a program that is critical to U.S. national security, the Trident II (D–5) sea-launched ballistic missile [SLBM]. Specifically, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. PENNY terminating production of the D–5 in fiscal year 1995. I also rise in support, however, of the amendment offered by Mr. DICKS to give the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the bill's prohibition on backfitting the D–5 missile into the first eight Trident submarines if the Secretary determines that foregoing the backfit would result in a significant risk to U.S. national security.

Mr. Chairman, under the START I and II arms reduction treaties, the United States is required to dramatically reduce the number of strategic warheads in its arsenal. The administration has decided to place the bulk of the remaining U.S. warheads in the stabilizing and more survivable submarine leg of the strategic triad. Relying more heavily on SLBM's requires the United States to produce enough D–5 missiles to equip the 10 Atlantic Ocean strategic submarines configured to carry the D–5. In pursuit of this objective, DOD has requested the funds necessary to procure an additional 18 D–5 missiles in fiscal year 1995.

Terminating D–5 missile production now would force a choice between two equally undesirable options: Send submarines to sea with empty launch tubes, or conduct costly modifications to the new Atlantic Ocean Trident submarines so as to permit them to employ the aging and less capable C–4 missile whose service life is limited—an option that could end up costing more than procuring the additional D–5 missiles. Either option will impose severe operational disadvantages and will create substantial inefficiencies in the overall U.S. strategic program.

Terminating D–5 production would also complicate U.S. arms control efforts. In fact, the Clinton administration strongly opposes any effort to reopen either START treaty to amendments—as would be required if the Penny amendment were to become law. As President Clinton noted in a letter dated May 18, 1994:

During debate on the fiscal year 1995 DOD authorization bill, Representative Penny will offer an amendment to terminate procurement of Trident missiles in fiscal year 1995. I strongly oppose this amendment. Terminating procurement of additional D–5 missiles would severely limit our ability to support the U.S. Trident SSBN program, which is the backbone of the U.S. deterrent well into the next century. It would also close our last remaining missile production line and adversely affect our support for Britain's Trident program. For these reasons, I urge Members to vote against the Penny amendment.

Here's what the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Gen. Colin Powell said about the D–5 missile in a July 27, 1993, letter:

The D–5 missile on Trident submarines will be the backbone of U.S. strategic deterrent forces under START II. I do not support the proposal to renegotiate the terms of the START II Treaty with Russia to allow either country to decrease the number of missiles carried by a submarine. I believe that production of the D–5 should not be prematurely terminated. The vast majority of the Trident investment is behind us, and procuring the remaining missiles for Atlantic Ocean Trident submarines will ensure a credible deterrent force well into the 21st century.

Former Secretary of Defense Les Aspin also strongly opposes the Penny amendment. According to a July 19, 1993, letter I received from Secretary Aspin:

Terminating D–5 missile production now would shut down the only operating strategic ballistic missile production line in the United States. Sustaining a low rate of D–5 production, and the associated industrial and technology bases, provides a key and unique hedge against future uncertainties. Continued D–5 production is, therefore, essential to the future health of our deterrent capability. I strongly urge your continued support for this critical program.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I strongly support the Trident II (D–5) missile program, and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Penny amendment and "yes" on the Dicks amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the first responsibility to the people and the Congress is to defend our people. All other things cannot come about if we cannot defend our people. How have we elected to do that over the years? During the days of the Soviet Union, we used something, either by happenstance or planned, and it was called the Triad: land, sea, and air. Little bit by little bit, the Triad system is being taken apart. We do not have strategic aircraft standing on alert. They are standing down. Little by little, we are pulling our missiles, like the MX and others, out of the ground. The MX will be out, we will have the Minuteman–III, that is all that we will have.

So why are we putting all our eggs in this basket? As we look at the three legs, we are deciding and electing to say that we are going to defend America with Trident boats and in these Trident boats, some in the Atlantic and some in the Pacific, those in the Pacific have an interim missile called the C–4. It is not intended to be a missile that will be longlasting. It does not have the range, it does not have the accuracy, it is not really the kind of missile we were looking for, because in this interim period we are waiting for the D–5 missiles.

We are asking now in the amendment of Mr. DICKS to put the D–5 in the Pacific fleet as it is in the Atlantic fleet. That is what we are looking at at this particular time.

Now, why at this time are we saying, "How do we defend America now?" Do we want to take the very best we have got and say, "No, we are going to use the old interim C–4?" It seems to me that as we lose our strategic B–52's, B–1, B–2, we are not using those to the extent we have, we are pulling our land-based missiles out; we do everything in our power to defend this Nation with the very best thing we have got, and that is the D–5. It seems to me totally unreasonable we would pull those out.

Also, let me add to this, we have our friends in the British Isles who are fitting their submarines and they are asking to do it with the D–5. To pull this program at this particular time, we cut off the legs of our friends, the British.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday a letter came from President Bill Clinton. If I may read part of that letter, it says,

During debate on the fiscal year 1995 DOD Authorization Bill, Representative Penny will offer an amendment to terminate procurement of Trident missiles in Fiscal Year 1995.

I strongly oppose this amendment. Terminating procurement of additional D–5 missiles would severely limit our ability to support the U.S. Trident SSBN program, which is the backbone of the U.S. deterrent well into the next century. It would also close our last remaining ballistic missile production line and adversely affect our support for Britain's Trident program.

For these reasons, I urge Members to vote against the Penny amendment.

□ 1040

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I just want to make it very, very clear what my amendment does.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, what my amendment does is say this:

The Secretary of Defense is in the midst of a strategic review of all of our strategic forces. The committee has put in a prohibition on backfitting the D–5's on the Pacific Trident. I do not take that prohibition out unless the Secretary of Defense, who happens to be a Democrat, Bill Perry, wants to waive it because it is in the national security interest to waive it, and then we could still have the debate next year. There is not a dime in this bill for retrofitting D–5 missiles on Pacific Tridents. What I am doing is just preserving the option.

The other thing I would want to say to the gentleman on the D–5 missile is that the chairman says we have enough missiles to take care of the 10 Trident submarines. That simply is not accurate according to Admiral Childs who says we do not have the number of missiles for the 10 Tridents in the Atlantic. So, let us correct that record, and we have the President on our side, and the Defense Department on the side who wants to defeat the Penny amendment and support the D–5 Program.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's clarification of what his amendment does, and, as he points out, it gives it to the Secretary of Defense to make that determination. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this is a very good amendment. I think we should support the Dicks amendment and oppose the Penny amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, "Thank you."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Penny amendment to terminate production of the D–5 missile.

Mr. Chairman, we have almost completed our procurement of this program, and it would be premature to stop D–5 missile production now. The Trident submarine force constitutes the backbone of our strategic deterrent in this post-cold-war era. If we terminate D–5 missile production now, we will not have enough missiles to support even the reduced force levels agreed to under the START Treaties.

The D–5 Program is also a priority of the administration. Let me share with my colleagues a letter from the President of the United States in support of the D–5 Program that the Committee on Armed Services received just 2 days ago, and I might add parenthetically this is the only letter, as far as I know up to this point, that the President of the United States has written concerning the defense bill.

I quote:

I strongly oppose this amendment. Terminating procurement of additional D–5 missiles would severely limit our ability to support the U.S. Trident SSBN program, which is the backbone of the U.S. deterrent well into the next century. It would also close our last remaining ballistic missile production line and adversely affect our support for Britain's Trident program.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly agree with the President's statement, and will insert the President's letter in the record of debate on this amendment.

I would also like to emphasize that termination of the D–5 Program now would amount to a unilateral U.S. force reduction under the START Treaties since the United States would end up deploying fewer warheads than are permitted under START II. Such unilateral reductions would actually undermine START Treaty implementation by removing a key Russian incentive to ratify the START II Treaty.

Finally, termination of the D–5 Program now will adversely affect our confidence in the safety and reliability of the missile by causing an inventory shortfall that would in turn undermine the Navy's Planned Testing and Logistics Program.

For all of these reasons I strongly oppose the amendment to terminate D–5 production, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The letter from the President is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 18, 1994.

Hon. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During debate on the Fiscal Year 1995 DOD Authorization Bill, Representative Penny will offer an amendment to terminate procurement of Trident missiles in Fiscal Year 1995.

I strongly oppose this amendment. Terminating procurement of additional D–5 missiles would severely limit our ability to support the U.S. Trident SSBN program, which is the backbone of the U.S. deterrent well into the next century. It would also close our last remaining ballistic missile production line and adversely affect our support for Britain's Trident program.

For these reasons, I urge Members to vote against the Penny amendment.

Sincerely,

BILL.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me just say, and Yogi Berra once said, this is deja vu all over again. This debate could have occurred 10 years ago. As someone much brighter than this person, much more philosophical and brilliant said, everything is changed except the way we think, and what I am challenging my colleagues to do is to change the nature of how they think. The cold war is over. To talk about survivability and nuclear weapons is bizarre and absurd. We need to put that genie back in the bottle. This is the first opportunity we have as American people to try to make the world a safer place, and talking about building more nuclear weapons, in my estimation, flies in the face of reality.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the letter from our distinguished President, but I would remind all of our col-

leagues here that we are a coequal branch of government, and we have both the right and the responsibility to make decisions.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, today we will have an amendment on the floor which would terminate the D–5 missile, and that in my opinion would be a serious mistake. Let me just give the House an overview of where we are with this very important system.

We today have 10 Trident boats, 10 Trident submarines, which will be outfitted to accommodate the D–5 missile. We, therefore, need 240 D–5 missiles to go in the 24 tubes on each of these 10 submarines. That constitutes the requirement of 240 D–5 missiles if they are to be outfitted with the missiles for which they were designed.

Now one facile solution, which the supporters of this amendment may suggest, is we have got plenty of C–4 missiles, the older missile now on the existing Trident boat.

I ask, "Why don't we take them and simply stick them in the tubes of these 10 Trident submarines?"

The answer simply is: "They don't fit. Their length, their width, their total dimensions are such that they do not fit, and it would require that these boats be taken back to their manufacturer in Brighton, CT, and completely rebuilt at a cost of at least 400 or $500 million per boat, an exorbitant cost."

Second, in addition to the 240 missiles we need to fill the tubes on these ten Trident submarines, Mr. Chairman, we have a requirement still remaining of 11 missiles to be used for certification to make certain that this missile can perform according to its specifications. Thirty-five originally were required for this purpose. It is now down to 11 additional missiles. So, we need these for certification, and I might add that this is not some simple requirement because we have learned things from the testing and certification of this system that have been important to its development and deployment.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we need 138 missiles for life cycle testing. Now what does this mean? We assume that the Trident boats will have a life of 23 years. They actually have a life of more than 23 years, but the utility of this missile we are assuming to be 23 years, and we are assuming that we will take six missiles every year and test. That means of the 10 boats 6 boats will be doing one test, one missile firing a year. That is the minimum necessary to keep proficiency in the crew so that they understand the flight system, the navigation system, the control system. It is the minimum test to make sure that we understand this system. It is also the minimum test to maintain confidence in the D–5 missile. That means that about every other year a Trident submarine crew will be going to sea and firing one missile. That is what we are providing for here: 240 to go in the tubes, 138 to test, 11 to complete the certification. That brings us to 389 missiles. That has been pared back considerably from last year, and I think that point ought to be made.

We have already cut, the Navy has already cut, the request for the Trident missile, D–5 missile by 36 percent. It is down to 696 million from 1.1 billion. We have cut it to the minimum necessary number and should cut no further.

□ 1050

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has expired, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct pleasure to yield the balance of our time to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], who is the author of one of the two principal amendments before the House.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I—along with Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY of California, Congressmen SCOTT KLUG and PETER BARCA of Wisconsin—are offering a bipartisan amendment to end procurement of the Trident II, D–5, missile after fiscal year 1994.

There are a number of very important reasons why this amendment should be approved by the House of Representatives at this time:

First, the Trident II, D–5, missile is a cold war weapon system which was designed to destroy hardened missile silos and other targets found only in the former Soviet Union. There is no national security argument which would necessitate the continued procurement of this weapon system.

A 1993 CBO report found that even if the United States ended the D–5 missile program after fiscal year 1994, the Navy would still have a Trident SLBM capability at the end of this decade which is comparable with the capability that exists today in the entire fleet of ballistic missile submarines.

This amendment would leave the Navy with nearly 320 D–5 missiles which have already been authorized by Congress. The authors of this amendment have proposed an option which provides 180 D–5 missiles on the 10 Trident II submarines and 140 D–5 missiles for tests and evaluations. This option would cancel the planned backfit of the Trident I submarines and would require the Navy to extend the life of the C–4 missile for an additional 15 years.

Continued procurement of the D–5 missile will likely lead to a hollow force in the near future unless steps are taken now to dramatically alter the way the Department of Defense spends its annual $260 billion budget. Many of us in this body have criticized the President of the United States for the so-called hollow force—however, the real blame for a potential hollow force lies right here on Capitol Hill where many of us are more concerned about preserving Defense industry jobs in our districts, and less concerned about preserving national security in this country.

Expenditures on cold war weapon systems—like the D–5 missile—will contribute considerably to a military force which is heavy on expensive big ticket weapon systems and less heavy on personnel readiness and training. This imbalance is what all Members of Congress should be focusing on—not the overall level of military spending—which as we all know is 10 times the amount spent by all of our potential adversaries combined.

This amendment will save some $700 million in fiscal year 1995 and nearly $5 billion over the next 5 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The savings from this amendment would be available for personnel readiness and training—thereby avoiding a hollow force.

The proposed option advocated by the sponsors of this amendment—and endorsed by the Defense Budget Project—would allow the United States to deploy nearly 1,490 nuclear warheads at sea. Along with the 1,750 warheads to be deployed on land, the United States would deploy over 3,200 nuclear warheads under the START II Treaty—more than what the Russians are expected to deploy under the same treaty. Again, this amendment clearly does not affect the overall security of the United States.

Finally, for those on the Republican side of the aisle I would like to quote the words of former Assistant Secretary of Defense in the Reagan administration, Lawrence Korb. He recently said that "relics of the cold war like the D–5 missile survived the Bottom-Up Review even though the Soviet threat that brought about their development has gone away."

This amendment has been endorsed by the Defense Budget Project, Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Taxpayers Union, Council for a Livable World, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and many other groups.

While I understand that President Clinton is opposed to this amendment—and I respect the opinion of the President on national security issues—I and many Members of this House on both sides of the aisle believe that this amendment is the right thing to do at this time. I urge all Members to vote for the Penny-Woolsey-Klug-Barca amendment and against the Dicks amendment which would undercut the House Armed Services Committee position on the Trident backfit issue.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

It is now in order to consider the amendments relating to the Trident II D–5 missile printed in Part 4 of House Report 103–509 which shall be considered in the following order: First, by Representative DICKS: and second, by Representative PENNY. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part 4 of House Report 103–509.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKS:

Page 19, line 4, insert "(a) LIMITATION.—" before "The Secretary of the Navy may not".

Page 19, after line 6, insert the following:

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—If the Secretary of Defense determines that adherence to the prohibition in subsection (a) would result in a significant national security risk to the United States, the Secretary may waive that prohibition. Such a waiver may not take effect until the Secretary submits to Congress a certification of that determination and of the reasons for that determination.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] will be recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge the House to support my amendment to the fiscal year 1995 national defense authorization bill. Section 123 prohibits the backfit of the D–5 missile on the Trident submarines currently equipped with the C–4 missile. My amendment gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive this provision if he determines that backfitting is in the security interests of this Nation.

Last year, the reported bill included a similar provision. I offered an amendment on the floor of the House that recommended that the Secretary of Defense conduct a study comparing the option of the D–5 missile backfit with paying for a service life extension for the C–4 missile on Trident I submarines. The study will consider cost effectiveness, force structure requirements, and future strategic flexibility.

The House adopted, and the conferees agreed to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, nothing has changed in the interim to suggest the House should reverse its position.

Simultaneously, the Department is conducting a strategic nuclear posture review for our national military strategy. Section 123 of H.R. 4301 would prevent the Secretary, and the Congress, from making an informed decision on all possible options from the ongoing nuclear posture review, and the Navy's study as mandated by the Congress.

Previously, the Navy has testified that it would make the decision regarding the backfit of the Trident I submarines no sooner than fiscal year 1996. I am advised that studies suggest that it may well be less costly to perform the backfit versus a service life extension plan.

Whether or not the study recommends the backfit or not, the Secretary must be allowed to finish this study in order to make an informed recommendation to the Congress on maintaining the viability of this important platform.

Pending the recommendations of the strategic nuclear posture review, the D–5 platform could provide potential survivability improvements as a hedge against any breakthrough of future anti-submarine warfare.

The prohibition to backfit the Trident I submarines with this missile could also drive decisions on overall Trident submarine force structure and force us to increased reliance on less survivable legs of the triad.

Furthermore, there is no funding requested in the budget for D–5 backfit and therefore there are no savings achieved by forcing the issue. If the Department opts to pursue this option it will have to request funding next year and the Congress will have ample opportunity to debate whether that funding ought to be provided.

My amendment, as last year, represents a compromise that would retain the section but provides the Secretary of Defense with the opportunity to waive its provisions if he certifies it is in our national security interests.

Admiral Chiles, CINC-Strategic Command, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the importance to preserve all options associated with backfitting D–5 missiles or maintaining the present C–4 missiles, and "The Nuclear Posture Review is evaluating these precepts to ensure the TRIDENT force will remain a viable, save deterrent force for the future."

The Secretary must be allowed to finish this thorough review of our strategic forces as previously directed by the Congress. The Department of the Navy has advised me that "any legislative prohibition that might prematurely restrict any option would not be operationally prudent, and in terms of deterrence, such a prohibition would be counter-productive."

Granting the Secretary this waiver prevents any option from being precluded in the future readiness of the Trident submarine force.

I urge the House to support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has expired.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my additional 3 minutes, the balance of my time, and I will yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. Chairman, first I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has made a very important point. The gentleman's amendment simply says that where the Secretary of Defense finds that there is "a significant national security risk" to the United States is not allowing backfitting of D–5, that can then take place. So it gives some discretion to the Secretary of Defense. He has to find a very high standard. He has to find that there is a significant national security risk.

We all know we have brought the Soviet Union to a dissolution point by being strong, by having the strong strategic triad that the gentleman from Utah spoke about. This part of the triad, our underwater dimension of the triad, is perhaps our strongest and our most survivable and in some cases our most important, and the D–5 is a very important part of that.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from California, and I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be very difficult to be the Secretary of Defense and have 435 junior Secretary of Defenses over here telling you what to do in every instance. In this particular instance all we are really trying to do is give some latitude to the Secretary, to give him the right to make a determination after he studies this and ask the question, is this the proper and correct thing to do?

I cannot see where anyone would want to oppose this. This is eminently fair to the gentleman over there. If we continue to put fences on him, we put hobbles on his legs and handcuffs on his arms, and I do not know how he can run the organization over there that way.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent amendment, and I support it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, we can debate this next year. It is premature this year. Let us give our good friend, Bill Perry, the distinguished Secretary of Defense, the opportunity to review our strategic weapons and then make a recommendation to the Congress. We can then look at it. We can look at it thoughtfully and carefully, and the gentleman's

very elaborate arguments can be considered by the chairman and by the Secretary. But it is premature at this juncture, in my mind at least, to take away this option when we do not have any money in here and it does not involve any expenditure. So therefore, there is no savings.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has 30 seconds remaining.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say to my colleagues that I understand the argument. The point here is that when I said we are a coequal branch of government, there are times when the clarity of our own thought dictates that we take action.

It is my position that we have considered this matter. This prohibition, interestingly enough was in the House bill last year, though it was modified in conference, so this is not a new position that we are reasserting. We are trying to understand that we are sending messages, and we are part of the policymaking equation here. That is why we draw our checks every month. That is why we get paid, to step up and play hardball, make intelligent, rational, coherent, and cogent decisions.

I am simply saying that on this matter we have made a decision. If we were in an iffy position, if we were indecisive about this, then, fine, we could pass an amendment, do a study, and say we would come back and recommend. But on this matter there are many of us in this Chamber who believe that we are already clear about what we think the decision should be.

Mr. Chairman, let us save $3 billion of the taxpayers' money and not retrofit.

Mr. Chairman, it is my great pleasure to yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], who rises in opposition to the amendment.

□ 1100

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. DICKS. We should not agree to have the Pentagon waste money on a study, which will simply make the recommendation to waste more money in the future. Not only should we support the committee's position on the backfit, but we should terminate the program entirely. We cannot base this decision on local economic interests. We must do what's right for our entire country.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dicks amendment. Language in the bill cancels the planned backfit of the eight Trident I submarines based in the State of Washington. That is the sort of tough decision we need to make in order to rationalize the defense budget in the post-cold-war era.

The Dicks amendment would undercut the committee's position. The Armed Services Committee has correctly questioned the necessity of spending billions of dollars at the end of this decade to reconfigure the Navy's eight Trident I submarines so that they can carry the larger D–5 missile. The fact is, this backfit is not necessary under any scenario in the post-cold-war era.

A 1993 Congressional Budget Office report estimated that the planned backfit of the Trident I submarines will cost some $2.6 billion. In addition, the 192 D–5 missiles which would need to be procured for deployment on the eight Trident I submarines would cost an additional $6 billion.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment—if passed—would allow the Navy to spend over $8.5 billion on the Trident program—above and beyond the amount that they will need to spend to outfit the 10 Trident II submarines with D–5 missiles. We simply cannot afford to give the Department of Defense the greenlight to go ahead with this wasteful and expensive program. I urge all Members to vote against the Dicks amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my distinguished colleague from Washington, Mr. DICKS, he is absolutely correct. Over the years, one of the highlights of this gentleman's service in the body has been to debate my colleague on a number of these issues. We have had an opportunity to stand together on some of these questions, and we have had an opportunity to stand apart and to debate substantively on this matter, and I appreciate that. We have always shown each other that level of mutual respect.

Let me just simply say to all of my colleagues on this particular item, this gentleman may not be right on this, but I believe to a moral certainty that these Trident submarines will never be retrofitted with the rest of these D–5 missiles. I do not believe that the Pentagon is going to spend $3 billion to retrofit. If I am correct, let us stop all this bantering around. This is wonderful great debate, but it is surreal discussion. It is in never-never land.

The military budget is going down. The stress on our national budget is increasing geometrically. And for anyone to think that in a post-cold-war era we are going to suddenly find $3 billion to take a D–5 missile that is a cold war weapon, a cold war weapon, and put it on Tridents, I think is taking a departure from reality. So I am saying if that is true, let us get on with it. Let us not keep adding amendments that will give a false sense of hope and direction. This $3 billion will never be spent on the D–5.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to take the opportunity to yield to my colleague and let him respond. I do not believe this money is ever going to be spent. We are not going to authorize it, they are not going to ask for it, and you folks are not going to appropriate it.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. The study that is being done, by the way, is being done. There is a strategic posture review being done by the Secretary of Defense. As you recall, Mr. Chairman, last year the House adopted my amendment that said go do a study on the difference between retrofitting and fixing up the C–4 missiles, or backfitting. It may well be that backfitting is less expensive than doing the retrofit and fixing up the C–4 missile, and you would have a brandnew missile with 30 years of lifetime.

Now, the world is not quite as stable out there as some would assert. We still see what is going on in Russia with the rise of Mr. Zhirinovsky and then problems there with stability. Let us let them do the study, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has expired. The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from California has the right to close debate.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would indicate to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], that I would be pleased at the appropriate time to yield half of that time to my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say, last year, the study; this year, another prolongation. I am simply saying, let us step up to it. We have thought about this matter. Let us end it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, there is no money in the budget to do this, so it is really premature at this point. We are not going to save a cent. So do we not have the benefit of Secretary Perry's analysis before we make the ultimate decision? It is premature. That is all I am saying.

Mr. DELLUMS. If I might reclaim my time, I am simply saying we are a

coequal branch of government. Let the Secretary of Defense benefit from the wisdom of this body. It is a two-way street. It is not a one-way communication here. Brilliance is not all invested in the Pentagon. There is brilliance and competence and capability and vision and wisdom in this body. Let them benefit from our wisdom.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield briefly, if you are so convinced on the merits and there is not one dime in the budget to do anything about it, why do you not wait and see what the Secretary of Defense thinks? If he agrees with you, he will never waive this provision. The only reason he would waive it is if there is some major change out there and he then says it is in our security interests. He must certify to that. Then the chairman still has the option of not authorizing the program, if he feels that the Secretary's certification is wrong.

All you are doing is giving him the option, Mr. Chairman. We are not going to save a nickel here.

Mr. DELLUMS. I think the gentleman has adequately made his point. Let us let the wisdom, or lack thereof, of the body make the judgment of who is correct.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, in fairness, if the Secretary of Defense wants to come back in the next year and asks us to lift the waiver, we can lift it next year. Is that correct?

Mr. DELLUMS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. DICKS. Let us give him the option this year. That is a long time away.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to support the Dicks amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

The question was taken, and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 169, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

AYES—226

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Knollenberg
Kyl
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lightfoot
Linder
Lloyd
Long
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meek
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rowland
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Scott
Shaw
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Torkildsen
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—169

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Berman
Bilbray
Boehlert
Bonior
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Byrne
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Coyne
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gephardt
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hancock
Hastings
Hinchey
Holden
Hughes
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
Lambert
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
McDermott
McInnis
McKinney
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Morella
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reynolds
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Synar
Thurman
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—43

Baker (CA)
Barlow
Becerra
Blackwell
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Collins (IL)
Crane
Dingell
Dixon
Emerson
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Flake
Ford (MI)
Grams
Grandy
Herger
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lehman
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Livingston
Machtley
McCollum
Miller (CA)
Murphy
Neal (NC)
Rangel
Roberts
Sawyer
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Smith (TX)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Washington
Whitten
Wilson

□ 1129

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Grams for, with Mr. LaFalce against.

Mr. Grandy for, with Mr. Sawyer against.

Mr. Kolbe for, with Mr. Becerra against.

Mr. McCollum for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Thomas of California for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Thomas of Wyoming for, with Mr. Rangel against.

Messrs. REYNOLDS, KREIDLER, FORD of Tennessee, COYNE, and HUGHES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. SCHUMER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas and Mr. BISHOP changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1130

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). It is now in order to consider amendment 2 printed in part 4 of House Report 103-509.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: At the end of subtitle C of title I (page 19, after line 15), add the following new section:

SEC. 125. TERMINATION OF TRIDENT II (D-5) MISSILE PROCUREMENT.

(a) TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall terminate the Trident II (D-5) missile program upon the completion of procurement of the missiles for which funds were appropriated for fiscal year 1994.

(b) FUNDING RESTRICTION.—The amount provided in section 102 for procurement of weapons for the Navy is hereby reduced by $696,000,000. None of the funds made available to the Navy for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1994 may be obligated for the Trident II (D-5) missile program except as required for program termination costs.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] will be recognized for 5 minutes and a Member opposed, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the D-5 should have died years ago, much as the Berlin Wall came tumbling down. It serves no purpose other than to keep our defense costs high at a time when our domestic needs are growing. But Mr. Chairman, year after year, we see the D-5 in our defense bill. The D-5 clings to life because this Congress just does not get it on military spending.

Right now, the United States is spending more on the military than the next 10 countries combined. We are spending $400,000 each minute on the military. Military spending is out of control, and this Congress refuses to act.

Some of my colleagues will disagree. You will hear from them about how we are dangerously close to a hollow force, and we cannot support a two-war strategy.

I tell you, we are dangerously close to a hollow education system, a hollow health care system, and a hollow fight against crime. We cannot devise a strategy to fight these very real domestic wars, because Congress is fixated on two nonexistent wars abroad.

We already have 320 D-5 missiles. If you do not think that is enough of these powerful weapons of destruction, ask the group that has come together from all parts of the political spectrum to say, enough is enough. Republicans, Democrats, the National Taxpayers Union, the Council for a Livable World, Citizens Against Government Waste, and the Defense Budget Project, they all agree that continued production of the D-5 is wasteful and unnecessary.

When people talk about gridlock, when they talk of a Congress that will not listen, they are talking about the D-5. This year, let us listen for a change. Let us act for a change. Let us put this cold war relic where it belongs—in the history books.

Please vote in favor of the Penny-Woolsey-Klug-Barca amendment.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the total time remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I usually vote to cut spending everywhere I can, but not when it hurts and does harm to our national security.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very critical of our President because I thought he has been cutting too much from our national defense. Even the President is opposed to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from a commander of our Strategic Command, and I want to quote this much from it: "This will result in unilateral reductions below those negotiated by current arms control agreements."

Mr. Chairman, I include this letter and another letter from the President as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
U.S. STRATEGIC COMMAND,
May 19, 1994.

Hon. FLOYD D. SPENCE,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SPENCE: The upcoming debate on the Fiscal Year 1995 Defense Authorization Bill will include an amendment to terminate procurement of the Trident II (D-5) missile. I would like to offer my thoughts regarding the Trident II submarine and continued procurement of D-5 missiles.

The Trident II submarine with its D-5 missile system will remain a critical element of this nation's future strategic force structure for many years. Terminating D-5 procurement in Fiscal Year 1995 will not provide sufficient missiles to outfit and support the ten Trident II submarines presently at sea or undergoing construction. Without a sufficient number of missiles to support loadout, testing and evaluation. Trident submarines would ultimately be deployed with fewer missiles onboard, a situation I consider not to be in our country's best interests. This will result in unilateral reductions below those negotiated by current arms control agreements. To offset this, we would have to load more warheads per existing missile which complicates treaty compliance and results in operational drawbacks in terms of platform survivability and efficient targeting.

Additionally, continuing Trident II missile production preserves our ballistic missile industrial base as this is the only strategic missile in production today. It would be a mistake to put existing older Trident I (C-4) missiles on our new Trident II submarines because C-4 re-engineering costs would nearly equal D-5 procurement costs, and this would result in our strategic submarines carrying an older, less capable missile. Also, D-5 production allows support for Britain's strategic program.

For these reasons, I conclude that funding the President's Fiscal Year 1995 budget proposal for Trident II missile procurement is essential to the U.S. strategic deterrent capability. I ask for your support of this critical program.

Very respectfully,

H.G. CHILES, Jr.,
Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Commander in Chief.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, May 18, 1994.

Hon. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During debate on the Fiscal Year 1995 DOD Authorization Bill, Representative Penny will offer an amendment to terminate procurement of Trident missiles in Fiscal Year 1995.

I strongly oppose this amendment. Terminating procurement of additional D-5 missiles would severely limit our ability to support the U.S. Trident SSBN program, which is the backbone of the U.S. deterrent well into the next century. It would also close our last remaining ballistic missile production line and adversely affect our support for Britain's Trident program.

For these reasons, I urge Members to vote against the Penny amendment.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, deterrents are important. Strategic deterrents are important. We have survived and been able to keep the world in a reasonably stable state for the last 40 years because we had a deterrent that was comprised of land, sea and air forces. Defense spending is dropping off the shelf.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a massive cut in defense spending. We are cutting across the board bomber forces, fighter forces, we are cashiering 1,700 young people a week out of the military. We have one remaining strong survivable part of the strategic triad and that is the undersea part. That is the part that is difficult for any potential adversaries to detect and that has the capability of striking at military targets.

Mr. Chairman, the D-5 missile is the centerpiece of accurate missiles that can be fired out of submarines that can hit military targets. We still have a very dangerous world. The President and the Secretary of Defense have asked to have this remaining part of the strategic triad kept alive by this House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, we should at this point keep this option open for the President, keep this option open for the Secretary of Defense. The Soviet Union is not cutting back its submarine program at this time. Vote "no" on Penny.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge the House to oppose the Penny amendment to eliminate the D-5 missile production after 1994.

Mr. Chairman, here we are again, on the floor of the House, debating this same argument as last year. But Mr. Chairman, the arguments against Mr. PENNY's amendment are also the same. If anything, world events have taken a turn for the worse.

Tens of thousands of nuclear weapons continue to be deployed in the former Soviet Union.

The political future of the New Republics is not cast in stone, and recent developments in Russia are not encouraging.

While the United States has deactivated more than 90 percent of the START I required reductions in the number of warheads on ballistic missile systems, the former Soviet Union has deactivated less than 30 percent of the forces that must be eliminated under the terms of START I.

These reductions, Mr. Chairman, are primarily a result of the dismantlement efforts by Kazakstan, Belarus, and the Ukraine, to comply with United States requests in order to receive United States aid.

START I has not been ratified, much less START II.

And yet, the Russians are currently developing, and plan to deploy, three new ballistic missiles within the next 10 years: a road mobile, single RV, as well as a silo-based single RV, and a follow on missile for the *Typhoon* class ballistic missile submarine.

We do not know if they plan to deploy these capabilities or sell them to the highest bidder.

Admiral Chiles, CINC-Strategic Command states:

> The Trident II submarine with its D-5 missile system will remain a critical element of this Nation's future strategic force structure for many years. Terminating D-5 procurement in fiscal year 1995 will not provide sufficient missiles to outfit and support the 10 Trident II submarines presently at sea or undergoing construction * * * the funding for the President's fiscal year 1995 budget proposal for Trident II missile procurement is essential to the U.S. strategic deterrent capability.

Mr. Chairman, these are many of the same arguments that we raised last year in opposition to the amendment to terminate the D-5.

Nonetheless, the United States still continues to downsize its strategic nuclear force structure. Under START II, the peacekeeper, small ICBM and Minuteman II ICBM's are eliminated. We are buying only 15 percent of the B-2 bombers originally programmed, the SRAM II program has been cancelled and Cruise missile carrying B-52's retired. We are scrapping all Poseidon submarines. The Trident submarine program is at 18 and the W-88 warhead terminated.

The Trident submarine force will be even more critical as the lowest cost and the most survivable leg of the strategic deterrent. In addition, the D-5 is the only strategic missile still under production.

79-059 O—97 Vol. 140 (Pt. 8) 28

The assertion that the Navy already has enough D-5 missiles for deployment is incorrect. Last year, President Clinton stated "even at the lowest Trident levels that remain under review pursuant to the bottom up review, additional D-5 missile procurement are required in FY 1994 and 1995."

This administration strongly supports this program. The President, in his letter to Chairman DELLUMS, conveyed his strong opposition to this amendment:

> Terminating procurement of additional D-5 missiles would severely limit our ability to support the U.S. Trident SSBN program, which is the backbone of the U.S. deterrent well into the next century.

In his letter, the President urges Members to "vote against the Penny amendment."

We cannot afford to lose this capability.

Recognizing the world events over the last year, I strongly urge the House to support the President and vote "no" on the Penny amendment.

□ 1140

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA].

Mr. BARCIA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Penny amendment.

During this era of tight defense budgets, and a transformed international environment, it is increasingly necessary to prioritize the programs upon which the Department of Defense spends its money.

We have an opportunity here to do just that. In this era of decreased world tensions the continued procurement of this weapons system is an imprudent expenditure of our scarce defense resources. As is well known the Navy has already procured 320 D-5 missiles, and continues to maintain operational its C-4 missiles.

As is evident, the majority of the threats to our present security cannot be addressed by nuclear weapons. Conflicts such as the war in Bosnia, or peacekeeping operations, and even the tensions now on the Korean peninsula can not be solved by nuclear weapons. I question how the continued purchase of a weapons system, which will slightly increase the accuracy and range of nuclear warheads, will increase our national security.

The benefits of this improvement are marginal, and do not return enough on the necessary investment. By voting for this amendment we can save $700 million in fiscal year 1995 alone. Let us take a small step toward fiscal prudence and vote for this amendment.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA].

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, and Members, this amendment stops procurement of the D-5 missile after fiscal year 1994, leaving the Navy with 320 D-5 missiles to deploy on the 10 Trident II submarines and maintain 140 more for testing.

This amendment would save over $700 million and about $5 billion over the next 5 years.

Now, we talked in this body time and time again about being serious about the deficit, about being serious about our national debt, and that has to extend across all programs including unnecessary defense programs.

This D-5 missile was designed specifically for hardened targets in the former Soviet Union, and even former Assistant Secretary of Defense under the Reagan administration Lawrence Korb has stated this is a relic of the past, one that we can do without.

We can no longer afford this. Let us vote "yes" on this amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PENNY. Under the rule, is it the right of the opposition to close on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the committee position, the gentleman is correct, that the gentleman from South Carolina has the right to close debate.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, let us begin with an idea from zero-based budgeting, which simply says the beginning of each year you should reassess the cost of each program and its fundamental mission, and let us make it clear the original mission of the D-5, as my colleague from Wisconsin says, is to penetrate hardened targets such as missile silos in the only place those targets exist in the world today, which is in the former Soviet Union.

We have difficult decisions to make as we decide to make cuts in both defense and domestic spending, and it seems to me for those of us on the Republican side of the aisle as we face tougher and tougher cuts and fewer and fewer dollars to spend on defense, that we need to spend them on the best places to defend the United States in a very dangerous world. Those are more likely to be regional conflicts. They are not likely to be nuclear exchanges.

We are 1 year farther out from the cold war than we were last year. Today's amendment allows 25 more missiles than the amendment which failed last year, and let me remind everybody in this room, we are $255 billion deeper in debt than we were at the start of this year.

This amendment will save $700 million next year and $5 billion over the next 5 years. We still give the United States Navy 320 missiles to deploy at sea against the only hardened target we can find in the world, in the former Soviet Union.

I understand the administration is opposed to this amendment, but let me

remind my Republican colleagues that this is the same administration that is opposed to the A-to-Z proposal, it is the same administration that is opposed to the balanced budget amendment, it is the same administration that is opposed to the line-item veto, and the same administration that was opposed to the Penny-Kasich budget cuts of last year.

We in this room have begun to make some very difficult decisions about defense cuts in the years ahead. If we want to invest it in training and we want to invest it in manpower, as my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], pointed out, if we want to invest in U.S. strategic defense interests in a very dangerous world, then spend the money where we need to spend the money, not in a cold war relic that no longer has a mission.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Penny-Klug amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, the proponents of this amendment want to cut strategic weapons, and as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] and others have pointed out, we have already cut strategic weapons. We are in the midst of the biggest downsizing of strategic weaponry since the end of the Second World War. Bombers are being cut back drastically. Cruise missiles at sea have been cut out totally. We are coming down to the point where this system, the D–5 system, is the centerpiece of our triad.

Fifty percent of our deterrent will depend upon the D–5 missile in the years to come as a result of START 1 and START 2.

The proponents of this amendment also say they want to cut the budget. They say $5 billion. I count the outyear requirements for this system at less than $2 billion, but that is still a lot of money.

The Navy has already taken the budget in earnest, and they have cut this program from $1.1 billion last year to $696 million this year. They are asking for the bare minimum.

We have got 255 D–5 missiles already on hand. The Navy says they need 134 more. Why do we need 389 D–5 missiles? First of all, we have got to complete the certification of it. If 50 percent of our deterrent is going to depend on the D–5 missile, we want to make sure it is certified to do what we think it can do.

Second, we need 138 to test, and that is a modest 6 missiles each boat every other year, which will fire 1 missile over the next 23 years. Every missile system, every system we have had has had this provision for testing in it; 138 to test, 11 more for certification; and we need 240 missiles just to deploy.

Ten boats are outfitted for the D–5 missile. They have 24 tubes.

If this passes, some of those boats are going to sea with empty tubes, empty-handed, partially loaded, doing less then they can do on patrol and having less than we provided for ourselves in the START 2 provisions in the treaty that we made with the former Soviet Union.

This amendment should be defeated for all of those reasons, and there is one more reason. This is the last ballistic missile line that we have open in the United States. Lockheed missiles in space, the best in the business, but it is the last line that we have. Close this and we have no production base left in the ballistic missile business, and we should not do it for that reason alone, but there are strategic reasons to vote down this amendment.

Stay with the Navy's program, which has been pared to the minimum already.

□ 1150

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is an important debate; this is an extraordinarily important debate for two reasons. It has strategic implications, it has budgetary implications.

I would like to speak to both and speak specifically to those Members of this body who have not made up their minds. First, with respect to the strategic issue: Members of the committee, as I have stated on more than one occasion, to the point of redundancy, the cold war is over, Mr. Chairman. We are in a new era. The Berlin Wall is down. The cold war is over, we are in uncharted waters. We are in unprecedented times, and we now have to think, and think in very radically different ways, Mr. Chairman.

Many of us came here concerned about the expense, the danger, and even the insanity of the arms race. And now with change that has come with incredible speed, with awesome implications, we now have a marvelous window of opportunity, Mr. Chairman. And that window of opportunity is to stop the old arms race. All of us on both sides of the aisle are preoccupied and concerned with the danger of nuclear proliferation in the world. But we are leaders on this.

Do you realize what message we are communicating to the world when we continue to walk down the road of nuclear madness and we can stand in the well talking about "strategic this" and "strategic that?" The cold war is over, Mr. Chairman. Who are we pointing these weapons at?

There is no longer a Soviet Union. There is no longer a Warsaw Pact; and we all know that even if the former Soviet Union attempted to turn the corner and head back to the old days, we are talking 10, 12, and 15 years down the road, we have all kinds of time to come back to that insanity if we wish. But my hope is that we march forward into the 21st century.

This D–5 missile is a relic. We can end the old arms race so we do not trigger a new one so that we do not communicate to the world that there is a need for us to move down this road.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at the cornerstone of the Pentagon's doctrine based on the Bottom-Up Review, is this preoccupation with nuclear weapons and the former Soviet Union? No. Two major regional conflicts. Do we anticipate firing nuclear weapons at Third World countries, Mr. Chairman? We do not. We have achieved a level of madness here that has to be challenged. We have got to reject old thinking. We have this one brief opportunity to change the world in profoundly radical ways.

Mr. Chairman, to those who are budget conservatives, let me say to all of you here: My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], has been one of the most consistent human beings here in these Chambers, arguing for fiscal accountability, arguing to address ourselves responsibly to our fiduciary function with respect to the taxpayers' dollars. If we cannot adopt this amendment, where can we cut? No one in this room contemplates or believes we are going to fight a nuclear war. The fact of the matter is we ought to be walking dramatically and powerfully away from that notion. We can say, based on all of the figures enunciated here—some have said $2.1 billion, some have said $5 billion; take your pick, two or five—that is a hell of a lot of money, Mr. Chairman.

We spend time in these Chambers debating over cutting $5 million and $10 million; we cannot even listen to each other on an amendment that deals with between $2 billion and $5 billion, when there is human misery all over this country that we cannot find money to spend to deal with these miseries.

Here, with the D–5 missile, let's reject the past, walk forward into the future, save the American taxpayers' money, protect our children and our children's children from an insane arms race that serves no useful purpose but to spend their money and endanger their lives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 229, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

AYES—166

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Bachus (AL)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Berman
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Byrne
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Coyne
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hancock
Hastings
Hefner
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnston
Kennedy
Kildee
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
Lambert
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Morella
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Reynolds
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Schaefer
Schenk
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Synar
Thurman
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—229

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Knollenberg
Kyl
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Levy
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lucas
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHugh
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mineta
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ravenel
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rowland
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Shaw
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Torkildsen
Valentine
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Whitten
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—43

Barlow
Becerra
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Crane
Dingell
Dixon
Emerson
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Flake
Ford (MI)
Gephardt
Grams
Grandy
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lehman
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Livingston
Machtley
Matsui
McCollum
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Murphy
Neal (NC)
Rangel
Roberts
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rostenkowski
Sawyer
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Smith (TX)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Washington
Wilson

□ 1215

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. LaFalce for, with Mr. Emerson against.

Mr. Sawyer for, with Mr. Grams against.

Mr. Becerra for, with Mr. Kolbe against.

Mr. Washington for, with Mr. McCollum against.

Mr. Rangel for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Thomas of California against.

Messrs. GALLEGLY, LIGHTFOOT, and McDADE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ROSE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I was unfortunately detained while chairing a hearing in the Rayburn House Office Building and thus missed rollcall vote No. 189, on the Penny amendment to terminate funding for the Trident D–5 missile. Had I made it to the floor time, I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, May 18, 1994, it is now in order to consider any amendment printed in part 1 of the report not previously considered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part 1 of the House Report 103–509.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY: At the end of title X (page 277, after line 2), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1038. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO OPERATE ARMY SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS.

Funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense pursuant to an authorization of appropriations contained in this Act may not be used to operate the Army School of the Americas, currently at Fort Benning, Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of earlier today, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has a long history of involvement in Latin American affairs. As a bastion of democracy with a vibrant economy, the United States is looked to with great admiration and respect by millions and millions of Latin Americans.

But our history in Latin America is checkered by our financial, military, and moral support and association with people like Omar Torrijos, the dictator of Panama; Manuel Noriega, the dictator and drug runner; Leopoldo Galtieri, who led the military junta in Argentina; Roberto d'Aubisson, organizer of the Salvadoran death squads that killed Archbishop Romero; 19 of the 26 Salvadoran officers that planned and carried out and covered up the murder of 6 Jesuit priests in 1989; and more than 100 of the 246 Colombian officers cited for human rights violations, including several instructors from the School of the Americas, as well as 6 Peruvian officers linked to a military death squad that killed 9 students in 1992, and the 3 most senior Guatemalan officers who backed a coup attempt in May 1993.

What is the one thing that they all had in common?

They are all graduates of the U.S. Army School of the Americas.

The fact is that this is a school that has run more dictators than any other school in the history of the world. They boast about the fact that 10 separate heads of state throughout Latin America were graduates of the School of the Americas. Not one of them was elected through a democratic election, and in many cases they actually overthrew the civilian governments that brought them into power.

They tell us now that the school is changing, but we know and understand, Mr. Chairman, that the school is continuing the kind of modus operandi that left us with the legacy of being associated with some of the worst human rights abusers on the face of this planet.

□ 1220

We see just on the House steps, Father Ray Bourgeois, who has gone on a hunger strike for 40 days, to demonstrate his personal commitment and the commitment of millions of others that our association with the school ought to end. Let us stop the days of the cold war, let us stop our history with these associations, and let us get on to a new day with the association of the United States and Latin America through peaceful means, not military ones.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. It is illogical. There is simply no cause-effect relationship between the problem and the proposed solution to kill the School of the Americas. The School of the Americas does teach the law of war and respect for human rights. The fact that this instruction does not sink into every participant during this span of course of several weeks' length should not surprise us. There are Americans who have attended seminary courses and then become murderers. You do not blame the seminaries for that.

I am hearing that some graduates of the school become dictators. It is also true General Somoza, the late dictator of Guatemala, was a graduate of West Point. Did we close West Point down at that point?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to provide the House of Representatives with factual information regarding the School of the Americas at Fort Benning, GA.

The school was established in 1963 under President John F. Kennedy's Alliance for Progress from the existing U.S. Army Caribbean Training Center in Panama. In 1984, the school was moved from Panama to Fort Benning, GA. Since 1963, more than 58,000 Latin American soldiers have graduated from the School of the Americas.

The school was developed to train and teach Latin American militaries how to defend against subversion techniques from the Soviet Union and Cuba. However, as the cold war began to end, the School of the Americas began to adopt a new curriculum. The new emphasis began to focus on the role of military professionalism in a democratic government. The guiding principle of the school now is to provide professional service subordinate to civilian control by democratically elected governments. Training at the school is focused on effective response to drug trafficking, natural disasters, and respect for human rights.

Instruction is conducted in Spanish to allow for others outside the English-speaking upper class to attend; however, approximately 122 out of 160 instructors are from the United States. Claims that instruction is extensively carried out by foreign trainers is absolutely false. The fact that classes are taught in Spanish has substantially reduced the cost of training and allowed a uniquely diverse population to attend the school.

The curriculum at the School of the Americas undergoes constant review not only by the Army's Training and Doctrine Command but also by a new outside policy review board which has recently been established to ensure that human rights awareness is an integral part of training.

Have there been bad apples at the school? Yes. However, many of the so-called bad apples attended the school before it was located at Fort Benning, GA. For example, Gen. Manuel Noriega attended the school in its early inception in Panama during the mid-1960's. He did not attend the school of the Americas at Fort Benning, GA. Another thug routinely recognized by critics of the school is Gen. Domingo Monterrosa of El Salvador. General Monterrosa, now deceased, has been linked to the death squads which plagued El Salvador in the early 1980's during the country's bloody civil war. However, General Monterrosa also did not attend the School of the Americas at Fort Benning. He spent 2 weeks at the school when it was located in Panama in 1966. Was General Monterrosa trained to be a human rights violator during this time? No. He spent the entire 2 weeks learning to pack a parachute.

I submit to you that the school has improved dramatically over the years and has responded to the changing world by taking a hard look at itself and making a strong effort to address those areas in need of improvement. In fact, President Ronald Reagan's decision to move the school to Fort Benning has proven to be an excellent decision. Because the press has spent hours upon hours detailing the few bad apples of the past, I want to spend a few moments detailing the successes of the present.

José Gallardo Román, current Minister of Defense in Ecuador, is one of the School of the Americas' true all-stars. General Gallardo strongly supports democratic principles and the need to respect human rights. In 1993, he signed an accord with the Latin American Association on Human Rights to begin a sweeping human rights training program throughout the Armed Forces.

Another all-star is Gen. Hernan José Guzmán, Army Commander in Columbia. General Guzmán has initiated measures to prevent human rights abuses such as assigning judges to brigades involved in counterinsurgency operations. These judges accompany the brigades on operations and ensure that insurgents' human rights are protected.

Minister Román and General Guzmán represent the school's all-stars in the realm of human rights. The School of the Americas has also had true success stories in the name of democracy and defeating anti-democratic coups.

Brig. Gen. Fuget Borregales, the current director of operations of the Venezuela Army and graduate of the school, was a major player in defeating coup attempts in Caracas in November 1992. His unit recaptured the La Carlota Air Base which had been overrun by coup rebels.

Another success story involves the current commander of the 4th Infantry Division in Venezuela and School of the Americas graduate, Brig. Gen. Pedro Valencia Vivas. General Vivas identified officers who had participated in the February 4, 1992, coup attempt. When the November 28, 1992, coup occurred, not a single platoon under his command participated in the attempt to overthrow the democratic government.

I have detailed these gentlemen because they represent the overwhelming graduates of the School of the Americas who are currently playing a constructive role in Latin America. The critics of the school detail past graduates who did not receive training at Fort Benning and are no longer players in Latin America.

I have received a number of letters from Veterans' service organizations supporting the School of the Americas. At this time I would like to read portions of those letters to you for the record.

Ret. Vice Adm. T.J. Kilcline, president of the Retired Officers Association writes:

> The impact of the school has truly been significant. Not only has the education been most helpful for our Latin American neighbors, but the contact with Americans and the positive attitudes of the American military personnel they met and got to know while at Benning was the basis for friendship

and understanding between individuals which translates to better relationships among our countries.

Ret. Army Gen. Roger Sandler, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, writes "I am well aware of this outstanding school's very important contributions to democracy in our hemisphere."

Mr. Chairman, our veterans support the School of the Americas at Fort Benning. At this time I would like to enter into the RECORD a resolution by the American Ex-Prisoners of War specifically supporting the school's continued operation and opposing the effort to eliminate the school's funding.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE U.S. ARMY SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS, FORT BENNING, GA

Whereas, the U.S. Army School of the Americas has successfully trained over 54,000 troops from Latin America and the United States;

Whereas, the School of the Americas has graduated 10 Presidents, 38 Ministers of Defense or State, 71 Commanders of Armed Forces, and 25 Service Chiefs of Staff;

Whereas, the School of the Americas systematically advocates human rights awareness and strives to graduate students whose respect for such values is enlightened and solidified;

Whereas, the School of the Americas has greatly improved its human rights curriculum adding new instructors and course requirements;

Whereas, the Department of Defense is using the School of the Americas concept to design a new facility in Germany, the George C. Marshall Institute, to educate and train former Soviet Union military personnel to understand the social and political benefits of a western democratic society;

Whereas, the School of the Americas has played a major role in the dramatic change in Latin America from dictatorships and military juntas to military supported Democratic Societies;

Whereas, for the first time in 200 years, democracy in Latin America is beginning to take hold and from Argentina to Guatemala coups are being resisted due to the influence of the School of the Americas;

Whereas, on September 30, 1993, there was an active attempt in the U.S. House of Representatives to close the School of the Americas which was rejected by a vote of 174–256;

Whereas, the School of the Americas is expected once again to be under attack from various organizations and Members of Congress during the 1994 session of the 103rd Congress;

Now therefore be it resolved, That the members of this organization do hereby go on record in full support of the U.S. Army School of the Americas at Fort Benning, Georgia; do advocate its continued operation; do oppose any attempts to reduce or eliminate funding for this program which has been instrumental in fostering democratic principles throughout Latin America; and do hereby direct that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each member of the United States House of Representatives and of the United States Senate.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to enter into the RECORD a letter I received on May 18, 1994 from Gen. Barry McCaffrey, a true patriot and commander in chief of our Southern Command.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND,
May 18, 1994.

Hon. SANFORD BISHOP,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BISHOP: Am writing to express serious concern over pending legislative action which could threaten the existence of one of our most useful institutions—the U.S. Army's School of the Americas [SOA]. For over forty years, the school has been an effective tool for promoting foreign policy objectives in Latin America. The school's reputation for providing superior military training in Spanish while instilling the principle of military subordination to constitutional civilian rule is long-standing. My recent visit to the school confirmed my belief that it is an indispensable institution with no substitute.

As you are aware, SOA has played a key role in the education of many Latin American military leaders. The vast majority of these graduates are positive supporters of democratization, human rights, and the rule of law. Unfortunately, this gets little publicity. Just a few examples—

Commander of the Colombian Army who initiated the assignment of judges to units conducting counter-insurgency operations to ensure the protection of human rights.

Ecuadoran Minister of Defense who signed an accord with the Latin American Association on Human Rights to begin a sweeping human rights training program throughout the Armed Forced.

Current Venezuelan division commander who helped identify members of a recent coup attempt against a democratically elected government.

Every course at SOA offers a regional perspective, includes human rights and democratization instruction, and ensures exposure to U.S. military discipline and expertise. Latin American students and instructors leave the school with an enhanced understanding of the proper role of the military in a civilian-led democracy. Provided the opportunity to continue this vital mission, SOA can play a critical role in the development of Latin America's leaders well into the future, further consolidating the gains for democracy in our hemisphere.

The growth of democracy throughout Latin America is a direct reflection on this institution. Now is not the time to abandon these efforts and the democratic momentum the school helps provide. SOA plays an essential role in our strategy for the region. I respectfully urge you to work to preserve this important institution.

Very respectfully,
BARRY R. MCCAFFREY,
General, USA,
Commander in Chief.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the critics of the School of the Americas continue to look into the past. We must maintain a vision for the future in our foreign policy and the School of the Americas is an excellent tool to further our foreign policy goals. The Congress will continue to ensure that the school maintains its human rights awareness training and adapts to the varying challenges that will face us in the future. However, we must not ignore Latin America, we must not forget our role as the only remaining superpower in the world, we must not close the School of the Americas, and we must never relinquish our grasp of the democratic ideals that the School of the Amercias represents.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, today I am rising in strong support of the Kennedy amendment to eliminate funding for the U.S. Army School of the Americas. We have heard serious charges. We will hear more; that the School of the Americas is nothing more than a school for assassins. Others say that a handful of bad actors has tarnished the image of an otherwise reputable training facility.

Whichever is more accurate, the real question remains, why are we engaged in this activity in the first place? Students at the School of the Americas are not integrated into regular U.S. military training forces. They are taught the vast majority of their course work by other Latin American officers. What is the justification for having foreign nationals training other foreign nationals on U.S. soil at U.S. taxpayers' expense? If there ever was one, which I seriously doubt, there certainly is not now.

I have a special message for my Republican colleagues: We cannot have it both ways. We cannot vote to eliminate funding for the ICC, for the National Helium Reserve, the Rural Electrification Agency, the honey bee subsidy, the Appalachian Regional Commission, every single one of which deserves to be shut down, and shut down now and permanently. Then, just because a program is in the defense budget, are we are going to give it special kid glove status and stay away from it?

This program is pork. It happens to be defense pork, it happens to be Georgia defense pork, but it is simply pork. It certainly is obsolete today, if it ever was justified, and it should be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, the graduates of the School of the Americas may be soldiers of righteousness. They may be soldiers of fortune. They may even be soldiers of evil. I suspect they have been all three. In any event, there are much better ways to accomplish the legitimate military existence and hemispheric cooperation goals of the United States. This is an anachronism. Right or wrong, it continues to give the United States a black eye with our Latin American colleagues.

I urge my colleagues, support the Kennedy amendment and close down the School of the Americas once and for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). The chair will ask visitors in the gallery to please refrain from expressions of support or disapproval of debate.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minor-

ity whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very simple question to address. If you think having Latin American officers come to America, having them learn about soldiering in a democracy, having them learn why America has been able to be militarily strong and free, having them learn a tradition different than the Latin American tradition of military dictatorship; if you think that the progress of the last 20 years, as country by country in Latin America has left dictatorship to move towards democracy, if you think that process is useful, and you think that America has something to teach Latin American officers, then you should vote no on this amendment.

On the other hand, if you think being tainted by visiting America weakens you, if you think being at Fort Benning makes you less likely to be for freedom, if you think that somehow there is some conspiracy in the School of the Americas that is showing up, then probably you ought to vote yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any kind of conspiracy at the School of the Americas. None of us has suggested a conspiracy. What we do believe is that if we look at the real record of who has graduated, the army will cite the fact that 10 separate leaders of Latin America all went to the school. The trouble is, not one of them was duly elected. There have been changes in Latin America, but none of them have been because of the graduates of this school.

Mr. GINGRICH. I would ask to gentleman, how many graduates were there in the last 20 years of the school?

Mr. KENNEDY. There have been tens of thousands.

Mr. GINGRICH. My only point would be in the current democracies, there are graduates of the School of the Americas currently serving within a democratic framework doing exactly what we are trying to teach the Russians, like how to soldier within a democracy.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. But the fact is we only have the record of those individuals who are involved in these hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of cases. We do not have the records of the ones who were not.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, all I would say to my good friend, and I appreciate so much your yielding, is that if you looked at the total record of all the officers who are graduates, who are currently, today, serving in democracies, you would be proud of the contribution America has made to the democratization of Latin America, just as today I am sure you are supportive of our efforts to teach the Russians and Ukrainians and others to learn to serve in a democracy.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming the time I yielded, I would conclude by saying we have a choice. Either the thousands that you say have not or the thousands that did, I would say that the thousands that did, ruin our reputation.

Mr. GINGRICH. Vote "no".

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and at the outset I want to pay tribute to my good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, who has stood with me on many, many human rights issues during the course of his tenure in this body. There is no doubt in my mind that the motivations of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts are the finest, as indeed are the motivations of all of my colleagues who will support his amendment.

□ 1230

I rise in the strongest possible opposition to that amendment, and I do so for two specific reasons.

As one who came to this country as a student from abroad, I can testify that attending institutions in this country is the most democratizing influence for people who come from totalitarian societies.

The School of the Americas is no exception. There is no doubt in my mind that some of the graduates of the School of the Americas have indeed participated in human rights violations. I am convinced that many more would have participated in human rights violations had they not attended that school.

I am very proud of my own alma mater, the University of California. But I would hate to see suggestions that the University of California be closed down because some of the graduates of the University of California are serving in prisons for all kinds of violations of law.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that attending the School of the Americas has been a very positive force for human rights in Latin America and in Latin American militaries. There is simply zero logic, zero logic to arguing that since some of the graduates of the School of the Americas have misbehaved, and they have, this positive influence on democratizing the Latin American militaries should be closed down.

Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, the School of the Americas is a noble thought: Bring Latin American soldiers to the United States to teach them respect for human rights. However, this ideal couldn't be further from reality.

Others have listed the scores of notorious human rights abusers who have graduated from our program. Let's look at the school itself. It is not much more than a country club for dictators.

Rather than directly exposing them to the rule of law that the U.S. military abides by, SOA students are isolated. All other international military education and training programs integrate students into U.S. forces so that they may experience first hand deference to civilian authority.

SOA students are given the chance to tour the United States, to go to an amusement park and a ball game. Supporters of the school claim this reinforces American ideals. Although I would not begrudge any visitor to the United States the chance to explore our great Nation, tourism, and materialism should not be the sole extent of the curriculum.

A few hours of human rights training have been added to SOA courses. What little time is devoted to this, to what ought to be the fundamental thrust of the shool, is greeted with indifference or outright hostility by both students and instructors.

Without the School of the Americas, Latin American soldiers will still be able to participate in IMET programs. Abolishing the SOA will end their segregation which has only fostered continued abuse of authority and abuse of civilian populations.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for human rights, to support the Kennedy amendment and to abolish the School of the Americas.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for offering this amendment. Approximately a year-and-a-half ago, I made a speech as a freshman Member of Congress calling for a closing of the School of the Americas. There were not many Members of Congress that knew that the School of the Americas even existed at that time. But since that time, we have seen more Members of Congress become aware of the atrocities that have taken place at this school with very, very little being accomplished that is in the interest of democracy.

I recently went to El Salvador, appointed by the President to observe the elections there. We are making

progress. But we face a house of cards in El Salvador.

What we need is, we have a new President there, just elected, who frankly, as one Member of Congress, I am not sure has a moral compass and the people around him, I am not so sure about.

The last place we want these new leaders to go is the School of the Americas. More than two-thirds of the Salvadoran soldiers named by the Truth Commission report on human rights abuses in El Salvador were graduates of the School of the Americas. By itself that should be enough to cause some serious soul searching.

We need to close the school and close it today.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Massachussetts and to support the U.S. Army School of the Americas. The School is specialized in training select Latin American military officers in military operations, teaching the values of democracy, and, yes, the need for human rights.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachussetts has been wrong in his past statements that Haitian Police Chief Michel Francois was a student of the School. Since 1963, not one Haitian student has attended the School of the Americas. It is simply wrong to suggest that any member of the current Haitian regime has ever attended the School.

Similarly, there has been a noticeable absence of Cuban officers enrolled at the School. In its history, the School has never graduated a single Cuban officer. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the common characteristic of the Haitian and Cuban governments is that they are the only two remaining countries in Latin America that are nondemocratic.

Since the School was established in 1946 as the U.S. Army Caribbean Training Center, over 58,000 Latin American officers have graduated, and many have gone on to hold prominent positions in their country's military and government.

In 1963, the focus of the School was sharpened by President John F. Kennedy, and it was renamed the School of the Americas. The focus of the School became the teaching of Latin American armies how to defend against Soviet and Cuban inspired subversion. This was the goal, even if it meant supporting a dictator or a military coup.

Well Mr. Chairman, the times and politics of Latin America changed, and so, too, did the direction of the School. In 1983, President Reagan moved the School to Fort Benning, GA, with the focus again redirected to emphasize the role of a professional military force in a democratic society. Today, this includes instruction in effective response to drug trafficking, natural disasters, and respect for human rights.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, there was resistance to democracy in El Salvador, Ecuador, Venezuela and other Latin American nations. And, yes, there were lives lost in this transition. Sacrifices were made, but not in vain. Democracy in each nation has prevailed. And due to those lives sacrificed, Human rights is a major part of the curriculum at the School.

Over 35 Latin American nations are now governed by such a democracy with only 2 nations continuing to suffer under dictatorships. The School has represented a significant investment in this success of democracy throughout the region. Do not throw this investment in democracy out the window.

I urge the Members to defeat the Kennedy amendment, and continue to support the teachings of democracy in our hemisphere.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to clarify for the record the fact is that this school has, in fact, suggested that they have begun to teach human rights at the school. I had the individual who was hired by the school come to my office and tell me that when he taught human rights at the school, he was ridiculed. He was abused, and he says that the notion that this school has reformed itself is a joke.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I once again come before this House with grave concern about the School of the Americas.

Rather than assisting to establish democracy in a part of the world so important to us, the great tradition of School of the Americas results in a who's-who of the hemisphere's dictators. In Honduras, Panama, Bolivia, Argentina, Perú, and Ecuador the stain of the School of the Americas remains.

The graduates of the School of the Americas include dictators and soldiers implicated in human rights violations all over Latin America thanks to the American taxpayer.

No more should our American soldiers be introduced to the position of being sent into dangerous situations in order to clean up the mess made by a few of the graduates of the School of the Americas.

At its best, the school is ineffective. And at its worst, it gives future dictators the skills to overthrow civilian democratic governments.

I ask the House to vote today to close the doors on the School of the Americas—the School for Dictators.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I understand that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is well-intentioned, but it is flawed in its logic. That members of the armed forces from throughout Latin America in countries with a history of human rights abuses and interference in politics come together with officers from the military of the United States with the greatest history of respecting political rights and human rights and by that association themselves become transgressors, it defies logic.

In fact, it defies the facts. Last year in Venezuela, there was an attempted coup. It was officers trained by the United States who put it down.

In El Salvador today, in implementing the peace accords, it is officers trained by the United States. When there was an attempted coup in Guatemala only 2 years ago, it was officers trained by the United States.

Have there been transgressors? Of course, but something must explain that Latin America is fundamentally changing. Democracy is the coin of the realm. Rights are being respected again. Something is working, and American policy in this school is a part of that success.

□ 1240

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that three of the coup leaders in Guatemala all were graduates of this school. The notion that somehow our military are able to influence these people in these foreign countries is simply not the case.

We have also brought in, since the Salvadoran soldiers killed the six priests, seven or eight of those individuals who killed the priests have come to America and went to this school after they killed the priests. That is the record of this school, and that is the reputation that rubs off on our country throughout Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman and Members, I rise in strong support of the Kennedy amendment, and want to make three points. First, if we do want to help develop leadership skills in Central America, then let us close the school, put the $3 or $4 million we put into that university in creative scholarship programs at the University of California or the University of Georgia.

Second, if we do commit American troops to Haiti, remember that we trained the opposition that is going to be trying to kill our soldiers.

Third, understand the purpose and the history and track record of this

university. It is a university of shame. This is a university where students major in murder. This is a university where they minor in mayhem. They receive a master's in the art of oppression, repression, and reprehensible conduct by any human rights standard.

In the name of America's honor, let us dismantle this university today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will admonish visitors in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House of Representatives. Expression of approval or disapproval of remarks on the floor is not allowed.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, when this school was founded in 1946, there were five Latin American democracies, five. Today there are over 35 Latin American democracies. As a matter of fact, there are only two that are dictatorships left in Latin America, Haiti and Cuba. Those are the only two that have never participated in this School of the Americas. If we want to talk statistics, look at that.

What this bill is is Castro's last gasp. He must really be enjoying this, and hoping that they can close down this school. Jesus Christ had 12 Apostles, one of whom went wrong. You would not tell the other 11 to disburse because one went wrong. John Wayne Gacey murdered 33 people. I do not know where he went to high school, but I would not close it down. I suspect some people from that school were pretty decent people.

This is a non sequitur. It does not follow. Yes, there are bad people. Yes, some of them go to our schools. However, are the schools bad? No. These are American schools, taught by American military. It is a non sequitur. It does not follow that some people have done wrong. They have done wrong despite what they were taught, not because of it.

This is an unwise, to put the most euphemistic tone on it, an unwise amendment, and I hope it is resoundingly defeated.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] has expired. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kennedy amendment to prohibit the use of funds for the Army's School of the Americas. This amendment is about where we have been in the past and about where we want to go in the future. Are we going to continue to uphold a tradition of human rights abuse, or are we going to truly promote democracy and peace in this hemisphere and around the world?

The evidence against the School of the Americas is overwhelming:

Manuel Noriega is a graduate; 124 of the 247 Colombian officers cited for human rights violations attended the school; and two-thirds of the Salvadoran soldiers cited by the truth commission for murder, torture, and disappearances trained at the School of the Americas.

A "yes" vote today is not going to erase the human rights tragedies that have occurred in Latin America, but a "yes" vote will say loud and clear that the United States will no longer permit outrageous abuses of human rights by U.S.-trained foreign militaries. We have started to see positive changes taking place in some countries of this hemisphere, and we need to further the progress that has been made. A vote for this amendment will do just that.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to advise the House of my absence for part of the debate on H.R. 4301, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995.

Consequently, I want to explain why I requested to be paired as a "nay" vote to the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts. I appreciate the honesty of his motives in offering this amendment to eliminate operations and maintenance funding for the U.S. Army School of the Americas [SOA]. But I disagree with his assessment of the school and its graduates. The closure of the SOA would be detrimental to our relationship with Latin American countries, and could hinder progress in human rights efforts in those countries.

The SOA was established under President John F. Kennedy's Alliance for Progress from the existing U.S. Army Caribbean Training Center in Panama. In 1984, the SOA was moved from Panama to Fort Benning, GA. It has only been since the early 1980's that human rights instruction and emphasis has been a part of the curriculum. Most of the individuals labeled "dictators" in various reports and publications attended the school long before the SOA emphasized human rights. And since the inclusion of human rights training at the SOA, the curriculum is structured so that each student receives, on average, 30 minutes of human rights training and/or exposure every day.

The purpose of the SOA is to provide guidance to Latin American military personnel to respond to drug trafficking, natural disasters, and human rights. The SOA emphasizes the role of a professional military force in a democratic society. I support these objectives, as democratically elected civilian governments of Latin America support them. They welcome the opportunity to have their soldiers educated at the SOA because of its emphasis on civilian control of military forces.

Each year, soldiers from Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, and the United States attend the SOA. No other school in the world with such a small operations budget brings together future civilian and military leaders of 16 countries in a purposeful effort to prepare for the future, strengthen alliances within a hemispheric region, and increase mutual understanding, cooperation, and the reinforcement of the principles of democracy among neighboring countries.

Last October, the United States strengthened the selection process for candidates seeking to attend the SOA. This process includes checking names by U.S. intelligence agencies and State Department security officers. In narcotics-producing countries, the Drug Enforcement Agency, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other law enforcement agencies evaluate possible candidates for any record of criminality, drug trafficking, or human rights abuses. The revised process makes it far more likely that human rights abusers, criminals, drug traffickers, and those associated with them, will not become students at the SOA.

We should understand that the SOA takes on the very difficult task of teaching students who often come from countries with long histories of dictatorships and abuse, the value of promoting human rights. It is difficult to quantify the number of abuses that the SOA's training has prevented, so this debate often turns to a name-calling game that has little practical value. Yes, some 100 of the 58,000 graduates have documented human rights abuses. But, we must not forget about the other 57,900 graduates. Over 100 SOA graduates served or currently serve their nation and its people from the highest levels of civilian and military office—from chief executive to commander of major military units. Furthermore, hundreds of SOA graduates currently occupy positions of leadership and command at all levels in their military and support democratically elected national leaders.

For example, SOA graduate Gen. Hernan José Guzman, Colombian Army commander, led a determined effort to curtail human rights abuses by initiating innovative programs such as the assignment of judges to accompany brigades during counterinsurgency operations. Their presence helped ensure that the civil rights of all personnel were protected. Another graduate, Brig. Gen. Eumenes Fuguet Borregales, the current Director of Operations of the Venezuelan Army Staff, helped put down coup attempts in Caracas—February and November, 1992—while Commander of the 31st Infantry Brigade. This list could go on.

In the early eighties, El Salvador was accused of about 2,000 human rights violations per month; in the latter part of the decade, that figure dropped to approximately 20 each month. Although SOA cannot take all the credit, almost 50 percent of El Salvadoran officers have graduated from the school since 1986.

Let me make one final observation. If Congress closes the SOA, it will negatively affect our ability to have a meaningful and cost-effective vehicle to promote democracy and human rights within the ranks of the Latin American military. The State Department, Pentagon, and participating Latin American governments all firmly believe the existing SOA

program is the best approach to achieving important national security and foreign policy objectives. If SOA were abolished, training for Latin American military personnel would become more expensive and fewer officers and enlisted personnel would be afforded exposure to U.S. training and values. Opportunities to develop joint peacekeeping with Latin American nations and exposure to human rights and democratization training would be reduced. And, the United States would lose a valuable vehicle that exposes non-English-speaking officers and noncommissed officers from Latin America to democratic values.

When objectively reviewed, we cannot dispute the fact that the overwhelming majority of SOA graduates honorably serve their countries as professional men and women. Clearly, there is no correlation between reported misconduct by individual SOA graduates and the professional education and training they received at the school. All the evidence, anecdotal or empirical, would lead you to the opposite conclusion.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment to end funding for the School of the Americas and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Last year, I voted against this amendment because I believed that it was important to try and impress upon the Latin American military officers who trained at the school American values, especially respect for human rights and democracy.

However, it is now clear to me that the school has failed to achieve those objectives. Instead of providing foreign military officers with respect for human rights, the school's graduates have become some of the worst human rights abusers in the world. Many of the graduates returned to their home countries to participate in the violent overthrow of their governments and seize power themselves. The fact of the matter is that the School of the Americas has been a failure.

We have heard many times during this debate that defense cuts are hurting the American men and women who have signed up to serve our country. Just today, when the Appropriations Committee marked up the military construction bill, we heard how defense cuts were resulting in the cancellation of many housing programs for military families. In my own State, the National Guard's Camp Smith is desperately in need of new housing. Camp Smith's officers, NCO's, and enlisted men and women are all living in cramped, dilapidated quarters. But the resources were not available to fund new housing at the camp.

If we cannot even afford to adequately house our own soldiers, how can we continue to operate this school whose teaching is not achieving its stated purpose. On this item, it is time that we get our priorities in order.

I hope my colleagues will join me this year in voting in support of this important amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I consider it both a duty and a privilege to join in opposition to funding for the School of the Americas.

This is not a school but a scandal. It is a training ground for dictators and thugs like Noriega and D'Aubuisson—who get their training in America with American taxpayers' dollars, and then go home and use their training to oppress and murder their own people.

This school for atrocities costs American taxpayers some $40 million a year, if we count in salaries and living expenses for the trainees or perks like free trips to Disney World. What we get in return is that we get to be identified with tyranny and oppression.

This is not just a boondoggle, but a shameful and murderous boondoggle which discredits the United States at the same time that it kills the people whose welfare we claim to support. End the killing and the waste and stop this scandal.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Simply stated, the School of the Americas remains the most effective way to ensure that Latin American military personnel respect human rights and the authority of the emerging democratic governments in that region.

As the only West Point graduate serving in this body, I am most sensitive to the heinous deeds perpetrated by individuals trained by the U.S. Army. However, I am also acutely aware of the great contribution that military personnel can make to a democracy. It is for both of these reasons that I support preserving funding for the School of the Americas.

Unfortunately, the positive contributions made by the vast majority of graduates of the School of the Americas are forgotten amidst the talk of those few individuals who have attended the school and later been implicated in human rights violations. In fact, of the 58,000 officers that have graduated from this institution over the past 31 years, over 99.3 percent have gone on to serve their countries in a professional and admirable fashion.

Typically, though, the U.S. Army is not satisified with a failure rate of seven-tenths of 1 percent. In addition to incorporating mandatory human rights training into the school's curriculum creating an external review board, the Army has also thoroughly revised the selection process by which candidates gain admission to the school. This new standardized screening process requires all potential students to earn admission based on a demonstrated history of their respect for the law and human rights.

Admittedly, there is no guarantee that these changes will prevent future graduates from betraying the democratic ideals drilled into them at Fort Benning. However, it would be even more disingenuous to claim that closing the School of the Americas would prevent future human rights abuses from occurring.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that we must do all we can to nurture the growth of democracy in Latin America. Keeping the School of the Americas open is critical to that effort because it is there that the men and women of the U.S. military interact and communicate most effectively with their Latin American counterparts.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this well intentioned but misguided amendment.

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kennedy amendment to terminate funding for the School of the Americas.

This amendment will cut $2.5 million for the school, a small fraction of the amount we spend on defense in this country. But this amendment is not just about dollar savings; its about what those dollars fund.

There can be no mistake that the School of the Americas has trained some of the most despised and corrupt military officers in Latin America. A list of their graduates reads like a rogue's gallery of individuals that have wreaked havoc and destruction on the people of Latin America.

Roberto D'Aubisson, Leopoldo Galtieri, Manuel Noriega. Respect and promotion of human rights do not spring to mind when these names are read. Graduates of the School of the Americas have planned and carried out some of the most heinous crimes in this hemisphere, including the murder of six Jesuit priests in El Salvador.

The United States, in the course of the past decade, has spent roughly $6 billion to wage war in El Salvador. That war is over. The Nation as a whole is reconciling its past and moving towards a future based on democratic ideals and respect for human rights.

Our foreign policy should reflect this. We have spent billions of dollars to wage war, and we should now be working to ensure that a new mutual relationship with El Salvador based on democracy and human rights is established. Continued funding for the School of the Americas is an impediment to that process.

People across this Nation are tired of their tax dollars being used in this way. Bill Thompson from my district has joined with people from across the country on the steps of the Capitol for the past month, fasting against continued funding of the School.

I urge you to support this amendment and in doing so support the people of this Nation, the people of Latin America, and the future of U.S.-Latin American relations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has that right, and is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to listen to both sides of the aisle on this debate. I have a few remarks to make before we vote.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I support this amendment, not, Mr. Chairman, because there are not good and honorable U.S. personnel currently employed at the school; not because there are not any School of the Americas graduates who moved on without becoming heinous human rights abusers; and, finally, not because I wish to deny Latin American military the opportunity to obtain training in our country.

Rather, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment because during the cold war ordinary people in Latin America came to see the school as the U.S. military institution at which their most brutal and vicious oppressors honed their military skills. Several of the previous speakers have outlined specifically who those persons were. I choose not to speak to it further.

Let me say there have been, on numerous occasions, Members who have arisen in the well of the House to talk about sending signals to other parts of the world about our commitment to democracy, our commitment to human rights, sending signals from this Congress. We have an opportunity from these Chambers to send a signal.

The people of the region, Mr. Chairman, fought long and hard to free themselves of oppressive regimes. In some cases like Haiti, Mr. Chairman, the struggle continues. However, in the many years that it has been in existence, the School of the Americas has not exactly established an outstanding reputation as promoting democracy, protecting human rights, or condemning or isolating brutal militaries.

The cold war, Mr. Chairman, and all of its anxieties are behind us. The cold war is over. We must now, through the adoption of this amendment, in this gentleman's humble opinion, signal to our neighbors that we are at last free to pursue regional relationships that are healthy, dignified, and respectful.

Mr. Chairman, these are the cornerstones of which the promotion of true democracy rests, and the establishment of mutual beneficial ties in a multiplicity of spheres, at a multiplicity of levels. That is the signal here.

We often know that we do many things that speak to symbolism. What better form of symbolism, Mr. Chairman, to say that we walk away from the tyranny of training oppressors.

If our Latin American neighbors perceive us as operating a school that has done that, what better way to do it in a post-cold-war environment than to get rid of that?

Mr. Chairman, with the passage of this amendment, Latin American military personnel, and this speaks to the issue that our distinguished minority whip raised, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], they would be free and welcome to continue receiving military training in the United States. However, instead of being isolated in a so-called Latin American school environment, why not train them in the same places that we train every other leader throughout the world?

It sends an incredibly bad message, given the history of oppression and violence that has taken place in this hemisphere from the School of the Americas.

So for those who say we need training, there is no problem about training. There is no lack of capacity. However, why train in the School of the Americas and train other world leaders someplace else? Let them all train together. They can benefit from the military-to-military contact that speaks to civilian rule and democratic principles.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Kennedy amendment gives the United States an important opportunity to signal a new beginning, symbolically as well as substantively, in our dealings with the region. It presents and represents an opportunity to break, both symbolically and substantially, with all of the errors and all of the pain of the past.

I would argue that we step forward boldly into a new reality, into a new future, into a new set of relationships. I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have said on other occasions that I have been amazed at the fact that our maker has endowed us with minds that allow us to look at the same facts and arrive at conclusions 180 degrees apart from one another.

□ 1250

Having said that, I never cease to be amazed at the agility of the minds of our liberal friends. They can stand reason on its head.

Someone said not long ago that liberals cause arthritis. I do not know if that is true or not. But they cause all kinds of other mischief. Today is a good example.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services yielding to me, and I join with my colleagues from Georgia and my former colleagues from the Committee on Armed Services in opposing in the most strong as possible terms this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, The purpose of the School of the Americas is to develop and conduct doctrinally sound, relevant, and cost-effective military training. It is designed to foster cooperation among Latin American armies, to promote military professionalism, and to expand knowledge of United States customs and democratic traditions to the armed forces of Latin America.

The question then arises, is the School of the Americans meeting these objectives? In my opinion, there is no doubt that this institution is an overall success story.

The School of the Americas has laid a strong democratic base for the more than 58,000 Latin American and Caribbean military officers, cadets, and noncommissioned officers who have successfully completed the professional military education and training courses. Without this school there is no way to tell how many Latin Americans would have faired at the hands of their leaders. There is no way to tell how many might have been treated inhumanely and denied the basic fairness associated with democratic principles. But the presence of this school has been an important reason that democracy now flourishes in Latin America.

I will not deny that several students of the School of the Americas have been abusive to the citizens of their nation. However, I would suggest that these abuses are not a product of the School of the Americas. These abuses would have occurred regardless of participation in the school's courses. I do not believe that anyone here really believes that this school is teaching Latin Americans to return to their country and deny the principles of democracy and violate human rights. That is inconceivable and it simply is not happening.

What has happened is that a small percentage of graduates of the school have returned to their country and been abusive. But I submit, this is the responsibility of the individual, not the School of the Americas. We simply cannot close an institution because a small percentage of participants are bad. If we closed every institution that had a few bad participants, none of us would come to work Monday because we would have to close Congress.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, the School of the Americas is critical if the democratic gains we have made in Latin America are to continue. I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the School of the Americas is taught by your military officers. Those military officers are your neighbors, your friends in some cases, your children, your grandchildren, and who can say that associating with American officers the caliber of Colin Powell is not going to make those particular Latin American officers most honest, more supportive of democracy and more in keeping with our traditions and values?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN].

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I would say that my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts is right in the facts he cited but the gentleman did not cite all the facts and, that is, there have been over 58,000 Latin American officers being exposed to democracy in America and where better should we expose those people that come from regions of the world to democracy than in our own country where our military has a history of being subservient to civilian control?

Mr. Chairman, we have heard all the horrible examples that have been cited. Let me give two success stories of the graduates:

First, none of the Haiti rulers today in power went to that school. Second, General Guzman, Colombian army commander, has instituted human rights reform by assigning judges to

the brigades as they go out in the field. Third, Brig. Gen. Borregales has helped put down coup attempts in Venezuela.

Mr. Chairman, this is what democracy training at the School of the Americas is about.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Kennedy amendment. This is an extremely ill-advised idea, based on sensationalism and hyped-up charges against a key part of our strategy to spread democracy in Latin America. And the School of the Americas is that key part of our strategy.

Over 58,000 graduates, the overwhelming majority of whom have never ever been implicated in human rights abuses, have returned home to serve their countries honorably. And who today would claim that our Latin American strategy has not been working, Mr. Speaker? That is, who except Fidel Castro and the thug who runs Haiti, the only two remaining dictators in Latin America?

In the early 1980's, Latin America was almost completely run by dictators. It was awash in civil war and violent repression. Today, as I said it is just these two pathetic thugs in Havana and Port-au-Prince.

Our military training of these people works. To those who say that we encourage and even teach repression to Latin American officers, I would offer the example of El Salvador. Would the supporters of this amendment really claim that repression in El Salvador increased in proportion with our military involvement? The facts say otherwise.

In 1981, death squad killings exceeded 800 per month. By 1987, after several years of U.S. involvement, including training at the School of the Americas, total political killings were under 100.

Mr. Chairman, today Latin America is making great strides toward democracy. Political violence is way down. Free-market economics has conquered Marxism. The unbearably stupid and stultifying doctrines of Third World ideology and liberation theology are on the ash heap of history.

But let's face it. The military is deeply entrenched in Latin American history and culture. Rather than pretend this isn't so, as this amendment does, we need to recognize reality and continue to work to make that reality better.

Mr. Chairman let's kill this very bad amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is not an easy issue. Both sides have made valid arguments about whether the School of the Americas should be maintained or terminated.

I strongly support continued funding for the School of the Americas. However, my support is with an important qualification—that the changes the administration has told us are underway be implemented promptly and unconditionally.

This includes changes in the courses of instruction, the amount of human rights training, the candidate vetting process, the creation and implementation of an outside civilian advisory board, and opening the school to a larger number of civilian instructors and students.

The United States Army has a positive contribution to make in the evolution of Latin American militaries. Our values as a society can be—and have been—transmitted to a large number of Latin officers through the School of the Americas.

This is not to ignore the number of Latin officers who have committed abuses after being trained at the school. I do not believe, however, that their subsequent conduct resulted from the training they received at the school. They were bad apples, pure and simple.

Based on a recent joint State Department-U.S. Army briefing for Foreign Affairs Committee staff, the School of the Americas recognizes that the cold war is over and that the school must reflect new missions, including counternarcotics, peacekeeping, and demining.

We need an effective mechanism to develop and conduct doctrinally sound, relevant, and cost-effective military training; to foster cooperation with Latin American armies; to promote military professionalism; and to expand knowledge of United States democratic traditions to Latin armed forces.

Rather than arbitrarily discontinuing the School of the Americas, we would be better served by requiring that we support it and make it live up to the legislative mandates that attended its establishment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, a former Member who left here in disgrace graduated from my college. I do not want to shut it down.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was recorded.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—ayes 175, noes 217, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

AYES—175

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Orton
Ackerman	Greenwood	Owens
Allard	Gutierrez	Pallone
Andrews (ME)	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Applegate	Hamburg	Payne (NJ)
Baesler	Harman	Pelosi
Barca	Hastings	Penny
Barcia	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Beilenson	Hochbrueckner	Price (NC)
Berman	Hoke	Rahall
Blackwell	Holden	Ramstad
Blute	Inslee	Rangel
Bonior	Jacobs	Ravenel
Borski	Johnson (CT)	Richardson
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Roukema
Bryant	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Byrne	Kennedy	Sabo
Cantwell	Kildee	Sanders
Cardin	Kleczka	Sangmeister
Carr	Klink	Schenk
Clay	Klug	Schiff
Clayton	Kopetski	Schroeder
Coble	Kreidler	Sensenbrenner
Collins (IL)	Lambert	Serrano
Collins (MI)	LaRocco	Sharp
Condit	Leach	Shays
Conyers	Levin	Shepherd
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Costello	Long	Slaughter
Coyne	Lowey	Stark
de Lugo (VI)	Maloney	Stokes
DeFazio	Manton	Strickland
DeLauro	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Studds
Dellums	Markey	Stupak
Deutsch	Martinez	Swett
Dicks	Matsui	Swift
Dooley	McCloskey	Synar
Duncan	McDermott	Taylor (NC)
Durbin	McHale	Thompson
Edwards (CA)	McKinney	Thurman
Engel	Meehan	Torkildsen
English	Meyers	Unsoeld
Eshoo	Mfume	Upton
Evans	Mineta	Valentine
Fawell	Minge	Velazquez
Fazio	Mink	Vento
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Volkmer
Filner	Moran	Walsh
Fingerhut	Morella	Waters
Fish	Nadler	Watt
Foglietta	Neal (MA)	Waxman
Ford (TN)	Norton (DC)	Wheat
Frank (MA)	Nussle	Williams
Franks (NJ)	Oberstar	Woolsey
Furse	Obey	Wyden
Gejdenson	Olver	Yates
Glickman		

NOES—217

Andrews (NJ)	Canady	Franks (CT)
Andrews (TX)	Castle	Frost
Archer	Chapman	Gallegly
Armey	Clinger	Gallo
Bacchus (FL)	Clyburn	Gekas
Bachus (AL)	Coleman	Geren
Baker (CA)	Collins (GA)	Gibbons
Baker (LA)	Combest	Gilchrest
Ballenger	Coppersmith	Gillmor
Barrett (NE)	Cox	Gilman
Bartlett	Cramer	Gingrich
Barton	Crapo	Goodlatte
Bateman	Cunningham	Goodling
Bentley	Danner	Goss
Bereuter	Darden	Green
Bevill	de la Garza	Gunderson
Bilbray	Deal	Hall (TX)
Bilirakis	DeLay	Hamilton
Bishop	Derrick	Hancock
Bliley	Diaz-Balart	Hansen
Boehlert	Dickey	Hastert
Boehner	Doolittle	Hayes
Bonilla	Dornan	Hefley
Brewster	Dreier	Herger
Browder	Dunn	Hilliard
Brown (FL)	Edwards (TX)	Hoagland
Bunning	Ehlers	Hobson
Burton	Everett	Hoekstra
Buyer	Ewing	Horn
Callahan	Fields (TX)	Houghton
Camp	Fowler	Hoyer

Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klein
Knollenberg
Kyl
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Lazio
Levy
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lucas
Machtley
Mann
Manzullo
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Ridge
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Rowland
Royce
Rush
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schumer
Scott
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Whitten
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—46

Barlow
Becerra
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Calvert
Clement
Crane
Dingell
Dixon
Emerson
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Flake
Ford (MI)
Gephardt
Gordon
Grams
Grandy
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lehman
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Livingston
McCollum
Michel
Miller (CA)
Murphy
Neal (NC)
Pickle
Roberts
Rose
Rostenkowski
Sawyer
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Smith (TX)
Stenholm
Sundquist
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Washington
Wilson

□ 1314

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Slattery for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. LaFalce against.

Mr. Sawyer for, with Mr. Calvert against.

Mr. Becerra for, with Mr. Kolbe against.

Mr. Washington for, with Mr. Thomas of California, against.

Mr. Grams for, with Mr. Emerson against.

Mr. RICHARDSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I do so in order to explain to my colleagues that it would be the intention of this chairman to move that the Committee do now rise.

The reason that we do so is because there still remains important debate on two significant amendments, one offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and one offered by this gentleman, regarding the selective service draft registration. These are important issues. They need to be discussed and debated and voted upon. The problem we have is one of time constraint.

Mr. Chairman, I have been asked either to have the debate and roll votes over until Monday, which seems to me to be a rather bizarre process because I think the votes ought to occur at the time we debate, otherwise by Monday Members are not even sure what they are voting on.

So it is the judgment of his person, if everyone concurs, that the Committee would now rise and come back on Monday, have the debate on these issues, vote on Monday rather than rolling the votes, which seems to me to be a much more rational way to proceed.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I certainly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is certainly a reasonable request. The Committee on Rules is about to come to an agreement on a rule for the remainder of this most important bill that will come before this body this year or any other year. We need to meet this afternoon, and we cannot meet if we are on this floor during the next hours on these two amendments. I think it is a reasonable request, and certainly we on this side would agree to it.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an idea, maybe the gentleman has stated it, does he have any idea when these last two amendments would come up? I am interested in the suspensions.

Mr. DELLUMS. Reclaiming my time, these two amendments, the regular order would be to finish the amendments that were laid out in the first rule that we adopted. So it would mean that the Solomon amendment and the Dellums amendment would be the first two items to be debated and voted upon. That is the regular order under the proceedings of the first rule.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, we have suspension bills. I would assume that we would go back on this bill after the suspensions.

Mr. DELLUMS. That is a call of the leadership. I am simply saying that at the time that the DOD authorization bill, H.R. 4301, comes to the floor, these two amendments would be debated first.

□ 1320

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the leadership will make a scheduling announcement later, but these two items will be debated first when we come back on this bill.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, what I am concerned about is most of the Members will not be back in this body to participate in that debate. If we just come back, and we take up both of these bills, most of the Members are going to be on airplanes across America coming back and will not have the opportunity to participate.

Mr. DELLUMS. Not if they do the suspensions first; and, No. 2, this gentleman has to fly all the way to California. But my job is also to be back here Monday, and I plan to do that, as I am sure the gentleman has planned to do.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, there are 17 suspension on Monday. There is no chance any debate will take place on this before 5 o'clock. I am sure every Member will be back in time for that.

Mr. DELLUMS. So, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is going to be protected; no problem.

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4301, the Department of Defense authorization for fiscal year 1995. This legislation makes great strides to balance our national security needs with Federal deficit concerns. H.R. 4301 accomplishes this goal and bolsters our ability to conduct national security given the end of the cold war and the domestic economic situation.

One such stride is a provision in the committee report which deals with an issue that I have had an interest in since the early 1980's. At issue is the possible use of the B–1B in maritime support roles for the Navy. During these time of tighter budgets, like many of my colleagues, I have concerns for protecting our military's state of readiness. Specifically, with an aging carrier fleet and a reduction in the number of new carrier battle groups, the time is right to revisit the issue of assigning the B–1B to maritime roles.

In its report, the committee has asked the Department of Defense to give serious consideration to the feasibility of the B–1B being used in maritime roles. The committee directs Secretary Perry to review this option and report back to the relevant committees no later than April 15, 1995. Mr. Chairman, because the committee has taken this action I chose not to ask for an amendment to H.R. 4301 asking for such a study. However, I wait with great interest for the results of this study and stand prepared to take the necessary actions to ensure that Secretary Perry and the Department give this option every consideration.

Currently, the Navy plans to retire its' A–6E force by 1998. This will leave the Navy without an aircraft having all weather strike capabilities until the proposed Joint Advanced Strike

Technology [JAST] Program produces an operational aircraft. Such an aircraft is not estimated to be operational until 2007. The ability of the carrier battle group to remain on station as a demonstration of U.S. interest, concern, and resolve cannot be duplicated by any Air Force. Given the essential role of the carrier battle group in U.S. diplomacy, it is important that they are in a constant state of readiness.

Simultaneously, Russia is maintaining a strong Navy, strongly oriented to the anticarrier mission. It is making efforts to develop new highly capable antiship missiles, for use by their navy and for sale to others. Many of the Republics in the former Soviet Union are obtaining Naval and other forces which pose potential threats to U.S. carrier battle groups and maintain a presence in areas of concern to the United States. This will without question place our ships and sailors at risk. Unfortunately the tactical protection through an all weather strike capability can only be achieved through tactical control of the assets by the battle group commander which cannot be based in the United States.

Recently, Gen. Merrill McPeak of the Air Force recently called for the 30 to 36 B–1B's be placed in "attrition reserve" as called for in the Clinton administration's Bottom-Up Review [BUR]. Under this plan, these aircraft will not undergo the modification program projected for the B–1B fleet to fit it for conventional missions as called for in H.R. 4301. The Congress has spent $20 billion—$30 billion in today's dollars—on the B–1B and less than 10 years after the first delivery the Air Force is planning to scrap about one-third of its fleet. This is the sort of waste which breeds popular cynicism about the Pentagon, the Congress, and Government.

I suggest that the Air Force be forced to modify the entire B–1B fleet. If the Air Force finds a surplus of the aircraft, I believe this surplus could be put to good use by the Navy, pending the reintroduction of a carrier based aircraft with all-weather strike capabilities. There are several reasons why the B–1B's should be considered for helping to project naval capabilities throughout the world. The two most important being readiness and taxpayer savings. Using the B–1B in this role is an opportunity for the American taxpayer to get the most value out of a ready strategic investment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker the B–1B's must be used to defend our sea lanes and compensate for bomber shortages created by our aging bomber and carrier fleets.

There is consensus among the American people and this Congress that we commit considerable amounts of taxpayer dollars to our national defense. This Congress must do everything in its' power to ensure that our investment in national defense is maximized. Therefore, we must guarantee that this Government make the fullest use of the weapons systems it procures. It is in this spirit that I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4301.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE) having assumed the chair, Mr. RAHALL, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4301) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the actions taken by this body thus far on the bill, H.R. 4301.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on Friday, May 20, 1994, and was not present for rollcall votes 188, 189, and 190. But had I been in Washington and not my congressional district, I would have voted to approve the Dicks amendment to H.R. 4301, I would have voted against the Penny amendment to H.R. 4301, and against the Kennedy amendment to H.R. 4301. On rollcall vote No. 188, "yea"; On rollcall vote No. 189, "nay"; and on rollcall vote No. 190, "nay".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on official business on Friday, May 20, 1994 for rollcall vote No. 190. Had I been present on the House floor I would have cast my vote as follows:

Roll No. 190: "Yea" on Representative KENNEDY's amendment to prohibit any funds authorized in the bill H.R. 4301, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995, to be used to operate the Army School of the Americas.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to commitments in Florida, I was unable to vote today on the House's partial consideration of the 1995 defense authorization. Had I been here, I would have voted "yes" on the Dicks amendment, "no" on the Penny amendment, and "no" on the Kennedy amendment to close the School of the Americas.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 322, MINERAL EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following additional conferees on the bill (H.R. 322) to modify the requirements applicable to locatable minerals on public domain lands, consistent with the principles of self-initiation of mining claims, and for other purposes:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following additional conferees:

As additional conferees from the Committee on Agriculture for consideration of sections 107, 201–09, 301–04, 404, 407, 408, 411, 416, 418, and 419 of the House bill, and sections 7–10 and 12 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DE LA GARZA, ROSE, and ROBERTS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of section 7 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. FORD of Michigan, MURPHY, and FAWELL.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce for consideration of sections 3, 201–08, 301–03, 414, and 420 of the House bill, and sections 7, 8, and 12 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DINGELL, SWIFT, and CRAPO.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for consideration of section 3, 201–09, 301–04, and 414 of the House bill, and sections 7, 8, and 12 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. STUDDS, HUGHES, and FIELDS of Texas.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution authorizing the 1994 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3355), an act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to allow grants to increase police presence, to expand and improve cooperative efforts between law enforcement agencies and members of the community to address crime and disorder problems, and otherwise to enhance public safety, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIDEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. GRASSLEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONGRESS EXCEEDS DELEGATED POWERS IN ITS MANDATES TO THE STATES

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received two resolutions from the Colorado State Legislature, and I would like to share those with the Members and put them in the RECORD as a reminder to us.

The first resolution talks about the 10th amendment and reminds us that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are States' powers, powers of the people, and that we should keep our hands off of that.

The second one goes a little further. The second one says, "We have had it, we are tired of it, and we are not going to take it any more." They have instructed the attorney general of the State of Colorado to file legal action against the United States of America to say, "You cannot do this any more based on the Constitution," and they have encouraged other States to join with them in this suit.

We must change the way we look. We cannot sit here on the Potomac and pretend that we are all-wise and all-powerful, and that we have the corner on what is best for every State in the Union. The Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, did not create the States for its benefit, the States created the Federal Government for their benefit. We have to change the way we look at this.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the two resolutions referred to:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 94-1035, COLORADO STATE LEGISLATURE

Whereas, The 10th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."; and

Whereas, The 10th Amendment defined the total scope of federal power as being that specifically granted by the United States Constitution and no more; and

Whereas, The scope of power defined by the 10th Amendment means that the Federal government was created by the States specifically to be an agent of the states; and

Whereas, Today, in 1994, the states are demonstrably treated as agents of the federal government; and

Whereas, Numerous resolutions have been forwarded to the federal government by the Colorado General Assembly without any response or result from Congress or the federal government; and

Whereas, Many federal mandates are directly in violation of the 10th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court has ruled in *New York* v. *United States*, 112 S. Ct. 2408 (1992), that Congress may not simply commandeer the legislative and regulatory processes of the States; and

Whereas, A number of proposals from previous administrations and some now pending from the present administration and from Congress may further violate the United States Constitution; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

(1) That the State of Colorado hereby claims sovereignty under the 10th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States over all powers not otherwise enumerated and granted to the federal government by the United States Constitution.

(2) That this serve as Notice and Demand to the federal government, as our agent, to cease and desist, effective immediately, mandates that are beyond the scope of its constitutionally delegated powers.

Be It Further Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate of each state's legislature of the United States of America, and Colorado's Congressional delegation.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 94-1027, COLORADO STATE LEGISLATURE

Whereas, The Constitution of the United States envisions sovereign states and guarantees the states a republican form of government in which decisions are made by the elected representatives of the people; and

Whereas, The state and local governments in Colorado are losing their power to act on behalf of their citizens, as the power of government is moving farther away from the people into the hands of federal agencies and officials who are not elected and who are unaware of the needs and concerns of Colorado and other states; and

Whereas, With increasing and alarming frequency important decisions affecting the lives of Colorado citizens are being made by the federal government in the form of both funded and unfunded federal mandates imposed on the states; and

Whereas, Congress fails to provide adequate means to implement many of the federal mandates directed to the states which places state governments in a vice that threatens to squeeze state resources beyond their limits; and

Whereas, Imposition of unfunded federal mandates requires states to fund the federal requirements with diminishing state revenues or jeopardize their eligibility for certain federal funds; and

Whereas, The states and Congress should engage in earnest discussions to resolve the difficult position that states are forced into by their efforts to comply with the growing number of unfunded federal mandates, because their trend could eliminate state flexibility to effectively deal with local problems as limited state resources are diverted to funding federally mandated programs; and

Whereas, Federal mandates threaten the fiscal integrity of the states and their right of self-determination; and

Whereas, The United States Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommended in a July 1993 report that "the federal government institute a moratorium on mandates for at least two years and conduct a review of mandating to restore balance, partnership, and state and local self-government in the federal system" and that the "Supreme Court reexamine the constitutionality of mandating as a principle"; and

Whereas, Numerous federal laws impose mandates on the state of Colorado, including, but not limited to the following: Asbestos School Hazard Abatement Act; Family and Medical Leave Act; Safe Drinking Water Act; Clean Air Act; Americans with Disabilities Act; National Voter Registration Act; Title XIX of the federal "Social Security Act"; and Water Pollution Control Act; and

Whereas, The members of the Colorado General Assembly want the members of the Colorado congressional delegation to fully understand the impact the actions of the federal government have on the state of Colorado, especially the difficulties imposed on the General Assembly in its effort to allocate resources to a large number of pressing state needs; and

Whereas, The federal court system affords a means to liberate the states from the grip of federal mandates and to give the power to govern back to the people; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

That legal action challenging the constitutionality of both funded and unfunded federal mandates, the court rulings that hinder state management of state issues, and the authority of the federal government to mandate state action is necessary to restore, maintain, and advance the state of Colorado's sovereignty and authority over issues that affect Colorado and the well-being of its citizens.

Be It Further Resolved, That the Colorado Attorney General examine and challenge by legal action, in the name of and on behalf of the state of Colorado, federal mandates, court rulings, the authority granted to or assumed by the federal government, and laws, regulations and practices of the federal government to the extent they infringe on the state of Colorado's sovereignty or authority over issues affecting its citizens.

Be It Further Resolved, That all of the states are urged to participate in any legal action brought pursuant to this joint resolution and that the Colorado Attorney General shall request and encourage such participation and shall cooperate with other states in any legal action that includes issues of joint concern.

Be It Further Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution be sent to the Attorney General and presiding officers of both houses of the legislatures of each of the states in the United States, the President of the United States, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Senate, and to each member of the Colorado Congressional Delegation.

CHARACTER IN GENERAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remaining colleagues, those watching on television, and a million and a half Americans who are still following the proceedings about the issue of character.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when character is mentioned in this Chamber, the Parliamentarians get uptight. Everybody thinks it is focused in on one person down at the White House. The tremors start. We implement old rules that are supposed to govern the discourse among ourselves in this Chamber and the other body, the U.S. Senate. Suddenly we are cranking in the executive branch, though I don't remember the House leadership being so sensitive when Republicans were in the White House and regularly subjected to harsh language.

There is a new scandal on the front page every day. The front page of the

L.A. Times mentions a scandal that I am not allowed to put into the RECORD. So instead I will speak about character in general.

In the paper the other day a lady found a faded newspaper clipping from 1924 tucked away in her grandmother's book, the grandmother having long ago gone to heaven. It was a book on public speaking. The book was 70 years old. The lady, Elizabeth Agnes Walsh of Curtis, NY, was the grandmother of the lady who brought this to the newspaper's attention. The clipping was an article penned by none other than President Calvin Coolidge, our Nation's 30th President and President Ronald Reagan's favorite President. The man who defined patriotism as "looking out for yourself by looking out for your country."

□ 1330

Coolidge titled his short piece "What the Country Needs," and, Mr. Speaker, if these are not powerful words pertaining to this very hour in American history, I do not know what are.

This is what President Coolidge said:

In America "we do not need more material development; we need more spiritual development.

We do not need more intellectual power; we need more moral power.

We do not need more knowledge; we need more character.

We do not need more government; we need more culture.

We do not need more law; we need more religion.

We do not need more of the things that are seen; we need more of the things that are unseen.

At 4 o'clock today I will appear on a television show called "Sally Jessy Raphael" about the major scandal of the moment. It was recorded last Friday.

Mr. Speaker, though Ms. Raphael and her staff were very nice, I will never again accept an invitation to appear on one of these tabloid shows. I am used to three against one, four against one, but nine against two? Thank heavens, I had a great Republican lady lawyer from New York, from the liberal wing of my party, with me. She did a great job, better than I did. But as this Sally Jessy Raphael show goes across the country, people will realize that there are forces attempting to burn at the stake, like Jeanne d'Arc, anybody who dares speak up truthfully against the current occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, we need character, as we always do, as every Nation does. Character does matter.

SUPPORT THE C-17—SUPPORT OUR TROOPS IN THE FIELD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 40 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss a very important subject that will come before this House and the American people next Tuesday afternoon, and that is an amendment to return the Defense Authorization Act for our armed services to what the President recommended was with reference to the C-17 military airlift aircraft.

Next week we are going to be asked to make one of the most important decisions and cast one of the most significant votes of this particular Congress. How we vote and what we decide regarding the fate of the C-17 will directly affect the ability of our forces to succeed in time of conflict. It will also directly affect the ability of this Nation to deliver humanitarian aid to countries that have problems of starvation.

Senior military leaders and theater commanders have consistently cited strategic lift as critical to their ability to provide reinforcements and necessary equipment to the young men and women serving our Nation on the front line of the world's trouble spots.

Particularly as our Nation reduces the size of its military and its presence around the world, it is essential that we have the ability required to project force from our shores. That is why it is essential that we restore the C-17 line in the fiscal year 1995 Defense Authorization Act to the President's request of six (6) aircraft.

It is important to heed the message of the letter of May 17, 1994, which the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. John Shalikashvili, sent to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

This is what the general said:

As I look into the future, it is clear that America's combat commanders will become increasingly dependent upon strategic mobility * * *. America must have a core airlifter to replace the aging C-141. The continuing myths of a service life extension program for the C-141 or the ability of a commercial derivative to meet the needs of a core airlifter are just that—myths. Neither aircraft can carry the equipment to forward areas that the Army needs to win on tomorrow's battlefields.

General Shalikashvili stated unequivocally that: "Today there is only one alternative that can meet the requirements of a core airlifter—the C-17."

Gen. Colin Powell, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has, unsurprisingly, made the case for the C-17 most succinctly and effectively:

Our military strategy is changing from a focus on global war to a focus on regional crises . . . And to deal with those kinds of crises you've got to get there fast. And you've got to get there with the mostest. And that's what the C-17 will do for us.

His words are echoed repeatedly by the commanders for whom the capabilities provided by the C-17 may mean life and death for young men and women serving under their command. Gen. Joseph Hoar, who succeeded Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf as commander of the U.S. Central Command [CENTCOM], made a compelling case in his May 17 letter to Chairman DELLUMS of the Committee on Armed Services. This is what General Hoar said:

As our forces are returning from overseas and increasingly based in the United States, I become the commander faced with the most strenuous requirement for mobility in the world. In the CENTCOM theater, because of the long deployment distances, we are particularly sensitive to, and dependent on, our ability to ensure the timely deployment of the early arriving lethal firepower—key to limiting the escalation of a conflict. This means armor, helicopters, rocket systems, and air defense missiles, most of which do not fit on any commercial aircraft. In the foreseeable future only the C-17, acting as the Nation's core military airlifter, can provide us this flexibility.

I agree with the commander of the U.S. Central Command. Gordon Sullivan, Chief of Staff of the Army, reinforced that point in a letter:

By 1997, 80 percent of America's Army will be stationed in the Continental United States as we complete our transformation to a power projection Army. * * * This Nation must have the strategic lift capabilities to project power rapidly to any potential trouble spot in the world. * * * While the aging C-141 fleet helps the Army fulfill this requirement today, we will need the C-17 to provide the strategic airlift for troops and equipment to provide our forced entry capability and simultaneous application of joint combat power across the depth of the battlefield in the 21st century. The C-17 is the only aircraft that can get the Army's outsized combat systems to the next war when required.

□ 1340

I agree with the Chief of Staff of the Army. I hope this House will too.

General Sullivan emphasized that the C-17 will provide the capability to deliver critical army outsized loads while allowing access to 9,000 more runways, an increase of 300 percent worldwide, then does the C-141 or the C-5, the two main load lifters which the services depend upon at the present time.

Equally important, General Sullivan noted, is that the C-17 will improve through-put capacity, or rapid off-load and turnaround on the ground, as the military put it; when you have a plane coming in, how fast can you land it, is there space on the airfield, how fast can you unload it, how fast will it return to the main base to continue to bring supplies, personnel, and other materials needed by the forward forces.

Essentially, that means how fast can we deliver the equipment in an efficient, effective, rapid manner. The performance characteristics of the C-17 will permit eight C-17's to fit on an airfield where three C-5Bs now fit.

General Sullivan added, "Had we had the C-17 during Desert Shield, we could

have delivered the First Airborne Brigade in 54 hours with just 93 aircraft, an improvement of some 34 percent over the 82 hours it took to deliver the brigade with 158 C–141's and 3 C–5's."

At a hearing last Tuesday in the House Committee on Armed Services, Gen. Ronald Fogleman, commander of the Air Mobility Command, brought home what a difference the C–17's capabilities can mean. He told the committee that the C–17 would have permitted him to double the amount of equipment provided to our forces in Mogadishu in support of their humanitarian and military operations there.

It is an incontrovertible fact that a military airlifter specifically designed to meet the needs of our forces in the field will be better able to accomplish that mission than will a commercial airliner converted for that purpose. Commercial wide-bodied planes were not meant to be a core airlifter for the military, and they are not capable of fulfilling that role.

Keep this in mind: The C–17 is not just another wide-bodied airplane. It was specifically designed to meet our Nation's airlift needs well into the 21st century, and it has successfully demonstrated its ability to carry heavy outsized loads long distances and land on the kinds of short, unimproved runways that are most likely to be the destinations of our airlift fleet in the post-cold war world in which you and I live.

The C–17 has set more than 20 world records in proving its ability to meet the military's unique airlift needs.

The chart I have with me displays the extent to which the C–17's capabilities dramatically exceed those of all alternatives. The comparison is among the C–5, the C–141, the C–17, commercial wide-bodied planes, commercial narrow-bodied planes, and the C–141 with service-life extension program. I will submit for the RECORD a full explanation of what the chart means. In shorthand, though, the green blocks indicate a full capability to meet the military's needs, the yellow ones a limited capability, and the red ones an inability to do so in general, combat and other military missions.

As you can see, the C–17 is unmatched in its capabilities. Nearly all blocks are green—and in the case of combat and military missions they are, in fact, all green. The C–5B, C–141, and C–141 with a service life extension program have more limited capabilities for fulfilling all three missions. And commercial variants are shown to be severely lacking in most missions when a strong lift capability may mean the difference between victory and defeat for troops in the field.

The chart shows that the C–17 has the needed combat capabilities for airdrop, low altitude parachute extraction, short airfields, unimproved airfields and survivability. It has the needed military capabilities for throughput, outsized and oversized cargo, drive on/off, air refueling, ground support requirements, and configuration flexibility. No other alternative can make that claim.

Moreover, the C–17 has an external size similar to the C–141, but carries twice the cargo. It has a more efficient cross section than the C–5B, and lands at smaller airfields. In fact, it can land at C–130 size airfields, but with four times the cargo.

The C–5B, perhaps the most realistic alternative to the C–17, is, simply put, a less capable aircraft with a higher life-cycle cost. A mix of commercial widebodies and C–5B's would provide one-third less throughput, the requirement which matters most to military operators.

It has been suggested that design specifications of the C–17 have been reduced, thereby making it less capable and desirable. In fact, the C–17's current payload and range specifications exceed operational requirements to perform its designed mission. As General Fogleman has said, "From my perspective, we have not changed our operational requirements for this aircraft."

The C–17 recently completed successfully the entire profile of static testing to 150 percent of operational load and has achieved one lifetime, 30,000 hours, of durability testing. The last six aircraft have been delivered to the Air Force within the timeframe that we in Congress established as a must-deliver schedule. The overall quality of each airplane delivered is obviously improving. Over 3,000 flight test hours have been completed, and flight testing is over 80 percent complete.

The six C–17's delivered to the 437th Airlift Wing at Charleston Air Force Base, SC, have completed over 100 initial squadron operations missions, flown over 700 initial squadron operations hours, and accomplished more than 2,800 landings.

In other words, this is a tested, proven airplane. It is a program which has not been without its problems. What weapon system, what major complex endeavor—whether in private industry or government—has not had problems as it has evolved over a long time period?

But these are problems which are now meeting the strictures placed upon it by both Congress and the Department of Defense. To truncate or terminate the program at this time, as the Furse amendment would, would be counter to the request not only of this President of the United States, but previous Presidents of the United States. It would be contrary to the impassioned pleas of military commanders, detrimental to the Nation's ability to respond in time of emergency, and potentially harmful to the young men and women in uniform who will need the reinforcements and need the equipment which the C–17 was specifically designed to deliver efficiently and effectively in order that they might do their job that a grateful nation expects them to do.

A look at recent missions performed by our military—Grenada and Panama in Central America, Desert Shield in the Middle East, Somalia in East Africa, and Bosnia in Southeastern Europe, and various humanitarian efforts, puts clearly into focus the choice we will be facing next week.

The C–17 has the capability to meet 100 percent of the airlift capabilities critical to mission success, including long-range capability, airdrop, combat offload of outsized cargo restricted runway, ground agility, parking efficiency, self-supporting, and survivability.

A commercial wide-bodied substitute could—at best—have performed only one of those missions—Desert Shield—25 to 50 percent of the time. It has little, if any, capability to address the military's needs in the other contingencies listed.

C–17 AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT NEED MILITARY CAPABILITIES

Recent military contingencies	Aircraft capabilities critical to mission success									Aircraft suitability to perform critical missions	
	Long-range capacity	Airdrop	Combat offload	Outsize	Restricted runway	Ground agility	Parking efficiency	Self supporting	Survivability	C–17 (percent)	Commercial freighter (percent)
Grenada	√	.....	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	100	0.
Panama	√	√	.....	√	√	√	√	.....	√	100	0 to 25.
Desert Shield	√	.....	.....	√	.....	√	√	.....	.....	100	25 to 50.
Humanitarian	.....	√	√	.....	√	√	.....	√	.....	100	0 to 25.
Somalia	√	.....	.....	√	√	√	√	√	√	100	0 to 25.
Bosnia	.....	√	√	.....	√	√	√	√	√	100	0 to 25.

Mr. HUNTER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. HORN. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. HUNTER. I want to commend my colleague for his advocacy for the C–17. I think it is appropriate you are doing such a total and long-range perspective on the C–17, because we are now, of course, commemorating the landing of Normandy in recent weeks.

We were down at the Air and Space Museum watching the 2-hour feature, which was extremely good. I think one of the messages that was sent to us when we watched that enormous military effort, power projection under the leadership of Dwight David Eisenhower striking the beaches at Normandy, coming up against the best that Hitler's panzer divisions could offer and ultimately spreading out and moving into a position to win the war in Europe, the key message that I got from that film, and I think from Normandy in general, was that getting there firstest with the mostest, getting into a strategic location with your equipment quickly, is and should be of utmost priority to military commanders.

The C–17 gives us the ability to get places quickly, on remote airfields that could not accommodate aircraft in the past, with large payloads, and to be effective early. And that is what saves lives, that is what reduces the number of body bags that come back to the United States in conflicts around the world.

Of all of the programs that we are looking at and analyzing in this defense bill, the C–17 is one of the most critical and one of the most important. I thank the gentleman for this very, very thorough presentation to our colleagues. I will be supporting you very strongly.

Mr. HORN. I thank my colleague. You have been always a strong supporter of the defense capability which this Nation needs in order to back up the leadership the rest of the world expects us to provide, and we thank you.

Noting that the C–17 has the capability to meet 100 percent of the aircraft capabilities on these various types of missions' success, the fact is in Desert Shield, a commercial wide-bodied substitute trying to substitute for the C–17 would have only performed one of those missions 25 to 50 percent of the time. It simply is not a viable alternative to think about commercial alternatives at this point in time in the evolution of the airlift airplane project, regardless of who that manufacturer might be.

The commercial alternative and a commercial wide-bodied substitute has little, if any, capability to address the military's needs in the typical contingencies that we now have facing us in various regions of the world, where small powers increasingly have nuclear capability; where two-bit dictators hold an arbitrary rule over their people; where democracy has not taken root.

Occasionally we have vital national interests that have to be protected, and it is this airlift capacity which seems innocent enough in essence that it is largely behind the lines, but it is taking needed equipment to the lines. And as my colleague mentioned, whether you are recalling Normandy in the Second World War, or you are describing other wars, what ultimately triumphs is the ability to deliver the human resources and the equipment produced by the industrial might of this and allied nations, into the field, readily, to backup the troops that need food, supplies, and reinforcement to accomplish the assigned mission.

At Tuesday's Committee on Armed Services hearing, General Fogleman stressed the importance of both the ability to land on austere, shorter runways, and to get the needed equipment to the troops in the field as efficiently and effectively as possible.

□ 1350

He reported that the Air Force, working with the Defense Mapping Agency, has concluded that the C–17 can land on 576 runways in the Far East versus only 217 for the C–5. The C–17 can land on 852 runways in Europe versus 184 for the C–5. The C–17 can land on 794 runways in Africa versus 137 for the C–5. The C–17 can land on 852 runways in Latin America versus 66 for the C–5.

This does not diminish the value of the C–5. The C–5 has done a noble job. It is an airplane that is three decades old. It is an airplane that is three decades old. New designs, new avionics, new types of engines are important, and they are what are in the C–17, an airplane that is operated by only three people: pilot, copilot-navigator, and the loadmaster, who works the computer system that delivers that load, whether it be at a fairly low altitude—even 10 feet off the ground—or after landing. Couple this with the C–17's ability to carry out-sized cargo and to off-load that cargo quickly and its advantage over the more limited commercial valiants, which would require a very cumbersome loading and unloading system for the more limited cargo that any of them could carry, and the need for the C–17 becomes even more obvious.

Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch has described the C–17 as "the highest priority defense system," if the military is to meet successfully its obligations in future years. Among the C–17's capabilities, which are not available in any other airlift aircraft, are the ability to back up and make tight turns, thus reducing the amount of ramp parking space needed, without its jet exhaust interfering with other aircraft; cargo door, ramp airdrop, cargo restraint systems that can be operated by one person and permit rapid unloading without special equipment.

The C–17 also has improved instrument displays that the two-person cockpit crew can easily read; built-in test equipment, modern avionics gear that are readily accessible to maintenance personnel.

The C–17 is an essential, perhaps the essential component of the military's ability to project power capably and in a credible way. This is especially so in light of the steady increase in the weight growth of army combat units over the last decade. The three army division types usually eligible for air deployment have seen weight growth increases between 36 and 55 percent. These weight increases in weapons, equipment and needed space are due to the changes in the force structure and the larger and heavier weapon systems. They correlate very closely with the increases in the airlift missions.

The trend for past and current weapons systems has been an emphasis on lethality-survivability, which generally involves increases in weight and size of the delivery of the weapons system and the use of that system.

For example, the M-2 series Bradley fighting vehicle has replaced systems that could be loaded three or four strong on this C–141, which again performed valued service for this country over several decades. Transporting the Bradley by C–141 is possible but impractical because of the massive disassembly and reassembly time required, 6 hours on either end.

The C–141 carries only one Bradley with the pallet of disassembled parts. By comparison, the C–17 can carry two Bradleys ready to drive on, drive off, and go right into battle.

The C–141, designed in the 1950's, could deliver most of the Army's combat vehicles over the past three decades. However, there are many new vehicles in the inventory which dramatically affect the military's ability to deliver combat forces in a timely manner.

One example relates to jeeps and their replacement, the HMMWV, otherwise known as the Humvee. The C–141 could carry 17 jeeps in a single load, but it can carry 5 five Humvees before it becomes cubed-out because of the additional width of the Humvee.

On the other hand, the C–17, with its wider cargo floor, is able to carry 2 Humvee's side by side for a total of 10, while the C–141 can only fit a single line of 5.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield simply to state that I want to congratulate him on the special order he has taken out here and on the diligent effort that he has put into the C–17 effort. One of the most serious problems that we face, and the gentleman knows it very well, is airlift

capability. And as we look at the extraordinary challenges that we are facing throughout the world today, we have gone through this debate in the past. I remember when we had the Boeing alternative that many people had thrown before us, which obviously is inadequate.

It seems to me that the need to deal with airlift capability is pressing one that is before us. We have the answer. The answer is as my friend has pointed out so well, the C–17.

I know that he has played a key role in this effort. I congratulate him on that. I simply want to say that I want to do anything I possibly can to help us meet that very important national security imperative which lies before us.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, who has done a tremendous amount in his leadership of this delegation in support of the defense of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to cross all of DAVID DREIER's t's and dot some i's and thank you for the good work you have done.

I went into your district and flew the simulator for this great aircraft, saw how aggressively and pro-actively they were trying to overcome the few growing pains that are generally in every system. The F–100 that I flew on active duty compared to the limited number of problems today and our accidents, we had no accidents with this one. It is ahead of schedule at Edwards. The F–100's were dropping out of the sky. It did not deter me, when I was a 22-year-old pilot who wanted to fly the world's fastest fighter.

We are not going to fly anything anywhere unless we have this system to fly the engines around and to carry individually one big massive 30-ton M–1 Abrams tank.

I want everybody to know so we do not get into all of this phony, actually bordering on lying, propaganda that the B–1 was hit with and is still hit with, this aircraft is flying. We have delivered now how many to Charleston Air Force Base? Three?

Mr. HORN. Much more than that are being tested there. A good part of the squadron in Missouri is already assembled.

Mr. DORNAN. And when we say tested up at Edwards Base, this means tested with loads, with load masters working them, carrying things and going around and across the seas with loads, working out with two other great Douglas aircraft, the C–124, and the C–133 that were the largest of their generation.

I just hope that people realize this is the state of the art and then some. It has a stick, two sticks like a fighter plane, side by side fighter. And this is the answer. Thank God you prevailed and General Fogelman, first to ever fly me in an Air Force fighter as a freshman Congressman back in January 1978, when he was a young major in Pittsburgh; four-star General Ron Fogleman's presentation before the Armed Services Committee the other day, Deputy Secretary Deutch, it was compelling testimony. And they took away all the fears that some Members legitimately had. I would like a laminated tiny card of your charts for my wallet. All kidding aside, it is excellent.

Mr. HORN. Thank you very much.

You, as a very distinguished fighter pilot, know that Gen. Merrill A. McPeak, the current Chief of Staff of the Air Force, is also a fighter pilot by background. And I saw him after he had just flown the C–17.

I said, smiling "I was a little worried that a fighter pilot could fly a big plane like that." He replied that he had never seen an airplane that handled as beautifully and effectively as the C–17, which is a great advance over the era you and many others flew in, whether it be Vietnam, Korea, or the Second World War.

The C–17 can carry five armored personnel carriers used by the Army versus only two for the C–141. This is because the C–141 is restricted to an allowable cabin load of 55,000 pounds. The five carried by the C–17 weigh almost 100,000 pounds combined.

The Army has cited a wide range of other weapons systems which are critical in the early days of a conflict which the C–17's enhanced capabilities will permit to be delivered more quickly and in greater numbers. These include the Multiple Launch Rocket System, the Patriot Missile System, AH–64 and UH–60 helicopters, the Armored Gun System, the Command and Control Vehicle, the Advanced Field Artillery System, the Forward Area Resupply Vehicle, the Line-of-Sight Antitank System, and the Bradley Fire Support Vehicle, quite a range. But the importance of these facts and the reason commercial derivatives cannot do this job is because of the special design that has been made in the interior and exterior of the C–17 to permit the hauling, in a sensible, efficient way, of these various combinations of military equipment that are needed abroad.

The bottom line is that the Army of the future will rely increasingly on the availability of airlift capable of delivering outsized cargo. And it will need to deploy from the United States to places all over the globe on short notice to defend American interests.

It is imperative that we provide the courageous young men and women putting their lives on the line for their Nation and for the cause of freedom the capability they need to defend themselves and to succeed in their mission with minimum loss of life and in the shortest possible time. We must not shortchange them or deny their commanders the C–17's airlift capability.

Mr. DORNAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. I am sorry to interrupt. I was looking for a break in the thought processes there. This is something the gentleman will want for his special order.

Your staff called. No. 7, and this is not, and this shocked me. Here I said three, maybe I was off by one. Seven is already at the Charleston Air Force Base working out all the load lifting problems, and No. 6 has joined the test program up at Edwards. This program moves fast apace.

Mr. HORN. Right. I thank my colleague for that vital fact.

Only one airlift aircraft, the C–17, was specifically designed to meet the present and future military requirements as projected by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Only one airlift aircraft, the C–17, has been recommended by the military—the Joint Chiefs and the commanders in the field—and the senior civilian leaders of our country under a previous Republican administration and now under a Democratic administration including the current and former Presidents of the United States, as the system we need for today and well into the 21st century. As former Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney has said of the C–17, "It is an absolutely vital strategic asset regardless of what size force we have in the long term."

The C–5 and C–141 were designed decades ago to meet the needs of a military and a world very different from the one we have today. And civilian widebodied planes were designed to carry passengers between major metropolitan areas. These planes are fine in fulfilling the purposes for which they were designed, but the military leadership uniformly tells us they are not the answer when the lives of Americans are on the line.

As the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has emphasized, there is only one plane that has the capabilities needed in a core airlifter. That plane is the C–17.

I have cited the Chief of Staff of the Army, and other generals as strong supporters of the C–17, but let us also hear from those who have flown the C–17 and worked with it. They, too, are its strongest proponents.

Said Capt. Mark Holland, a C–17 pilot at the Charleston Air Force Base in South Carolina: the C–17, "incorporates everything we know about airlift into one plane." Capt. Ron Nadreau, a former C–5 pilot and current C–17 test pilot, has concluded: "It's like going from Fred Flintstone to George Jetson." Lt. Col. Ron Ladnier, commander of the 17th Airlift Squadron, 437th Airlift Wing, observed: "If you asked me to do something important—like haul tanks into Mogadishu—and

told me to pick the airplane I want, I'd have to choose the C–17."

Among loadmasters, those crucial technical personnel in the back of the plane who have the say over how this load is to be distributed and how it is to be unloaded, there are especially glowing comments.

Chief M.Sgt. Glen Morgan commented: "The C–17 has taken us from Neanderthal to state-of-the-art. Because it can land on such short airfields and carry such outsized cargo as the M–1 tank, we can go right into a trouble spot and begin the mission immediately without having to disassemble and reassemble equipment." M. Sgt. Cecil Whaley concluded: "It's very user-friendly. A single loadmaster can reconfigure the C–17 in flight, whereas with other airlifters, it took a minimum of two people." M. Sgt. Bill Ellis reported: "They have incorporated everything that is good from the C–130, the C–141 and the C–5 on this plane." Finally, M. Sgt. Tom Clemons, who has responsibility for maintaining the C–17, stressed: "The aircraft was built for ease of maintenance. We may end up being like the Maytag repairman."

In other words, there is less need for maintenance. That means a saving of the money. So does the size of the crew of three.

As I stated earlier, this is a program which has not been without its problems, but it is a program that both Republican and Democratic administrations have listed as a top priority in terms of our national security. It is a program which has received careful scrutiny by the Department of Defense under the leadership of Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch.

Deputy Secretary Deutch is now overseeing a 2-year probationary period for the C–17 in which the Air Force will be limited through 1995 to buying 40 of its planned 120 C–17's. In November 1995, the Pentagon will make a decision whether to proceed with further purchases of the C–17 or to shift to commercial aircraft derivatives or revived production of the C–5 cargo plane. The bill reported out of the Committee on Armed Services in effect negates the Air Force's plan, committing funds for commercial widebodies planes well in advance of the completion of the Pentagon's review in November 1995 and moving in a direction which Secretary Deutch has stated in congressional testimony does not provide the best airlift mix to meet the military's needs.

The operational effectiveness and cost effectiveness of the C–17 have been emphasized by both Secretary of Defense William Perry and Secretary Deutch. Secretary Perry, in a May 5 letter to Speaker FOLEY, said, "The C–17 aircraft continues to be the most cost-effective means to meet current and projected airlift requirements. The C–17's ability to deliver outsize cargo, combined with its special capability to use austere fields, will provide us with modern, highly capable strategic airlift." And Deputy Secretary Deutch, in recent testimony, stated, "In general, the results—of the Defense Department's Cost and Operational Effectiveness Analysis—showed that a fleet of C–17's operating to our best expectations was more cost effective than any combination of C–17's, CWB's (commercial widebodies), C–5B's or C–141's with service life extension program."

Let us not second guess our military leadership and our commanders in the field. Let us provide our men and women in uniform the capability they need to do the job we expect them to do. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Furse amendment, which would eliminate this program, cripple the forces of this country in all parts of the world. I urge my colleagues to vote against any proposal that will reduce our military's ability to respond in a time of crisis and to support the bipartisan amendment which will bring the defense authorization for the C–17 back to that of the President and the military's request for six.

□ 1410

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD various documents pertaining to my special order as follows:

First, a spectrum of aircraft capabilities;

Second, a letter from Secretary of Defense William J. Perry to Speaker of the House THOMAS S. FOLEY, dated May 5, 1994;

Third, a letter from Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff John M. Shalikashvili; to House chairman of Armed Services RONALD V. DELLUMS, dated May 17, 1994;

Fourth, a letter from Army Chief of Staff Gordon R. Sullivan to Senator STROM THURMOND of the Senate Armed Services Committee, dated May 19, 1994, and

Fifth, a letter from commander in chief, U.S. Central Command General J.P. Hoar, to House Armed Services Chairman RONALD V. DELLUMS, dated May 17, 1994.

SPECTRUM OF AIRCRAFT CAPABILITIES

	Red	Yellow	Green
GENERAL AIRLIFT CAPABILITIES			
Throughput (MTM/D): Throughput of cargo to a theater of operations; numbers of airlift aircraft at en route or destination airfields are not limited by any parking or ground support limitations. Relative scale.	Throughput capability in bottom third.	Throughput capability in middle third.	Throughput in top third.
Cargo Volume and Payload: Cargo carrying capability; relative scale. Range: Aircraft range with normal planning factor payload, without air refueling	Volume/payload in bottom third Range <2000 nm.	Volume/payload in middle third Range 2000–6000 nm.	Volume/payload in top third Range >6000 nm.
Logistics Reliability: Reliability due to logistics factors, including maintenance, spares. Includes level of depot maintenance required, mission capable rates, and departure reliability due to logistics.	Less than 70% of force available for missions.	70%–90% of force available for missions.	Greater than 90% of force available for missions.
Acquisition Cost: Total program acquisition unit cost; includes total cost to field weapon system except for O&S costs. (CY3$; per aircraft)	>$400M	$100M–$400M	<$100M.
O&S Cost: Cost on a yearly basis to operate the weapon system. Includes manpower (aircrew, maintenance, and base operating support), contractor logistics support, flying hours, training. Cost per PAA per year, CY93$. Divided by MTMD per PAA to express both O&S cost and gain from that O&S cost.	>$60M	$30M–$60M	<$30M.
Longevity: Measure of how close the aircraft is to the end of its design service life; potential for further service	Within 10,000 hours.	10,000–20,000 hours.	>20,000 hours.
COMBAT CAPABILITIES			
Airdrop: Efficiency and effectiveness in the mission of airdropping troops and equipment	Cannot airdrop	Can airdrop; inefficient; cannot perform all missions.	Can perform full spectrum of airdrop missions.
Low Altitude Parachute Extraction: Efficiency and effectiveness in the mission of extracting equipment	Cannot extract	N/A	Can perform full spectrum of extraction missions.
Short Airfields (<3000'): Capability of the aircraft to operate into and out of airfields less than 3000 ft long on a routine operational basis	Cannot operate on short airfields.	N/A	Can operate on short airfields.
Unimproved Airfields: Capability of the aircraft to operate into and out of unimproved airfields on a routine operational basis	Cannot operate on unimproved fields.	N/A	Can operate on unimproved fields.
Survivability: Capability of the aircraft to survive in a wartime threat environment. Aircraft design incorporates survivability features	No design for survivability.	Some design for survivability.	Design optimized for survivability.

SPECTRUM OF AIRCRAFT CAPABILITIES—Continued

	Red	Yellow	Green
MILITARY AIRLIFT CAPABILITIES			
Throughput (constrained): Throughput of cargo to a theater of operations; the numbers of airlift aircraft at en route and destination airfields are limited by small and/or crowded parking ramps and ground support. Relative scale.	Throughput is in bottom third; addition of more of same type does not increase throughput.	Throughput is in middle third; addition of more of same type slightly increases throughput.	Throughput is in top third; addition of more of same type greatly increases throughput.
Outsize cargo: Capability of the aircraft to carry outsize cargo (cargo that is too wide for any aircraft except the C–5 and C–17)	No capability	N/A	Capable of carrying oversize cargo.
Oversize cargo: Capability of the aircraft to carry categories of oversize cargo (cargo that is too wide or long for the standard military 436L pallet)	<20% of oversize cargo.	20% to 80% of oversize cargo.	>80% of oversize cargo.
Drive on/off: Capability to drive vehicles on and off the aircraft from the ground	Cannot drive on/off.	N/A	Can drive on/off.
Air refueling: Aircraft's capability to air refuel (as receiver)	Cannot air refuel	N/A	Can air refuel.
Ground support requirements: Need for materiel handling equipment and extensive logistical support	Always requires extensive support/equipment.	Requires less extensive support equipment.	Routinely operates with no or minimum support equipment.
Configuration flexibility: Capability to rapidly (on the ground or in flight) reconfigure the aircraft for different types of cargo and passenger loads	Cannot reconfigure aircraft.	Can reconfigure with delays to mission.	Can reconfigure with no delays to mission.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, May 5, 1994.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On March 31, 1994 the Department of Defense provided the Committee on Armed Services draft legislation to authorize the Department of Defense to implement the January 1994 agreement between the Department and the McDonnell Douglas Corporation to settle C–17 issues.

Our nation has a critical need for intertheater airlift modernization if we are to maintain our ability to project forces and respond to humanitarian missions worldwide. Our C–141 aircraft are wearing out. The C–17 aircraft continues to be the most cost-effective means to meet current and projected airlift requirements. The C–17's ability to deliver outsize cargo, combined with its special capability to use austere fields, will provide us with modern, highly capable strategic airlift.

Last May the Department directed the Defense Science Board to organize a Task Force to conduct an extensive review of the C–17 program. The objectives were to assess the current status and the contractor's capability to successfully complete development and transition into production, and to identify the changes necessary to ensure a successful program.

The Defense Science Board Task Force conducted a thorough examination of the C–17 program over a two month period. At the conclusion of its review, the Task Force reported that the C–17 is fundamentally a good aircraft, that the contractor can successfully build the aircraft if management and efficiency improvements are implemented, and that gridlock on contractual and business issues was seriously hindering program performance. The Task Force recommended a number of changes to instill greater discipline and better management into the program, and a comprehensive settlement to change the program environment.

Based on these findings and recommendations, and further intensive review by the Defense Acquisition Board over a period of several months, the Department proposed a comprehensive settlement of business and management issues to the contractor on January 3, 1994, which the contractor has accepted. In my view, this resolution of issues is essential to ensuring that the C–17 will meet the nation's strategic airlift military requirement. One key aspect of the agreement is the establishment of a probationary period during which the contractor will either demonstrate improved performance or the Department will consider other alternatives. Enactment of this proposal is of great importance to the Department, and I strongly urge its favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. PERRY.

CHAIRMAN OF THE
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, May 17, 1994.

Hon. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
Chairman, Committee of Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As I look into the future, it is clear that America's combatant commanders will become increasingly dependent upon strategic mobility. This mobility will continue to be based on an integrated triad of air, sea and surface capabilities. Despite the fact that two of these transportation modes are in relatively good condition with bright prospects for the future, I am deeply concerned that recent congressional actions may seriously degrade our airlift capability and ultimately threaten the viability of the entire strategic mobility system.

America must have a core airlifter to replace the aging C–141. The continuing myths of a service life extension program for the C–141 or the ability of a commercial derivative to meet the needs of a core airlifter are just that—myths. Neither aircraft can carry the equipment to forward areas that the Army needs to win on tomorrow's battlefields. There may be a future role for a commercial derivative to supplement a core airlifter, but a CONUS-based force that lacks a core airlifter is a hollow force.

Today there is only one alternative that can meet the requirements of a core airlifter—the C–17. We have all been frustrated with the repeated setbacks in the program, but we mut not let this frustration obscure the facts. We now have an agreement in hand that allows us to test the capabilities of the airplane to meet warfighting requirements of America's combatant commanders and the capability of the program to meet efficiency and quality standards America's taxpayers deserve.

I ask for your support of the President's Budget Request for six C–17s in FY95, and for the reliability, maintainability, and availability and operational testing programs. Without the former, the program will not have the opportunity to demonstrate its significant improvements and production efficiencies. Without the latter, the C–17 will not be challenged to demonstrate its capabilities in the most rigorous testing program ever devised for an airlifter. Without your support, the program will guaranteed to fail. We must not let this happen on our watch.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN M. SHALIKASHVILI.

U.S. ARMY, THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
Armed Services Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR THURMOND: By 1997, 80% of America's Army will be stationed in the continental United States as we complete our transformation to a power projection Army. Our capability to lift the Army's heavy equipment by air and sea must keep pace with our changing requirements. This nation must have the strategic life capabilities to project power rapidly to any potential trouble spot in the world. We must get our forces to the fight.

Early arriving lethal combat power is the key to our joint warfighting capability. The Congressionally mandated Mobility Requirements Study generated the need for delivery of "outsized cargo" prior to the arrival of the fastest sealift. For the Army, this means armor, rocket systems, helicopters, and attack missiles. These weapon systems won't fit on any commercial aircraft—nor will they fit on most military airlifters in service today. Future air-deployable Army combat units will rely increasingly on the availability of airlift to carry this type of cargo.

The C–7 will provide the Air Force the capability to deliver critical Army "outsized loads" while allowing access to 9,000 more runways (an increase of 300%) worldwide than the C–141 and C–5. The C–7 can land on the same runways as the C–130 and deliver four times the cargo weight. Equally important, the C–17 will improve throughput capacity, or rapid off-load and turn-around on the ground, by increasing the "maximum on the ground" or MOG capacity. The performance characteristics of the C–17 will permit 8 C–17's to fit where 3 C–5's fit. Had we had the C–17 during Desert Shield, we could have delivered the first airborne brigade in 54 hours with just 93 aircraft—and improvement of some 34% over the 82 hours it took to deliver that brigade with 158 C–141's and 2 C–5's.

Finally, I am concerned about our joint capabilities for forced entry operations. In the Gulf War, we enjoyed the luxury of time and deployment to a country with secure and modern air and seaports. This may not always be the case. While the aging C–141 fleet

helps the Army fulfill this requirement today, we will need the C–17 to provide the strategic airlift for troops and equipment to provide our forced entry capability and simulatenous application of joint combat power across the depth of the battlefield in the 21st century.

I fully appreciate the concern over the troubled history of the C–17 acquisition program. However, I urge you to stay the course outlined by the Secretary of Defense earlier this year. The C–17 is the only aircraft that can get the Army's outsized combat systems to the next war when required. I respectfully solicit your support to maintain the President's request for the FY 1995 funding for the C–17.

Respectfully,

GORDON R. SULLIVAN,
General, U.S. Army.

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF,
MacDill Air Force Base, FL, May 17, 1994.

Hon. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

MR. CHAIRMAN, As you know I am concerned and have been critical of the current state of America's airlift forces. However, I am even more concerned about our future ability to project US forces by air.

As our forces are returning from overseas and increasingly based in the CONUS, I become the CINC faced with the most strenuous requirement for mobility in the world. In the CENTCOM theater, because of the long deployment distances, we are particularly sensitive to, and dependent on, our ability to ensure the timely deployment of the early arriving lethal firepower—key to limiting the escalation of a conflict. This means armor, helicopters, rocket systems, and air defense missiles, most of which do not fit on any commercial aircraft. Only the C–17 and C–5 can deliver this requirement.

In addition, during the Gulf War, we were able to deploy in a country with secure air and sea ports. In this scenario, I have said we could be well served by the effectiveness of large commercial type aircraft moving large amounts of bulk cargo, particularly during the sustainment phase of an operation. However, I do not feel this will be the case in the early surge phase of future operations.

We must ensure that all CINCs have the flexibility to conduct deployment operations given any set of theater constraints. In the foreseeable future only the C–17, acting as the Nation's core military airlifter, can provide us this flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, CENTCOM is dependent on the country's mobility system. We need the C–17. I urge you to support the modernization of the nation's strategic airlift as proposed by the Secretary of Defense and requested by the President in his FY 1995 budget.

J.P. HOAR,
General,
U.S. Marine Corps.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. KREIDLER].

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON A RESOLUTION ACCOMPANYING THE BILL, H.R. 4301, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a resolution accompanying the bill, H.R. 4301, National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wanted to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Rules, that the rule he is filing is an agreed-to rule by the Republican side of the aisle as well. It is not entirely to our liking. We support it reluctantly. There have been many, many hours of negotiation between the Republican and Democratic leaderships. It is a rule that should be supported because of the seriousness of the bill before us. We have to get this bill enacted before we get into the appropriations process. Therefore, we will be supporting the rule on this side of the aisle.

I thank the gentleman for his consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time that I might inquire of the distinguished majority whip, the program for next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend, the Republican leader.

The House will proceed as follows next week: We will meet at 10:30 for morning hours on Monday, May 23. Then we will go into session at noon, at which time we will have 18 suspensions, of which I believe the minority leader has a copy. I will not read through all of the bills. There are 18 of them:

H.R. 4425, fiscal year 1995 VA medical construction authorization.

S. 1654, to make certain technical corrections.

House Concurrent Resolution 176, to recognize and encourage the convening of a National Silver Haired Congress.

H.R. 4429, to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries.

H.R. 4246, Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995.

H.R. 3679, Junior Duck Stamp Conservation Program.

H.R. 3982, Ocean Radioactive Dumping Ban Act.

House Concurrent Resolution 238, authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

H.R. 3840, the Sam B. Hall, Jr. Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse.

H.R. 3724, the Brien McMahon Federal Building.

H.R. 965, Child Safety Protection Act conference report.

H.R. 3869, Minority Health Improvement Act of 1994.

H.R. 3863, to designate the Medgar Wiley Evers Post Office.

H.R. 3839, to designate the Roy M. Wheat Post Office.

H.R. 3984, to designate the John Longo, Jr. Post Office.

H.R. 4177, to designate the Candace White U.S. Post Office.

H.R. 4190, to designate the Alvaro de Lugo U.S. Post Office.

H.R. 4191, to designate the Audrey C. Ottley U.S. Post Office.

H.R. 4301, to continue consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995.

Then we will have recorded votes on those suspensions postponed until the end of legislative business. We expect to not have any votes until 5, according to my understanding. So that Members from the west coast would have the opportunity to arrive in time.

We hope to go beyond that and do some work on the National Defense Authorization Act that we have been working on this morning and this afternoon.

On Tuesday, May 24, Wednesday, May 25, and Thursday, May 26, we have the following schedule: 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday for morning business and then go in at noon on Tuesday.

We will meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday and Thursday to consider the following bills: Continue working on the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995, on which we have been working for the last several days.

We will then go to H.R. 4385, National Highway System Designation Act, subject to a rule. We also hope to consider the following appropriation bills: The military construction appropriation bill, subject to a rule; the foreign operations export financing and related programs appropriations, fiscal year 1995, subject to a rule; the legislative

branch appropriations bill, fiscal 1995, subject to a rule. The other two, H.R. 811 and H.R. 518, H.R. 811 being the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act conference report, subject to a rule, and then of course if we have time we will go to the H.R. 518, California Desert Protection Act.

We will not meet on Friday, May 27, so that Members may return to their districts for the Memorial Day district work period.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman, and I would like to make the observation that the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act is scheduled, but with no particular time. Could it be programmed for sometime in the week after we have had an opportunity to visit with the special counsel? The gentleman may recall a meeting we had with the Speaker and majority leader and the leadership on both sides in which the Speaker indicated that the majority leader and the minority leader, in company with the Speaker, would probably be meeting with the special counsel, Mr. Fiske, I gathered maybe Tuesday or Wednesday, the early part of this next week. Hopefully, it would be my preference that the consideration then of the extension of the Authorization Act be delayed until after we have had an opportunity to have that meeting.

Mr. BONIOR. I do remember the meeting, and I do remember the discussion well, and I know those requests have been made or are attempting to be made to bring people together to discuss that. I would say to my colleague that I am sure we will consider his request. It seems reasonable. I know we will not proceed on this certainly before the Senate does it. I do not know—I think they do it first, if I am not mistaken.

So I expect the timing can work out to the gentleman's satisfaction.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Then, since that will be a getaway week next week before the Memorial Day recess period, how late should we be telling our Members they ought to be meeting next week?

Mr. BONIOR. Well, I think we ought to tell folks, for the week, that we are probably going to be meeting until 8 in the evening each night because we have a lot of work to do on the defense bill, especially. And if we want to get a jump start on our appropriation bills, the three that I mentioned, it is going to take a lot of time and a lot of work.

On Thursday, obviously we would like to give Members the opportunity to catch their planes. So we will do the best we can. But we are still, frankly, thinking of 6 or 7 right at this point.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the Republican leader for yielding.

The gentleman mentioned appropriation bills. We are going to be having the legislative and foreign operations bills, appropriation bills, probably coming before the Committee on Rules. But considering the complex issue of having to cut up the pie, so to speak, for the entire budget, the membership really ought to have adequate notice so that we will have time really to know what is in the 602(b) allocations process throughout the entire appropriation process. We want to be as helpful as we can. But I just hope that the gentleman would be able to assure us that if these are coming to the Committee on Rules or directly to the floor, that Members should be given adequate notice so that they will know what they are voting on.

Mr. BONIOR. We will do the best we can. The fact that these three that are being announced today, I think people are aware that these are the first three out of the box and if they have amendments, we hope to be as generous as we can. If they bring them directly to the floor, of course anything that is germane can be offered. If we end up in the Rules Committee on any one of the three, we hope to be as inclusive as we can as we proceed with the appropriations process.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the Republican leader.

Mr. Speaker, I simply would like to inquire of my friend, again, as I asked of the chairman of the Committee on Rules yesterday: What can we anticipate on these appropriation bills coming forward, are any of them going to come directly to the floor?

Mr. BONIOR. There will be some coming directly to the floor, and I suspect that others will go up to the Rules Committee. I believe it will vary on the rule and on the amount and flexibility we have in the Rules Committee, depending on the legislation.

So we are going to try to be as inclusive as we can of Members' concerns. We are not about to close down our appropriation bills.

Mr. DREIER. So that every attempt will be made then to ensure that we do conceivably move appropriation bills under the standards rules of the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Of course.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman, and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I also would ask unanimous consent that in my remarks I be permitted to include a schedule of the dates or the days upon which amendments have to be filed to comport with what the Committee on Rules has more or less laid down as a guideline for us in the consideration of the measures next week. I think Members ought to all be aware that there are certain cutoff periods of time. So we will put that together unless the gentleman would prefer to have it included with his discourse here. Otherwise we will include it with our remarks so that the Members would know about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the Speaker, and I thank the majority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised by staff that the Rules Committee chairman did ask for amendments on foreign operations and legislative branch appropriations.

Mr. MICHEL. If that is all included, I just wanted it for anybody reading the RECORD to know that there are terminal points by which they can submit those amendments. And if they have not gotten to it, they had better get cracking. If there is no other inquiry, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1440

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 23, 1994

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREIDLER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WHY WE MUST RENEW MOST-FAVORED-NATION TRADING STATUS WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this very brief time, and I appreciate the forbearance of members of the staff here who have stayed, but I want to talk about an issue that is looming, going to be confronting us in the next few weeks.

As most of my colleagues are aware, by June 3, Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has to make the decision as to whether or not he is going to renew most-favored-nation trading status with China, and this has been an ongo-

ing debate. We are rapidly approaching the fifth anniversary of the tragedy of the Tiananmen Square massacre, and there is, understandably and correctly, a great deal of attention on the issue of human rights and human rights violations which have existed in China.

I think it is very important for us to recognize that there has been dramatic improvement in the human rights situation in China, and we have to look at why it is that that improvement has taken place, and I believe that every bit of empirical evidence that we have today shows that that improvement has come about because of exposure to the West by the people of China. It seems to me that, if we are going to deal with the issue of human rights in China, the most important thing that we can do is to renew most-favored-nation trading status with China and make it permanent.

Why?

Because it has been this exposure to the West, United States business investment in China, which has played a key role in improving the quality of life for people in China and at the same time strengthening ties between the United States of America and the most populous country in the world. China has nearly five times the population of the United States, between 1.2 and 1.3 billion people, and we would, if we were to revoke most-favored-nation trading status with China, not alienate China from the rest of the world. We would alienate the United States of America from the world and, most specifically, the large and very important market of the Pacific rim.

Now, as we have been looking at this debate on human rights, most of us who have been strong proponents of the MFN have had a pattern over the last several years of simply being on the defensive, trying to argue that it is very important for us to maintain this so we can improve the situation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that it is important for us to go on the offensive on this issue because, as we look at this question, it is going to be more United States business investment in China which will continue to improve the human rights situation there.

As this debate continues, Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the President will make the right decision. The right decision is in the name of human rights, in the name of denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, in the name of maintaining support in the U.N. Security Council, in the name of ensuring that we slow weapons exports from China, to renew most favored-nation trading status.

I hope the President makes that decision, and if by chance there is a resolution of disagreement which is offered in this House, I hope very much that my colleagues will reject it so that we can achieve those shared goals that we have.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LAFALCE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FARR of California (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GORDON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 12 noon, on account of official business.

Mr. CLEMENT for today after 12:30 p.m., on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LUCAS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BISHOP) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUCAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETRI.

Mr. CALVERT.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BISHOP) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. KANJORKSI.

Mr. REYNOLDS in 10 instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HORN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. ESHOO in five instances.

Ms. SCHENK.

Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. DORNAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida in two instances.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. REED.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1485. An act to extend certain satellite carrier compulsory licenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2087. An act to extend the time period for compliance with the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act of 1990 for certain food products packaged prior to August 8, 1994.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 23, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3215. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary (Environmental Security), Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Environmental Compliance for the Department for fiscal years 1995 through 1999, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2706(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3216. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report concerning the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation 93-6; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3217. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his determination that it is essential to our national security to continue draft registration and the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3218. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the final report of the Insular Area Energy Vulnerability Study, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, section 1406(a) (106 Stat. 2995); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3219. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the appropriate Federal role in assuring access by medical students, residents, and practicing physicians to adequate training in nutrition, pursuant to Public Law 101-445, section 302; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3220. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the 1993 Annual Report for the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., pursuant to

31 U.S.C. 9106(A); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3221. A letter from the Privacy Officer, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3222. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of various lease prospectuses, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3223. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 13 of the act of May 14, 1954, Public Law 358 (33 U.S.C. 988A) as amended by section 805(a)(4) of title XIV of the Water Resources Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662 (100 Stat. 4372) to waive collection of charges or tolls by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3224. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to make discretionary the financial reporting requirements applicable to recipients of certain need-based benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3225. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending March 31, 1994, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(e); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources.

3226. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a comprehensive report on the Clean Coal Technology Program entitled "Coal Diesel Combined-Cycle Project," pursuant to Public Law 102-154; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, and Appropriations.

3227. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Semi-Annual Report on Program Activities for Facilitation of Weapons Destruction and Non-proliferation in the Former Soviet Union, pursuant to Public Law 103-160, section 1207 and Public Law 103-139; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 431. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4301) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-520). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. PETERSON of Florida):

H.R. 4464. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Program on Social Ethics and Community Service; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the employment status of certain fishermen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself and Mr. TORKILDSEN):

H.R. 4466. A bill to amend the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to ensure that the American public is fully and properly informed about the perquisites and privileges afforded to Members of Congress who use parking facilities through the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 4467. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the existing Federal employee bonus and incentive award programs and establish a program for incentive awards for Federal employees only for suggestions, inventions, or other personal efforts which cause a demonstrable monetary savings to the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (for herself, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KLINK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 4468. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reduce certain restrictions on the participation of proprietary institutions of higher education in programs of student financial aid; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 4469. A bill to restrain health care costs and ensure adequate medical care for all Americans by providing for a State and market-based system of choice among qualified health plans, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Education and Labor.

By Ms. SHEPHERD:

H.R. 4470. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the dependent care tax credit refundable, to phase out such credit for higher-income taxpayers, and to provide for advance payments of such credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTTO (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.J. Res. 368. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

389. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to returning lands utilized by the United States military in Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

390. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to banking; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

391. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to banking; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

392. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to the impact of unfunded Federal mandates on State budgets and economies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

393. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the ratification of the 27th amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

394. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, relative to shoppers visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

395. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1128; Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1455; Mr. HAMBURG.

H.R. 1709; Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 1818; Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1840; Mr. GORDON and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2043; Mr. CARR.

H.R. 2326; Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 2418; Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 2460; Mr. HANSEN, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 2484; Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 2788; Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2873; Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FROST, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2954: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 3039: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. EWING, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 3128: Mr. WATT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3224: Mr. WILSON and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3246: Mr. CHAPMAN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WATT, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 3293: Mr. WALSH and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 3328: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 3392: Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 3407: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 3472: Mr. POMBO, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 3762: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 3783: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3790: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

H.R. 3796: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 3842: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 3882: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COX, Mr. LEVY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. MOL-

INARI, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 3900: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 3906: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. INSLEE, Miss COLLINS of MICHIGAN, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 3949: Mr. WALSH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3951: Mr. ROWLAND.

H.R. 3990: Ms. FURSE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TUCKER, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 4138: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 4306: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4331: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4345: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 4353: Mrs. LLOYD and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 4354: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 4370: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4375: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 4400: Mr. SAWYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WATT, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 4410: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 4412: Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 4419: Mr. CANADY and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.J. Res. 209: Mr. CLAY, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. ORTON.

H.J. Res. 286: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KING, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. WISE.

H.J. Res. 297: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REED, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.J. Res. 315: Mr. ROTH.

H.J. Res. 326: Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 327: Ms. NORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. OLVER.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. HOAGLAND, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H. Con. Res. 210: Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 217: Mr. FLAKE and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H. Con. Res. 235: Ms. NORTON, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. VENTO.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXVII, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 19, May 17, 1994, by Mr. EWING on House Resolution 415, was signed by the following Members: Thomas W. Ewing, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Porter J. Goss, Ron Packard, Cliff Stearns, Rob Portman, Joe Knollenberg, Tillie K. Fowler, Dan Burton, Jon Kyl, Y. Tim Hutchinson, Elton Gallegly, Dan Miller, Peter Hoekstra, Donald A. Manzullo, Bob Stump, Michael Huffington, and Spencer Bachus.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 3 by Mr. MCCOLLUM on House Joint Resolution 38: Frank D. Lucas.

Petition 11 by Mr. RAMSTAD on House Resolution 247: Nancy L. Johnson, Alfred A. (Al) McCandless, James C. Greenwood, Duncan Hunter, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Bob Inglis, Ralph M. Hall, James A. Hayes, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Y. Tim Hutchinson and Peter Hoekstra.

Petition 12 by Mr. TRAFICANT on H.R. 3261: Wayne Allard, James M. Talent and Thomas W. Ewing.

Petition 15 by Mr. BILIRAKIS on House Resolution 382: Jerry Lewis, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, C. W. Bill Young, Tom Lewis and F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.

Petition 16 by Mr. ZELIFF on House Resolution 407: Frank D. Lucas, C. W. Bill Young, Hamilton Fish, Jr., John E. Porter, Ralph M. Hall, Karen English and Marge Roukema.

Petition 17 by Mr. SHAW on House Resolution 386: Dan Burton and Bill Paxon.

Petition 18 by Mr. HASTERT on House Resolution 402: Bill Paxon, Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., Ron Packard, Joe Skeen, Joel Hefley, Gerald B.H. Solomon, Richard H. Baker, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter Hoekstra, Nancy L. Johnson, James M. Inhofe, Bill Barrett, Alfred A. (Al) McCandless, Robert S. Walker, Rob Portman, Elton Gallegly, Spencer Bachus and David L. Hobson.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PASSING OF MRS. JACQUELINE KENNEDY ONASSIS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues in mourning the passing of a truly remarkable woman, at too premature an age.

Each First Lady in our Nation's history—from Martha Washington through Hillary Clinton—has enjoyed a significant impact on our Nation. Few, however, have had as tremendous an influence as did Mrs. Kennedy.

Today, our young people may not appreciate that, prior to the Kennedy administration, the White House was considered a temporary residence by its occupants, and enjoyed little historic significance.

Mrs. Kennedy, virtually single-handedly, transformed the White House into a national treasure. She scoured the Nation for furnishings and trappings of bygone eras, and in many cases through cajolery, convinced private citizens to redonate to the American people items of historic significance. As a result of her crusade, the White House became an invaluable historic landmark during her husband's administration. As hard as it may be to believe today, prior to Jackie Kennedy's tenure as our First Lady the White House was not even officially listed by the Federal Government as an historic site. She vigorously campaigned for this designation, as she also vigorously campaigned for the funding—the vast majority of which was from the private sector—necessary for the restoration and preservation of the White House.

Few of the visitors to the White House today appreciate that it is due to Mrs. Kennedy's efforts that its value as an informative and favorite stopping place for tourists, as well as a historic landmark, is preserved for us and for future generations.

We must not forget, either, that it was through her efforts that the White House, and Washington, DC, became a cultural center. The Center for the Performing Arts, which today is named in memory of President Kennedy, was her inspiration.

Most Americans are well aware and quite conscious of the fact that, during her tenure as First Lady, Mrs. Kennedy set a style of elegance and grace in the White House which captivated the imagination of the world, and which rapidly became the hallmark of Americanism throughout the world. My close friend, Oleg Cassini, served as Mrs. Kennedy's fashion designer and the revolutionary changes he and she made on the styles of the day reverberate to this day.

Not so many Americans are conscious of another, even more indelible contribution made by Mrs. Kennedy: the example she set of dignified courage in the face of overwhelming personal tragedy. The assassination of the President, on Nov. 22, 1963, was one of the most traumatic single events in all of history. President Kennedy's youth and vigor made his sudden, totally unanticipated death all the more shocking and distressing. The fact that the United States had not experienced a Presidential assassination in over 62 years, and the fact that what was then the new electronic age brought the horror of the assassination into virtually every living room in America only underscored the deep emotional impact which it had on all alive at that time. Mrs. Kennedy was only the second First Lady in history to be present at the scene of the awesome crime, and accordingly would have been justified in a total withdrawal from the public eye.

Instead, with infinite grace, Mrs. Kennedy publically led our Nation through its period of mourning. Her grieving face, standing next to President Johnson as he was sworn in just minutes after the assassination, is etched in the public memory forever. She, in fact, is the focal point of all our shared memories of that tragic weekend: her kneeling at the coffin in the Capitol Rotunda; her urging her small son to salute his daddy's casket; and her accepting the folded American flag at Arlington National Cemetery—all of these images are forever frozen in the national consciousness and were indispensable in allowing us to cope with this monumental tragedy.

The assassination of President Kennedy was the first single event in all of history which was known by over 90 percent of all Americans within an hour of its occurrence. Her strength and dignity throughout the 4 days of memorial services did much to keep the Nation united during this time of uncertainty and dread.

Her conduct throughout the remainder of the 1960's set an example which all of us in the future should use as an appropriate role model. Although the tabloid press and the sensationalist elements in our society attempted to utilize her persona to their own ends, she remained above all controversy and criticism in silent dignity, pursuing her own grace and charm while protecting her children from the glare of needless publicity.

Throughout the twilight of her life, Jacqueline Kennedy chose to die with dignity. Her courage in the face of fatal illness, her refusal to be kept alive by artificial means, and her insistence in passing away in the presence of her dearest loved ones have humbled us all. The manner of her passing was an example to all of us on death with dignity, and is tragic only because, at the relatively tender age of 64, we appreciate that she had so much more to contribute and to be with us.

We extend our condolences to her children, John Jr. and Caroline, to her grandchildren, and to the many family members and loved ones who were touched by the life of this remarkable woman.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. LEON C. BLAIR

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Sgt. Leon C. Blair. Attached is a proclamation I issued Sergeant Blair commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Leon C. Blair is a native of Chicago, Illinois, the son of Etta Mae Blair, he is an alumnus of Tilden Technical High School, where he was an outstanding athlete and a citywide Basketball Champion; and

Whereas Sergeant Blair has prepared himself academically, he matriculated at Loop Junior College, Chicago, Illinois earning the Associate of Arts Degree in Law Enforcement, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Illinois, earning the Bachelor of Arts Degree in public administration, completed eighty hours of specialized training in Narcotics and Dangerous Drug Law Enforcement, under the Federal Drug Administration Department of Justice; and

Whereas Sergeant Blair joined the Chicago Police Department in 1962, he has served thirty-one years in various assignments, Traffic detail, Gang Crimes, Tactical Unit, Vice and Unit, Detailed Security to Governor Elect Dan Walker, State of Illinois, Chicago Housing Authority Unit, Gambling, Patrol Division, Sergeant of the thirty plus uniformed detail, assigned to City Hall and the Mayor's Office, he is a member of the Afro-American Police League, the Sergeants Association of the Chicago Police Department, and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives; and

Whereas Sergeant Blair is a member of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. serving as Chairman of the fraternities Annual Achievement Dinner, and Chairman of the Sick and Welfare Committee, he is Vice President of the Board of Directors of Christ Universal Temple, Coordinator of the Men's organization, Co-Coordinator of the Safety Committee, and a National Board Member of the Rat Pack Foundation dispensing annual scholarships to College bound students each year: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Sergeant Leon C. Blair, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

● 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.

TRIBUTE TO MARIANNE J. CROWDER

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Marianne J. Crowder, a dedicated community leader from California's 14th Congressional District who was recently honored by the Palo Alto Senior Coordinating Council with its Lifetimes of Achievement Award.

Marianne J. Crowder is an exceptional woman who has danced for all but the first four of her 88 years. She has been a respected and beloved teacher of dance and physical well-being to three generations of mid-peninsula students. At Standford University she taught a fundamentals of movement class and choreographed dances for plays and operas from 1949 to 1968. Also in 1949, Mrs. Crowder began 39 years of teaching through the Palo Alto Adult School, and she still holds 6 classes a week at the Menlo Park Recreation Department. Some students have been with her for 35 years.

Mr. Speaker, Marianne J. Crowder is an outstanding member of our community. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating her on receiving a Lifetimes of Achievement Award.

THE REVEREND WILLIAM F. LEMOYNE WAS POPULAR PRIEST IN SCHUYLERVILLE, NY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for many Catholics in Schuylerville, NY, the Reverend William F. LeMoyne was the only priest they have ever known.

Father LeMoyne has retired after 45 years in the priesthood. A French-Canadian, Father LeMoyne moved to the northeastern United States for his pastoral training. In 1949, he was ordained in Albany's Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception. After several other assignments, Father LeMoyne came to Notre Dame de Lourdes Visitation Church in Schuylerville.

Although many changes have taken place, both in the world and in the Catholic Church since that 1949 ordination, Father LeMoyne, according to everyone who knows him, has remained a dedicated and accessible priest, involved in the community, and gifted with the knack of getting his parishioners involved.

Whenever a priest of long-standing retires, his replacement is likely to be confronted with reminders of the way his successor used to do things. Typical of Father LeMoyne's graciousness is the effort he is making to ease the transition to a new pastor.

The affection of non-Catholics for Father LeMoyne is equally strong. Indeed, at the recent farewell for him many of Schuylerville's civic organizations took part, including the local fire department and emergency squad.

I would like this House to pay its own tribute. Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me in commending Father William LeMoyne for his years of devotion to the priesthood and his flock, and to wish him many enjoyable retirement years.

TRIBUTE TO JACK HAEHL

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my district's most dedicated and generous individuals, Jack Haehl, who is also affectionately known as Mr. Corte Madera.

The town of Corte Madera is conducting a dedication ceremony in his honor to inaugurate improvements to the Village Square this Saturday, May 21, 1994. Jack Haehl was instrumental in achieving these renovations, and as many people acknowledge, the project would not have been completed without his vision. Today, I wish to recognize Jack for his commitment to the people of Corte Madera and Marin County, and to thank him for his years of service to the community.

Jack Haehl has influenced the lives of so many individuals. As a schoolteacher at Terra Linda High School, Jack was a strong role model for his students, and he taught them how to express themselves through the arts. For years, he organized the crafts exhibit at the Marin County Fair, and his redwood carving representing Corte Madera hangs proudly in the Veteran's Auditorium. We are also fortunate that Jack shares his appreciation for the historical aspects of the town of Corte Madera, and that he has been so dedicated in helping others to achieve a clearer understanding of how they can be a part of the town's history.

There is no doubt that throughout his years in the community Jack effectively articulated Corte Madera's values by helping to maintain and define its "small town character." He helps the community set its objectives, and works with them to ensure that the community's goals are accomplished.

These are only a few of the many reasons that the people of Corte Madera continually express gratitude for the tireless efforts of Jack Haehl. Time and time again he has extended himself on behalf of so many people and causes.

Of course, no recognition would be complete without also mentioning Jack's equally dedicated wife, Ms. Corte Madera, Jana Haehl. Together they have made our town, our county, and our world a better place.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay tribute to Jack Haehl and to congratulate him for this achievement on this special occasion.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT L. SCOTT

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are honored to pay tribute to Robert L. Scott, who is completing an extremely successful 2-year term as president of the United Chambers of Commerce of the San Fernando Valley. Bob has proven himself not only a skilled business leader, but also someone who can function well in a crisis.

In the chaotic days after the Northridge earthquake Bob coordinated with both the Small Business Administration and the Federal Emergency Management Agency to ensure that affected businesses received prompt assistance. Due to the efforts of Bob and others, many San Fernando Valley businesses were back on their feet quicker than expected.

Prior to the earthquake Bob had already established his credentials as a dynamic head of the UCC. The organization, which represents 21 chambers and more than 10,000 businesses in the San Fernando Valley, has never been visible or active. It was Bob's goal to increase the profile of the United Chambers of Commerce of the San Fernando Valley, and he has been successful in achieving this objective.

Bob's community involvement does not stop with the UCC. He is a member of the Los Angeles Board of Planning Commissioners, chairman of the Los Angeles City Task Force for Code Simplification and Permit Streamlining, and is vice president of the Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce. In addition, he is a full time practicing attorney.

We ask our colleagues to join us in saluting Bob Scott, an outstanding business leader in the San Fernando Valley and a man who cares deeply about his community.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BONUS REFORM ACT OF 1994

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Federal Government Bonus Reform Act of 1994.

Quite often, agencies of the Federal Government seem to give tax-paid bonuses to employees whenever the agencies take a notion to do so. And, of course, the bonus does not come out of the pocket of the decision maker. This practice amounts to something on the order of "whoopee."

This reform legislation would provide that, if a tax-paid bonus were given by the U.S. Government to a U.S. Government employee, it would have to be for something. Here's what the bill provides:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BONUS REFORM ACT OF 1994

The bill would:

First, repeal the authority of the Federal Government to pay certain bonuses.

Second, authorize the President to make a cash award to employees who by their personal efforts or accomplishments: (a) contribute to the overall efficiency of Federal Government operations; and (b) achieve demonstrable savings to taxpayers.

A cash award paid under this act could not exceed $1,500.

LIFE IN LITTLE HAITI

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a human rights tragedy is occurring in Haiti: a consistent campaign of terror by the ruthless regime in power against the Haitian people. As we all know and the administration has finally acknowledged, this is a political campaign of terror being waged against supporters of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. It has intensified in recent weeks.

As sponsor of H.R. 3663, the Haitian Refugee Fairness Act, I applaud President Clinton's commitment to stop the summary repatriation of Haitians fleeing their country by boat. However, it concerns me greatly that Haitians currently interdicted are being summarily returned to Haiti and afforded no protection at all.

Mr. Speaker, these are human beings. Men, women and children with hopes and dreams. We must act in the most fair and humane way possible to ensure their safety and well-being. I am inserting in the RECORD a Washington Post article by William Booth that provides a glimpse into the lives of the many Haitians who have settled in Little Haiti in my district.

"WORK, WORK, WORK": IN LITTLE HAITI, LIFE IS HOPEFUL BUT HARD

(By William Booth)

MIAMI, May 18.—As the Clinton administration dispatches more ships to intercept a feared mass exodus of Haitian "boat people," a classic tale is unfolding here on the streets of Little Haiti, where the nation's most unwanted immigrants pursue their own version of the American dream.

On the nightly news, Haitian immigrants appear as a desperate and diseased people, walking barefoot down the gangplanks of U.S. Coast Guard cutters, another burden to the already overwhelmed courts and schools of South Florida. Under pressure from state officials, President Clinton has vowed to keep them out.

But the negative image fades against the vibrant scenes of life in Miami's Little Haiti. Here the streets are lined with storefront churches and mom-and-pop businesses selling medicinal herbs, beepers, mangoes and health insurance, while members of a growing, economically mixed community of more than 100,000 are filling adult education classes, opening beauty salons and struggling to survive.

"Work, work, work, church, school and more work. That is the life of Haitians in this country," said Tony Garcon, a Haitian who came to Miami 14 years ago and now cooks at a country club, a job that allows him to take vacations and send his children to school back in Haiti, where he says there is better discipline.

During two dozen interviews, most Haitians and their advocates said they believed Haitians would stop coming to the United States if the political violence, repression and economic stagnation in their homeland ended.

Haitians described their lives here as hopeful but very hard. Many are disturbed by the crime and discrimination, and parents complain that their children are becoming "too American," meaning unruly and disrespectful.

"In almost all respects, the Haitians are the typical immigrant ethnic community, people who really come to the States for a better life, to get their kids an education, to sacrifice for the next generation," said Alex Stepick, a sociologist at Florida International University who has studied the Haitian community for more than a decade.

But the Haitians face unique obstacles too, Stepick said. They are from the poorest country in the hemisphere; they are black; and they are immigrating to a city where the balance of power is shifting away from English-speaking Anglos and toward relatively affluent Spanish-speaking Cubans and other Hispanics.

Thrown into the mix is the unease felt between many American-born blacks and Haitians, seen in schoolyard fights and in the fact that Haitians do not move into traditionally black neighborhoods a few blocks away.

Clinton administration and state officials say they fear a mass exodus of Haitians to South Florida will swamp local government, already struggling with past waves of migration. Florida Gov. Lawton Chiles (D) is using the federal government to recoup the hundreds of millions of dollars he says the state has spent caring for, teaching and incarcerating illegal aliens, including the Haitians.

But calculating the real costs—and benefits—of the Haitians is not so easy. Many Dade County officials said they are not sure how much the Haitians consume; nor do they believe that the Haitians are any more "costly" than the Nicaraguans, Dominicans, Colombians and Cubans who have settled here.

As a community, Haitians are praised by officials in Miami as industrious and law-abiding. It is not unusual for Haitian immigrants to work two and or sometimes three jobs for minimum wage. Many attend school besides, either to learn English or a trade.

"Our adult classes are absolutely crammed with Haitians," said Henry Fraind, assistant superintendent of the Dade County schools.

Raymond and Clotilde Sylverne and their four children came to Miami two years ago from Port-au-Prince, where Raymond worked as an accountant and Clotilde as a government receptionist. Because of their ties to the exiled government of Jean-Bertrand Aristide, both were granted political aslum here.

After getting two months of free rent, the Sylvernes now live in a spartan duplex on a tough street in Little Haiti. They have been robbed twice. They want a better house, but cannot afford one.

Raymond works at night as a security guard for $5.20 an hour. During the day, he takes five hours of English classes at Miami-Dade Community College. He sometimes falls asleep in class.

"But I keep going. My English must be good," he said. "Without English, nothing." A counselor has suggested that, after he improves, he should seek training in health care, perhaps as a medical technician.

Clotilde works at a children's day care center for $4.50 an hour and takes free English classes at night. The two see each other in passing.

"Tired, tired, all the time," Clotilde Sylverne said. The couple laughed when asked if they had been to Disney World in Orlando; they have neither the time nor the money.

Two of their children go to Toussaint L'Ouverture Elementary School, where 80 percent of the pupils are Haitians. One son will go to a magnet school next year.

The Sylvernes get $159 a month in food stamps and Medicaid for their children. They have used Medicaid once in two years.

As soon as they earn more money, Raymond Sylverne said, his family will stop taking public assistance. "It's no good," he said, "It's for poor people."

The Sylvernes live in the middle of Little Haiti on a dilapidated side street behind Notre Dame d'Haiti, the large Catholic church that serves the Haitian community and holds services in Haitian creole.

The history of Haitians in Dade County is brief. When the first recorded boatload of immigrants detected by the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service arrived in 1963, they were sent back to Haiti. By 1981 there were between 50,000 and 70,000 Haitians. Today, there are more than 100,000 reports Oliver Kerr of the Dade County Planning Department.

Kerr said recent patterns of settlement show Haitians are moving into more affluent areas north and west of Little Haiti. They are also moving to Homestead, the agricultural area hardest hit by Hurricane Andrew, where they work in construction and landscaping and on vegetable farms, displacing migratory Mexican labor. More and more Haitians, many of them middle class, are moving to Miami from New York, Boston, Chicago and Canada.

While some Haitians rely on food stamps and Medicaid, social workers say that many seem reluctant to take public assistance and often view it as a dead-end.

Dade County officials say they do not know exactly how many Haitians seek help because they cannot ask the question of ethnicity. But they said they believe that many Haitian children and pregnant women seek medical care at county clinics, where they must either have Medicaid or pay from $8 to $50 for their visits.

Officials have often warned that Haitians could overwhelm the school system, but of the 307,000 students in Dade County, only 7,000 are Haitian-born. The principal of Toussaint L'Ouverture Elementary said only about 75 of the 1,200 students need intensive English instruction.

The language problem, however, is more severe at middle and high schools, where many Haitian students who recently arrived in Miami—the "just-comes," as Haitians call them—must learn English and often struggle with their other classes.

Danielle Romer, the program coordinator of An Nou Koze, a Haitian-help hot line, said that among the biggest problems she hears about are Haitian parents frustrated by unruly teenagers who become too Americanized.

"They keep sending them back to Haiti to go to school," Romer said. "I don't think it's right. But in Haiti, kids don't talk back to their parents."

Like the Cubans who came before them, many Haitians live in an immigrant enclave and socialize mainly with other Haitians.

In Little Haiti, it is possible to buy Haitian Prestige beer at L'Unique Minimarket; eat *griot* and *lambi* at Restaurant BeBe; listen

to Haitian merengue at Les Cousins; monitor one of the dozen creole radio programs; and worship in a church where the liturgy is in creole.

But unlike the Cubans, whose middle class and elites fled the island in the early 1960s after the ascendancy of Fidel Castro, the Haitians did not arrive with money or organizations. Nor have they benefited from the almost $1 billion in aid that the federal government funneled to the Cubans in the decade after their arrival.

To work, Haitians have to learn English and often some Spanish. And they must leave the enclave and compete with others for jobs.

In the last few years, the number of homegrown Haitian civic clubs, business associations and advocacy groups has exploded, and the leaders of the Haitian American Chamber of Commerce say that more than 350 Haitian businesses are operating in Dade County.

Still, for the average Haitian in Miami, the immigrant's story is still about sacrifice. "We are tired, tired, tired," said Raymond Sylverne. "Sometimes all we want to do is go to sleep and have some dreams."

TRIBUTE TO WILEY C. COSEY

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Wiley C. Cosey of the First Corinthian Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued the reverend commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Wiley C. Cosey is a native of St. Louis, Missouri, reared and educated in Clarksdale, Mississippi, served his country enlisting in the United States Army in 1941, and

Whereas Reverend Cosey acknowledged his call to the ministry and was ordained in 1960. In January of 1962 he was elected Pastor of the First Corinthian Missionary Baptist Church where he served faithfully for the past 31 years and continues to serve, and

Whereas Reverend Cosey is a world traveler with a mission, traveling to Jerusalem in 1985, and to the African Continent several times, helping to build two churches and two schools, and

Whereas Reverend Cosey is a former President of the Pastor's Conference of Chicago and Vicinity, in 1989 the church building was destroyed by fire, today by the Grace of God, a new 800 seat church now stands in its place, the ministry continues to grow with a soup kitchen for the poor, weekly clothing and food distribution, and

Whereas Reverend Cosey is a family man married to Ms. Eloise Johnson since 1943, with two adopted children, a girl and a boy from Africa—Reverend and Mrs. Cosey are truly a rare couple, who live by their church motto, "The greatest joy in living is the joy you get from giving": Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Reverend Wiley C. Cosey.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN V. BEAHRS

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute John V. Beahrs, a dedicated community leader from California's 14th Congressional District who was recently honored by the Palo Alto Senior Coordinating Council with its prestigious Lifetime of Achievement Award.

John V. Beahrs has balanced a 40-year career in the marine insurance business with a remarkable commitment to community service. He served as a forthright member of the Palo Alto City Council from 1963 to 1977, coining the term "balanced community" as a civic goal. His public service includes working as founding president of the board of directors of the former Palo Alto Stanford Hospital Center, founding president of the board of directors for the Bay Area Hospital Council, former director of the Lucile Salter Packard Children's Hospital, and former director of the Ronald McDonald House. In addition, he has been an extraordinary volunteer for the Senior Coordinating Council of Palo Alto, Family Service Association of the Mid-Peninsula, Palo Alto Historical Association, and St. Mark's Episcopal Church.

Mr. Speaker, John V. Beahrs is an outstanding member of our community. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on receiving a Lifetime of Achievement Award.

BERWICK HALL OF FAME HONORS THOSE MAKING OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOCIETY

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call my colleagues' attention to a wonderful program that has been implemented in my district that recognizes individuals that have made outstanding contributions to society.

The Berwick Academic Hall of Fame honors alumni of Berwick High School who have gone on to a life of excellence after graduation.

The first induction ceremony was held on May 19, 1990. In addition to being a graduate of Berwick High School, honorees must have been out of school for at least 10 years before they can be nominated.

The Hall of Fame is the brainchild of Mr. Arthur Wark. A former educator himself, Mr. Wark has worked to promote and support academic and volunteer programs for more than 60 years.

In addition to serving as director of the Hall of Fame, Mr. Wark has worked closely with the youth programs in the YMCA, Boy Scouts, and various school and church groups throughout the years. He started the local Little League and Midget Football programs which have been running for more than 40 years. Mr. Wark helped establish the Berwick High School Sports Hall of Fame and was one of its first inductees. He is a member of the National Academy of Educators and is listed in the "Who's Who in Education." Because of his dedication to the youth of the area and academics, the Berwick Chamber of Commerce and Industry created a special Arthur K. Wark award that is given every year to a graduate of Berwick High School in recognition of outstanding volunteer community service.

Perhaps the most admirable thing about the Academic Hall of Fame is that in addition to recognizing past graduates, the program works with current students to provide incentive and encouragement to excel in their studies by providing citations and awards to good students. It also works to keep students in school through its Project RETAIN Program.

Mr. Speaker, we all know of the importance of a good education and what it can allow an individual to attain and achieve. On May 21, 1994, the Hall of Fame will induct its newest members. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate those who will become members of the Berwick area High School Academic Hall of Fame and all those associated with the program, and especially Mr. Arthur Wark, for their work on behalf of this admirable and innovative program.

RABBI NORMAN PATZ

HON. HERB KLEIN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to join Temple Sholom of West Essex, Cedar Grove, NJ, in expressing my congratulations to Rabbi Norman Patz for his 25th year at the temple, in addition to celebrating the temple's 40th anniversary.

Rabbi Patz arrived at Temple Sholom of West Essex in 1969. In addition to his work at the temple, he is currently the chairman of the Israel Committee of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. He served as past chairman of National UJA's rabbinic cabinet. Also, he was chairman of the MetroWest Community Relations Committee from 1985 to 1988, a member of the federation's board of trustees, and a chair of the Holocaust Remembrance Council of MetroWest.

In addition to these activities, Rabbi Patz was the past president of the New Jersey Association of Reform Rabbis and the Metropolitan New Jersey Conference on Soviet Jewry. Moreover, he was a member of the Board of Rabbinic Overseers of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion from 1981 to 1988.

Rabbi Patz has received awards for his work. In 1980, he was the recipient of the Rabbinic Leadership Award of the Jewish Community Federation of Metropolitan New Jersey. Also, he and his wife, Naomi, received the Masada Award by the State of Israel Bond Organization. He was given an honorary doctor of divinity degree by HUC–JIR in 1990 as well.

I applaud Rabbi Patz' hard work for the community, and it is with great pleasure that I wish him a wonderful anniversary at Temple Sholom of West Essex.

TRIBUTE TO ELDER DELMUS ALBERT ALLEN

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Elder Delmus Albert Allen of the Sion Temple Church Of God in Christ. Attached is a proclamation I issued Elder Allen commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Elder Delmus Albert Allen is a native of Blytheville, Arkansas, where he also matriculated at Harrison High School, he is married to Rosie Lee Allen, who has labored faithfully by her husband's side, especially with the Youth Ministry, Elder Allen is the father of six children and thirteen great grand children; and

Whereas Elder Allen was employed by the Chicago Transit Authority as a Motorman for thirty years prior to his retirement. He is a former member of the St. James Church Of God In Christ where he served as Assistant Chairman of the Deacon Board and YPWW Instructor, in 1972 the Lord Called Elder Allen to the Gospel Ministry, later Pastor Allen enrolled in the Charles Mason Seminary; and

Whereas Elder Allen was led by God to establish the Sion Temple Church of God In Christ, Chicago, Illinois, the Lord prospered the congregation to purchase it's first new church home and later it's present location at 1800 West 79th Street, Chicago, Illinois; and

Whereas Elder Allen has provided housing in the Englewood Area for those with little or no resources, has fed the hungry, continues to help uplift downtrodden humanity, leads souls to Christ, and continues to be a steadfast role model in the community: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Elder Delmus Albert Allen and the Sion Temple Church Of God In Christ, Chicago, Illinois by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress.

TRIBUTE TO BEATRICE CILKER HUBBARD

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Beatrice Cilker Hubbard, a dedicated community leader from California's 14th Congressional District who was recently honored by the Palo Alto Senior Coordinating Council with its Lifetimes of Achievement Award.

Beatrice Cilker Hubbard has been a tireless volunteer leader for youth and seniors for over 50 years. While she cites her family—five children and twelve grandchildren—as her greatest achievement, she has devoted considerable energy to the PTA—serving as its president at Palo Alto's Walter Hays and Jordan Schools—the Boy Scouts, Junior Red Cross, and the Junior Auxiliary to the former Stanford Children's Hospital. Her work to help save a downtown preschool has left a legacy—the Parents' Cooperative Nursery School. Mrs. Hubbard actively supported her late husband, Wesley "Bud" Hubbard, when he was a Santa Clara County supervisor and chaired the $1.5 million capital campaign that created today's Senior Center of Palo Alto. Mrs. Hubbard also has served twice on the board of directors of the Senior Coordinating Council of the Palo Alto area and is active with the Senior Center auxiliary.

Mr. Speaker, Beatrice Cilker Hubbard is an outstanding member of our community. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating her on receiving a Lifetimes of Achievement Award.

TRIBUTE TO MSGR. JOHN PATRICK CARROLL-ABBING

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of John Ricciardelli, a close friend and constituent. Mr. Ricciardelli is the Florida chairman of the National Board of the Boys Towns of Italy as well as its tireless advocate. It is through his commitment that I have become familiar with the Boys Towns of Italy and how I come today to pay tribute to the humanitarian efforts of Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing. The Monsignor's work has spanned the course of the last half-century and has served to establish and preserve the Boys Towns of Italy.

Born in Dublin, Ireland, Monsignor Carroll-Abbing moved to Rome in 1930 to join the priesthood. Ordained a priest in 1937, he was appointed to Vatican service later that year. It was the Monsignor's subsequent work in World War II, during which he founded many first aid stations and organized a group called Medical Aid, that he first became acquainted with the orphans created by the war. This involvement with distressed World War II civilians led to his involvement with the war's orphans. Touched and amazed by the fortitude of these children, the Monsignor was compelled to work on their behalf. Many of these young orphans aided the Monsignor in his war relief efforts.

The winter of 1944 was marked by food shortages and misery. After seeing the starving boys pressed against the walls for heat, the Monsignor felt a personal responsibility to help them. No existing institution would take the orphans, so the Monsignor established the "Shoeshine" Hotel where he lived with the orphans. The daily work was divided among the residents of the hotel, with each boy having his own responsibilities. Soon enough the group grew too large for the Shoeshine, and the Monsignor was prompted to acquire vacant army barracks outside the city.

In 1945 Monsignor Carroll-Abbing founded his first Boys' Town 45 miles from Rome. The purpose of the Town was simple, to give orphaned or abandoned children a home. The Boys' Towns were run completely by the children. They shared in the work responsibilities and learned to respect one another. Monsignor Carroll-Abbing raised money worldwide to pay for these life savings Boys' Towns.

The dreams of Monsignor Carroll-Abbing have been realized today with nine Boys' Towns and one Girls' Town in Italy, all run by the Monsignor's international Boys' Towns of Italy—the organization which he established. Orphans in Italy no longer go without homes. Beside the Towns which he established, the Monsignor's organization also donates money, clothes, medical care, furniture, and time to children in need worldwide.

Today, Monsignor Carroll-Abbing's touch is felt around the globe. He has extended his aid across seas and continents. More than 400 refugees from Africa and Asia who suffered due to war, famine, and disaster have found a home in the Monsignor's Boys' Towns. In addition, the Monsignor travels around the world to disaster sights to assist in relief efforts, on each occasion with the help of children.

With the world changing as fast as it has, Monsignor Carroll-Abbing has changed with it. He has worked with children with drug addictions, who have attempted suicide, who are runaways, and who have committed acts of violence. He has an understanding with the Italian courts which allows him to gain custody of children who have been orphaned or are delinquents. His ability to communicate with youths has only been overshadowed by his generosity and kindness.

Monsignor Carroll-Abbing's major contribution to the world has been to give opportunity to a group of forgotten children who would have otherwise lacked it. Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing has served humanity throughout his life; whether they be orphans, delinquents, or children in need, Monsignor Carroll-Abbing is a man who has touched, changed and saved the lives of thousands of children. For more than 50 years he has dedicated himself to improving the lives of children. Monsignor Carroll-Abbing is a man who should be revered by all, and overlooked by none, as one of the great humanitarians in history.

SALUTE TO ROBERT J. CONNER

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, Robert J. Conner, assistant to the Sergeant at Arms and counsel for a wide range of special projects and studies, is today concluding a long and distinguished career in Washington, DC. Bob has served the office of the Sergeant at Arms well and was an enormous asset to this institution. His character and good sense of judgment have given him a wide circle of admirers among my colleagues.

He also has given selflessly of his own time by being a volunteer lecturer on issues of Government at colleges and universities throughout the United States. The lessons and observations that he has amassed through his years of service with Government, beginning

as a page in the other body, and in the private sector will continue to be made available to the future generations that will serve this Nation.

All of us in this House wish him and his charming wife, Peggy, all the best as they travel the new and exciting roads that lay ahead of them.

TRIBUTE TO REV. WILLIE C. AUSTIN

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Willie C. Austin of the New Israelite Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Austin commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas The Reverend Willie C. Austin is a native of Cuthbert, Georgia, moving to Chicago in 1953, he matriculated at the Chicago Baptist Institute, Chicago, Illinois earning the Associate Arts degree in 1983 and the Bachelor of Arts degree in Religion, 1985; and

Whereas Reverend Austin is a family man and a role model in our community, he is married to the former Miss Jannie Green, they are the proud parents of one son, Gregory and one daughter, LaShaun; and

Whereas Reverend Austin has served the Church his whole life, he was crowned a Deacon in 1960 in the Mount Pleasant Missionary Baptist Church, served as Superintendent of the Junior Department Sunday School, Director of the Junior Church, General Superintendent of the Sunday School for fifteen years, Scout Master, Director of the Baptist Training Union, he responded to the Call to the Gospel Ministry and was Ordained November 21, 1976, following Ordination Reverend Austin served as Assistant Pastor of the Mount Pleasant Missionary Baptist Church, currently he is the Second Vice President of the New Era District, National Baptist Convention, Chicago, Illinois; and

Whereas Reverend Austin was elected Pastor of the New Israelite Missionary Baptist Church, December 1983. Under Reverend Austin's leadership the mortgage to the previous location on South Ashland Avenue was paid off and the present location was obtained, new departments and ministries were initiated: the Missionary Society, Educational Scholarship Committee, Youth Department, a special relationship with four Nursing Homes ministering to the Senior Citizens, sponsoring a Pre-Thanksgiving Dinner for Senior Citizens, a special ministry to a girls home in the community, and Vacation Bible School: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Willie C. Austin and the New Israelite Missionary Baptist Church, Chicago, Illinois, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress.

TRIBUTE TO MARY E. LANIGAR

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Mary E. Lanigar, a dedicated community leader from California's 14th Congressional District who was recently honored by the Palo Alto Senior Coordinating Council with its prestigious Lifetime of Achievement Award.

Mary E. Lanigar is a role model for professional women. As one of the first women to become a certified public accountant [CPA] in the country, she served as a pioneer in her field. Ms. Lanigar carved out a career that began as the first woman partner to join Arthur Young and Company in San Francisco. On her retirement in the 1970's, she accepted directorships with several major corporations, including Wells Fargo & Co., Transamerica Corporation, and Castle and Cooke, Inc. Her business acumen also has been put to extensive use in the nonprofit world. Her community work includes serving as director and president of the Children's Health Council, trustee of the Palo Alto Medical Foundation, and the first woman member of the Business Advisory Committee of the Greater Action Center, formerly the Resource Center for Women.

Mr. Speaker, Mary E. Lanigar is an outstanding member of our community. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating her on receiving a Lifetime of Achievement Award.

TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN ARABIC AND JEWISH FRIENDS OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the American Arabic and Jewish Friends of Metropolitan Detroit for sponsoring their eighth annual scholarship dinner. This Sunday, May 22, the group will be hosting its annual dinner to raise funds for college scholarships for high school seniors of Arabic and Jewish descent.

Established in 1981, the friends are a model of cooperation committed to peace and friendship. They are dedicated to promoting greater understanding between the Arab and Jewish communities in southeast Michigan.

Whereas the peace process is taking its first steps in the Middle East, Jewish and Arab-Americans have been walking down the road to peace in Michigan for many years. I commend them for their desire to put aside their differences and focus on our common interests.

It is particularly encouraging to see a joint effort between these communities that promotes education. It is often ignorance that maintains the walls of misunderstanding. However, through their educational efforts, the friends have been building bridges of understanding for more than a decade. The lessons they are teaching should be well heeded by all who believe in peace.

I ask all my colleagues to join me in saluting the American Arabic and Jewish Friends of Metropolitan Detroit. Their contributions to the rich tapestry of American heritage are to be applauded.

A TRIBUTE TO AL REID

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the primary role models for so many Americans are the glamorous people we see in the mass media. Our heroes come not from the real world, but from television sports shows, music videos, and movie theaters.

Certainly, it is not wrong to have sports or film heroes, but it is unfortunate that so many of us overlook the heroic qualities of those who are not blessed with natural music talent or special athletic ability. There are so many other Americans who have qualities that are worth our recognition and admiration.

One of these citizens is Mr. Albert J. Reid of California.

Mr. Reid is not a sports hero or a movie star. And he certainly won't be making any music videos. But, Al represents what America is all about. He served his country in World War II. He raised a family—a wife, five children, and eight grandchildren. And he has worked hard his entire life.

He began a career in outdoor advertising in 1954, becoming a prominent player in the industry in California. He was instrumental in the implementation of the Highway Beautification Act in California, and championed the cause for fair and legal city sign ordinances, protecting prominent and historical billboards on the San Francisco Skyway and the Sunset Strip in Los Angeles.

For 38 years, Al worked for the same outdoor advertising company. He was the prime legislative representative for the company, and was active in both the Outdoor Advertising Association for America and the California State Outdoor Advertising Association, serving as the latter's president for over a decade. And, quite remarkably, during this 38 years, Al Reid took only 1 sick day.

Al also assisted many nonprofit organizations with donations of time, billboard space, and money. Organizations promoting traffic safety, crime prevention, AIDS awareness, sickle cell anemia awareness, and drunk driving prevention are just a few of the groups that benefited from his assistance.

In addition, Al served as a member of the board of directors of the SCARE Foundation and the Catholic Youth Organization.

Al Reid recently celebrated his 70th birthday. He may not be a movie star or a sports hero, but he has worked hard, played by the rules, and set a good example for others. He is the kind of person who makes America the great country that it is.

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR FITZ BARCLAY, JR.

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Pastor Fitz Barclay, Jr., of the Morgan Park Pentecostal Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Pastor Barclay commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Pastor Fitz Barclay, Jr., is a native of Chicago, Illinois, the son of Bishop Fitz and Mrs. Geraldine Barclay, he is a graduate of the Paul Lawrence Dunbar High School, and the loving father of three children; and

Whereas Pastor Barclay prepared himself academically, he matriculated in Mexico City, Mexico, in graduate Bilingual Education Studies in 1971–1972, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, earning the Bachelor of Science degree in English with a Minor in Spanish, Governors State University, Park Forest, Illinois, Master of Arts degree in English and Communications, Trinity College Seminary, Deerfield, Illinois, Master of Divinity Degree; and

Whereas Pastor Barclay has excelled in dual careers for over twenty years, as an English teacher in Thornridge High School, Dolton, Illinois since 1972, he has also taught English and Spanish in Central Y.M.C.A. College, Olive-Harvey College, and Richard Daley College, Chicago, Illinois, in 1978 he was Called to Pastor Morgan Park Pentecostal Church, Chicago, Illinois, host church for the Sixth Annual Men's Midwest Regional Conference, encouraging the "African-American Male;" and

Whereas Pastor Barclay is a Community Leader he is a member of the Morgan Park/Beverly Ministerial Alliance, Board Member of the Evangelical Elementary School, Morgan Park High School-Local School Council, and the State of Illinois Gang Taskforce: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Pastor Fitz Barclay, Jr. by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO H. DONALD WINBIGLER

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute H. Donald Winbigler, dedicated community leader from California's 14th Congressional District who was recently honored by the Palo Alto Senior Coordinating Council with its Lifetimes of Achievement Award.

H. Donald Winbigler is an exceptional community servant whose commitment to Stanford University began in 1941 and continued into the 1990's. After teaching at Stanford for 5 years, he became university registrar in 1945, coping with the post-war jump from 4,385 to 7,000 students. He was the dean of students for 14 years before serving as academic secretary to the new faculty senate from 1967 until his retirement in 1974. In 1980, he directed President Donald Kennedy's inaugural celebrations, and later served on the Stanford Centennial Committee.

Mr. WInbigler has also served as president of the Palo Alto Kiwanis Club and director and chairman of the YMCA, in addition to working with the Boy Scouts. As a result of his extensive commitment to the YMCA, he was the first recipient of the prestigious YMCA Red Triangle Award. His awards also include the Hall of Achievement Award from his alma mater Monmouth College.

Mr. Speaker, H. Donald Winbigler is an outstanding member of our community. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on receiving a Lifetimes of Achievement Award.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JOB CORPS

HON. LYNN SCHENK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support and applaud the efforts of the Job Corps centers in my State. Job Corps is a Federal program which offers education, job training, basic health care, 24-hour residential supervision, and counseling to our Nation's at-risk youths. The six Job Corps centers in my State of California serve approximately 6,000 disadvantaged young people annually. Every year, 2,300 young women and 2,600 young men get jobs or enroll in higher education after receiving basic education and job training through Job Corps. My State's Job Corps centers train young people in over 50 trades, as well as offering parenting classes and social skills training.

I am pleased to add that there is a highly successfully Job Corps center in the community of Imperial Beach in my district. Founded in 1978, this center boasts an impressive 85-percent placement rate for these at-risk youth in either jobs or educational programs. The 650 students currently enrolled perform services for various nonprofits in the community. Last year it was estimated that San Diego Job Corps donated more than $10,000 in services and construction in our community.

This year, Job Corps celebrates its 30th anniversary. This Federal program has been operating in California for 29 years and is a great boon to my State for both its economic and social contributions. The program means so much to our at-risk young people who want to turn their lives around and break the cycle of poverty, dependence and lack of education. Job Corps makes them self-sufficient, employed tax-paying citizens. Economically, each Job Corps center offers about 140 jobs for people from the community. Job Corps students, as part of their training, complete over $22 million in free community service construction projects nationwide each year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to salute all the students who choose to enter this outstanding program. I commend the committed Job Corps staff who work so hard. No wonder this program has an almost 30-year track record of success and returns $1.46 from every dollar invested.

I am so proud of Job Corps in California. I believe we need more Job Corps centers to help more young people face their challenges and become productive citizens. That is why I support the enrichment and long-term expansion of this much-needed program through the Job Corps 50–50 plan, a long-term initiative to enrich existing services and to incrementally expand the program by building 50 new centers to serve 50 percent more poor youth in the next decade.

THE INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE 85/15 RULE OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, thousands of students stand to lose their student financial assistance and be forced to leave school because their post-secondary institution will no longer be eligible to participate in Federal financial assistance programs.

The Department of Education estimates that up to 50 percent of all for-profit trade and technical schools will lose their eligibility because of the 85/15 rule established in the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1992.

The 85/15 rule, which is scheduled to go into effect on July 1 of this year, requires that proprietary institutions obtain no more than 85 percent of their revenues from Federal financial assistance programs in order to retain eligibility for such programs.

The purpose of the 85/15 rule was to assure that proprietary schools were not overly dependent on Federal funds. However, the regulations promulgated by the U.S. Department of Education require proprietary schools to count student and parent loans as Federal funds, which means that more than 50 percent of these schools will no longer be eligible to participate in Federal student financial assistance programs.

While the Federal Government provides a guarantee for student loans, the loan capital is obtained from private sources. Furthermore, parents and students are required to repay these loans. These loans should not be counted as Federal funds.

Today, I along with 17 colleagues have introduced legislation which will exclude loans from being considered as revenues derived from Federal financial assistance programs for the purposes of calculating whether a school has met the 85/15 rule.

To allow hundreds of trade and technical schools and career colleges to close their doors is inconsistent with our efforts in the recently passed School-to-Work Opportunities Act, which focuses on skill training, and current efforts to expand education and training for individuals on welfare. Proprietary institutions provide valuable training and educational services for those individuals that do not go

onto college and nontraditional students who are already in the workplace, or reentering the work force, and want to gain the skills necessary to get a better job.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and help keep the doors of educational opportunity open to low-income individuals in our Nation.

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP MELVIN CRAWFORD

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Bishop Melvin Crawford of the Church of the Living God. Attached is a proclamation I issued the Bishop commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Bishop Melvin Crawford was born in Clarksdale, Mississippi, to Leah and Moses Crawford, the youngest of ten children, six boys and four girls, Bishop Crawford and his late wife Overseer Beatrice Crawford were married for over fifty years; and

Whereas Bishop Crawford has always been very industrious, and an entrepreneur, he migrated to Memphis, Tennessee seeking better opportunities at the age of twelve, there he worked for the Humko Packing Company for five years, saving enough money to purchase his mother a home. He served in the United States Army for three years in the one hundred and eighty second Medical Corps, he and Mrs. Crawford saved enough money to start the Crawford Brothers Grocery, the first Black owned business on fifty-ninth and State Street in Chicago, to improve his business skills he attended the Miller's Business College, later he opened a Tastee Freeze which he operated for ten years; and

Whereas Bishop Crawford and his family were the first Blacks to move to the West Englewood Community, from their home they began religious services under the Church of God Pillar and Ground Of The Truth, the Church serves the community through food give away programs, summer youth employment program, Job Training in Construction Rehab for Ex-offenders, and a Senior Citizens Program and more; and

Whereas Bishop Crawford is a Community Leader, he has worked to ease racial tension when the Englewood Community was in a racial transition, he is committed to helping the poor, he is a member of Operation P.U.S.H., The Minister's Alliance, President of the World wide Rainbow Development, and the Senior and Chief Bishop of the Church of the Living God, P.G.O.T.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Bishop Melvin Crawford and his late wife, Overseer Beatrice Crawford, by entering these accomplishments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

79-059 O—97 Vol. 140 (Pt. 8) 29

HONORING SENIOR CITIZENS COORDINATING COUNCIL OF RIVERBAY

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to the Senior Citizens Coordinating Council of Riverbay, which is celebrating its 20th year as sponsor of the Co-op City Multi-Service Center.

As a resident of Co-op City, I have supported and followed the growth of the SCCC over the years. The original concept, conceived in 1973, was to form a group with representatives of the six volunteer-operated senior clubs in Co-op City. Together, they could work toward ensuring the efficient delivery of services to the community. The plan has worked.

The SCCC now sponsors two vital programs serving hundreds of senior citizens in the community. The multiservice center helps the elderly gain access to a range of programs, such as home-delivered meals and community based health care. The Co-op City Nutrition and Recreation Program operates at three sites in Co-op City, and also provides meals to the homebound.

The SCCC is responsible for maintaining a decent quality of life for many senior citizens. It is a difficult mission that requires dedication and caring. I have seen first-hand the positive results of the work put in by the SCCC's administrator, employees and volunteers.

Therefore, I congratulate all the people who have been involved in the success of the SCCC and thank them on behalf of my constituents. I look forward to working with the SCCC for many more years to come.

HONORING LONA BOGGS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and address this House to recognize Mrs. Lona Boggs, a grand American, for her commitment to her family, her community, and her country.

Mrs. Boggs retired some years ago after a long career as a farm wife/homemaker and then out of necessity began a career with and retired from the Charles County Board of Education. She turned 80 in January of this year and is still going strong as a homemaker. Mrs. Boggs is a founding member of the United Methodist Church in La Plata. She enjoys gardening and quilting, which is why I want to bring this lady to your attention. She recently won the grand prize at the Clark Senior Center in La Plata for her entry in the Maryland seniors art competition. Her art is a beautiful hand made quilt with a lonestar pattern. Her work will be displayed in Annapolis on July 8 along with other winners of competitions held around our State.

I congratulate Mrs. Boggs and ask now that the following article be included in the RECORD.

[From the Maryland Independence, May 18, 1994]

A SENIOR STITCH: LA PLATA 80-YEAR-OLD WINS SENIORS' ART CONTEST

(By Debra Zimmerman Murphey)

Lona Boggs is having her 15 minutes of Andy Warhol-predicted fame. And she is 80 years old.

Recently, at a well-attended gathering at the Richard R. Clark Senior Center, Boggs joined the ranks of other county seniors who have been singled out for a prestigious award: the Best in Show winner in a state-sponsored art contest held yearly in each Maryland county and in Baltimore City.

"I called my children," Boggs says almost sheepishly, "and told them I was a celebrity."

And as the now-deceased pop artist Warhol said years ago about everyone experiencing fame at some point in their lives, Boggs' moment in the spotlight has come.

Boggs, who lives in La Plata, decided this year to enter the contest. She submitted her now revered "lonestar" patterned quilt in the competition, which is part of a statewide effort to improve the quality of seniors' lives and focus on their accomplishments. For the past three years, Charles County residents have often entered intricate woodcarvings and contemporary paintings to earn that top award.

Boggs' choice to enter the contest came months ago after she dropped by the Clark center to show its staff the multi-colored quilt she had worked on from April 1993 to January of this year. As a result of that visit, the employees encouraged her to enter the quilt, explaining that this was the first year quilts were being considered as art. "I didn't think it was hard quilt this," Boggs explains. "A lot of people will work on a quilt for two to three years."

But then Tuesday, May 3, came around, and Boggs sat in an all-purpose room at the Clark center for the much-awaited announcement of who had won in the four separate categories (woodcarving, works on paper, works on canvas and quilting) and, lastly, for the Best in Show.

"I said, 'Not me,'" Boggs recalls, her hand moving to her chest the way it had that day after she claimed the No. 1 spot. "I was really shocked.

First-place winners in the divisions were Robert Hale, wood-carving; John Neubauer, works on paper; Cecile Stotesbury, works on canvas; and Boggs for quilting.

Days later, while sitting in a chair where she often works on her quilts, Boggs thinks back to her first taste of locking thread and needle with material. "I was raised in West Virginia and we always had quilts, but they were made for warmth. Our beds were covered with quilts my mother made. . . . The women would get together and have quilting bees. They would go from neighbor's house to neighbor's house and quilt all day."

She adds: "As a girl, I had done a little quilting, but then I got married and had children and didn't have the time."

More than a half of a century later, Boggs has kept that connection to family as part of her quilting, a hobby she pursued after retiring in 1980 from the board of education. Today, she is working on her 13th quilt (for a grandchild), with others—with the exception of the prize quilt—having gone to her children and grandchildren. Boggs says she is not interested in the hefty, more-than-$1,000 prices her quilts could bring.

Kneeling down, Boggs traces her hands across the crisp cloth, and the precise stitching, to explain the work that went into the

quilt. The more than 300 pieces are sewn together, each angled corner becoming part of the cover. Another quilt, the one Boggs works on now, is called applique (the pieces are sewn onto a piece of cloth and their edges mask the stitches), and Boggs uses it to explain the way her quilting is exacted.

On nights, when she was working on the winning quilt, she would spend hours sewing—but never with the thought of winning any award. "I kind of thought I might win for the quilts (category)," she admits reluctantly. "But not overall. In my life, in terms of winning, I have never had anything that compares to this."

She pauses, then smiles and says: "Just being proud of the quilt means the most."

But Boggs is not only interested in quilting. A widow, she travels extensively and has visited most of the United States as well as England and several Scandanavian countries. Her favorite remains picturesque Wales.

Her other activities include vegetable gardening, a weekly ceramics class she takes at the senior center, membership in the 2-N-1 seniors' organization and the Patchworkers' Quilt Club, church activities, housework, visiting with friends and shopping at the mall.

Boggs is upfront about her husband's death 17 years ago, explaining that several years after he suffered a stroke when he was 56, the family sold their 120-acre farm in St. Mary's County and later settled in La Plata. "The doctor talked to me and said, 'You just can't depend on your children. They have their lives and you have to live yours,'" she remembers.

So, Boggs continued working and retired when she was 65. Although she has journeyed beyond the county's borders, it is Charles County that has earned her devotion. "My family moved from West Virginia to Southern Maryland in 1940. We settled in St. Mary's County for one year and then moved to Charles County and I lived there until 1950, when we bought the farm and moved to St. Mary's County," Boggs says.

In 1968, Boggs and her husband moved back to Charles County and made La Plata their home. "I like this area because I like the people," she says. She adds that La Plata's small-town environment, family members who have stayed in Charles County, and her long-time affiliation with a county-based Methodist church are the prevailing reasons for her staying here.

Boggs' honors for earning the award include a luncheon in July for all the Best in Show winners and a weekend getaway. But it is the joy she gets from looking at the swirl of peach, dark blue, mauve, medium blue and green bundle of cloth that has meant the most. "I believe it's the prettiest quilt I've made," she says before adding that she will keep this one.

"Quilting is relaxing. It's peaceful to sit down with something in my hands to work on," says Boggs. "It's something that you create and it's an art that has been forgotten for so long. . . . I don't think about selling them. I just want my children to have something that I made."

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP ARTHUR M. BRAZIER

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my Congressional District, Bishop Arthur M. Brazier, Episcopal leader of the Sixth Episcopal District of Illinois of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World. Attached is a proclamation I issued Bishop Brazier commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Bishop Arthur M. Brazier is a native of Chicago, Illinois, he matriculated at Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois, receiving several Honorary Degrees, the Doctor of Divinity Degree, William Holmes College, Doctor of Humane Letters, North Park College, Doctor of Laws, Monrovia College—Industrial Institute of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Rockefeller Public Service Award—Princeton University; he served his country in the United States Army, three years and two months during World War II with duty in China, Burma, and the India Theater of Operations, decorated with the Good Conduct Medal, and two Battle Stars for Central and Northern Burma Campaigns; and

Whereas Bishop Brazier is a community leader, a man blessed with many gifts and talents, he was the first president of the prominent Woodlawn Organization, presently he serves as a Chicago Housing Authority Commissioner, he is one of four critical advisors to the famous Hanna-Barbera Productions, Inc. for the award winning children's videotapes, "The Greatest Adventure: Stories From the Bible," he also speaks French fluently; and

Whereas Bishop Brazier was elected to the office of Bishop in 1976, he is the Episcopal leader of the 6th Episcopal District of Illinois of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, he is a Pastor/Scholar serving as an instructor at North Park College and Theological Seminary for two years in Church and Community, published several articles, an author, a lecturer at the University of Chicago Law School, North Western University Law School, Harvard University, Antioch College, and New York School of Social Work; and

Whereas Bishop Brazier was called to the pulpit of the Apostolic Church of God in May of 1960, under his pastoral leadership the congregation grew from 70 to over 9,000 parishioners, the congregation outgrew its facilities twice, constructing a new facility at 6303 S. Kenwood, again God Blessed and the increase came and a new church seating more than 3000 at a cost of $6 million dollars was constructed, the Church's "Saving Grace Ministries," is aired on Channel 26 in Chicago, and Channel 55 in Milwaukee, seen in Indiana and Michigan, and a Bible Teaching hour on radio station WYCA, a book store and many other ministries to help people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Bishop Arthur M. Brazier by entering these accomplishments into Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress.

NELSON MANDELA

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, an article about Nelson Mandela written by Richard Cohen for the Washington Post on May 12, 1994, describes the unique and remarkable man who has emerged from decades in prison to become the first President of a unified South Africa.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article about Nelson R. Mandela.

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1994]

THE WONDERFUL MYSTERY OF MANDELA

(By Richard Cohen)

Albert Einstein's brain remains in the possession of Dr. Thomas Harvey of Lawrence, Kan., who has over the years peered into it to discover the secret of genius. He has learned nothing. But if, as Alexander Pope wrote, the proper study of mankind is man, let us study the living Nelson Mandela. He is, as the gentle Einstein himself would have acknowledged, an even greater miracle. Nothing accounts for the man except the man himself.

Over the course of the last several weeks, I would find myself pausing in my work to ponder the mystery of Mandela. On occasion, I would sit in the car, not going into the house until this or that report from South Africa had concluded. Always the voice of Mandela urged reconciliation: no retribution or vengeance, inclusion instead of exclusion, love instead of hate. Why?

Mandela humbles psychology. Where in his childhood do we find the clues to his character? He was raised in a polygamous household, four wives, of which his mother was the third. His father died when he was 12. He loved the stunningly beautiful Winnie, divorcing his first wife to marry her, but a life on the run and, later, in jail meant he saw her seldom. Daily, in jail, he would dust her photo, and it was 20 years before prison authorities allowed them to embrace. When, finally, they separated, he said, "My love for her remains undiminished."

He lived underground and on the run and paced a cell on Robben Island, South Africa's Alcatraz. He was treated like dirt, but he came out of prison with his immeasurable dignity intact. He said prison "matured" him, but nearly three decades earlier, at his trial in 1964, he uttered words remarkably similar to those we've heard recently: "I have fought against white domination, and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society." He was sentenced to prison for the rest of his life. He was 44 when he went in, 71 when he got out.

Maybe Primo Levi could have explained Mandela. The one-time Italian chemist, a Jew, went through Auschwitz, but wrote about his experience without bitterness. Levi extolled work, the occupation of the hands and the mind, raising vocation to virtually metaphysical heights. In the end, it seemed he couldn't escape Auschwitz after all. He killed himself in 1987, but if he turned bitter and angry he never showed it—not in his writing anyway.

Mandela has that Levi quality—and then some. His lack of rancor is downright dumbfounding. In an age of strutting, vengeance-seeking political leaders, he is an anomaly. Never mind 27 years in jail. Never mind the time robbed from fatherhood and marriage—bedtime stories, and bed, the mundane pleasures that are the condiments of life. Like all black South Africans, he suffered on account of his skin. As good as any man, better in fact than most, he was treated little better than an animal. The essence of apartheid wasn't segregation, it was a forced mortification, an incessant humiliation by the state. There is ample reason for anger here.

I was in South Africa once. Mandela was still in jail. I stayed a week and never went back. I never wanted to. That gorgeous country, so spectacular in its natural beauty, seemed to me a dismal place, a vast jail where all the nonwhites were inmates. I remember asking cabdriver after cabdriver to take me to the station where the trains from Soweto came in. None of them knew the place. Someday they would, I thought. The payback was surely coming. Mandela may yet prove me wrong.

Mandela refutes an entire historical theory. There are those who believe that no single person is of historical importance. Movements—social, economic, religious—are the engines of change. For the most part I believe that. It is not Ronald Reagan who brought down the Soviet Union but the illogic of communism. The late philosopher Sidney Hook argued otherwise. He said here and there were great men who on their own changed history.

Mandela vindicates Hook. With the self-discipline of a biblical martyr, with the force of his own personality, with a keen appreciation that evil is a useless term when applied to a whole people, with all of that and something else, Mandela has so far held together a nation that is not really a nation at all. It is, instead, a place with a name. Its problems are immense—ethnic tribalism, racial tribalism, economic tribalism and, of course, the core tribalism of individual political egos. In the end, South Africa may well go the way of Africa. If it does not, Mandela will be the reason.

At his inauguration, Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela was characteristically embracing. He did not hail the victory of one race or ideology over another but instead proclaimed his triumph as "a common victory for justice, for peace, for human dignity." Here again, he was being inclusive, inviting everyone to savor a truly marvelous historical moment. Mandela rebukes most of us. As with Einstein's brain, it would be folly to examine the cause of Mandela's greatness. Maybe, as he would probably prefer, we would be better off studying another question: Why can't more of us be like him?

THE WAR ON DRUGS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration is apparently in full retreat in the war on drugs. In a Washington Post op-ed article today, May 20, 1994, Lally Weymouth notes that the administration has permitted cuts in the budget of drug czar Lee Brown, the State Department's Bureau for International Narcotics Matters [INM], and the Drug Enforcement Agency. In addition the administration is reportedly no longer sharing real-time, i.e., contemporaneous, intelligence with Peru and other Latin American countries to help interdict planes carrying illicit drugs.

We have also learned that the House Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee has just cut the State Department INM budget by one-third again for fiscal year 1995. The United States must be able to fight the traffickers and producers overseas before unlimited supplies of cheap and high quality drugs reach our streets, schools, and workplaces. These budget cuts will hinder and harm our Nation's efforts in our drug war. Obviously there is a void in Presidential leadership on fighting drugs.

Illicit drugs affect our crime rate, health care costs, worker productivity, and the very future of many of our Nation's youth here at home. By neglecting the battle against drugs overseas, our domestic problems will surely worsen.

Mr. Speaker, I request that Ms. Weymouth's op-ed be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

THE DRUG WAR: ANOTHER RETREAT

One argument used by Randall Robinson in calling for a U.S. invasion of Haiti—an idea popular among some Clintonites—is that Haitian military officials are involved in drug trafficking.

But if the administration wants to cut down the flow of drugs to this country, it can do better than invade Haiti. Indeed, Haiti's a virtual nonplayer in the drug wars. The real damage is being done elsewhere.

It's already well known, for example, that the administration has slashed the budget of drug czar Lee Brown. The White House has also acquiesced in cuts in the State Department's bureau for international narcotics, has made deep personnel reductions in the Drug Enforcement Agency and has reduced the Defense Department's drug budget—all of which casts a measure of doubt on the Clinton team's commitment to the war on drugs.

What isn't known is that the administration is also in the process of phasing out a key drug interdiction program that has succeeded in preventing tons of cocaine from reaching America's streets.

During the Bush administration and indeed until recently, Washington shared "real-time" (i.e. contemporaneous) intelligence with Peru, Colombia, Mexico, Bolivia and Guatemala, in an effort to allow those countries to force down drug-carrying aircraft so their illicit cargoes could be seized. The program also allowed the United States and its Latin American allies to track planes loaded with drugs as they flew north from Colombia. The goal was to apprehend traffickers at transit zones in Mexico, the Caribbean and Guatemala, to seize the planes and to confiscate their cargoes. In addition, American AWACs and ships tracked the drug-trafficking planes on their return to Colombia, so they could be seized upon landing. Meanwhile, Washington developed sophisticated techniques to allow U.S. authorities to actually pick up drugs when planes dropped them—either in the Caribbean or in southern Mexico.

A key component of the war on drugs involved persuading Peru to take control of its own air space. This was deemed essential, since 70 percent of the cocaine that comes to the United States originates in Peru. From Peru, the pre-processed cocaine (two-thirds of the world's supply) is moved, primarily by small aircraft, to Colombia, where it is processed and then shipped abroad—mostly to America.

But on May 1, the United States stopped sharing "real-time" intelligence with Peru and other Latin American countries, bringing the drug interdiction program to an abrupt end. Administration lawyers—with Defense Department attorneys in the lead—explained that a 1985 amendment to the 1948 Chicago airline convention forbids the United States from sharing intelligence with a country that might use it to forcibly shoot down civil aircraft.

Clinton administration lawyers have elected to read the amendment to include the entire spectrum of nonmilitary aircraft, even the small civil aircraft used by drug traffickers in illegal flights over foreign air space.

Former Bush and Reagan administration officials regard the Clinton team's reading of the 1985 amendment as overbroad in the extreme. They believed there was no problem so long as U.S. personnel were not knowingly involved in a decision taken by a host country to shoot down a plane.

Moreover, a high-ranking Bush administration official notes that "the U.S. has the ability to be certain that what we give . . . foreign host countries . . . is a trafficker aircraft." There are ways to identify drug trafficking aircraft, adds a former DEA official.

As things stand, there's a major interagency fight underway in Washington, with State Department officials fighting to preserve the interdiction program while both the military Joint Chiefs and the Department of Defense staunchly oppose doing so.

Lacking "real-time" intelligence from the United States, there's no way for Peru or Colombia to know where a drug-filled aircraft is flying or has landed. If these countries can't force a drug trafficker plane to land, the result will be an inability to prevent the movement of massive amounts of pre-processed cocaine from Peru to Colombia. In the end, more cocaine will enter the United States.

"If a substance from a foreign country was coming into the U.S. and causing young white males to kill each other, we'd take whatever measures would be necessary to stop it," says John P. Walters, who was deputy director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy during the Bush administration. But Walters points out that most drugs go to inner cities.

Race is often employed far too easily to explain unwelcome policies. But in the case at hand, it may well be that Walters has a point.

TRIBUTE TO REV. EDWARD CLARK

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, The Reverend Edward Clark of the Good Hope Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued the Reverend commending him for his good work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas The Reverend Edward Clark was born in Yazoo, Mississippi, in Yazoo County, the son of John and Annie Clark, he is a family man celebrating thirty-four years of Holy Matrimony to his wonderful bride, Bernice Horton; and

Whereas Reverend Clark accepted Jesus Christ at the age of twelve, he joined the Good Hope Church in Tchula, Mississippi, in Holmes County, at the age of fifteen he was a Sunday School Teacher, from the age of sixteen through eighteen he served as the Sunday School Superintendent, upon moving to Chicago, Illinois in 1959 he united with the St. Paul Baptist Church, under the pastorate of The Reverend J.J. Taylor, where he served in the choir and on the Deacon Board; and

Whereas Reverend Clark matriculated four years of Seminary 1974–1977 at the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois, in August 1979 he organized the Good Hope Missionary Baptist Church, Chicago, Illinois; and

Whereas Reverend Clark has led the congregation to acquire it's present church and educational building, and reaching out to the community through giving food and clothing to the needy, scholarship foundation for needy high school graduates, Adopt-A-School Program, William Henton Elementary School, and a Christian Education program for all ages, Reverend Clark is a shepherd, a community leader, a business man, and a true role model in our community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Reverend Edward Clark and the Good Hope Missionary Baptist Church, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

SCHOOL FOR SCANDAL

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial by Mark Helprin that appeared in the March 25 edition of the Wall Street Journal. The article discusses the many scandals that continue to plague President Bill Clinton.

SCHOOL FOR SCANDAL

(By Mark Helprin)

Now that the bloom is off the rose, the White House oracles are thumping their naked tails in unison to protest that Whitewater is political. Surely they deserve the Nobel Prize for the discovery that political scandals have a political component, and if they continue their researches perhaps they will also learn that the measure of a scandal is not the material of scandal itself but the political dynamic of which the unfolding scenario is but an expression.

Though liberals hallucinate much about Watergate, Richard Nixon was forced to resign because he was the first American president to lose a war. The rest was merely the instrument of the underlying forces, a shadow play. By the same token, Iran-Contra was a result of the complete isolation of Republican political fortunes in the executive, an island in a tide of Democratic power that threatened to wash over it.

The corruption of Whitewater are like the fruit of a richly bearing tree, and it seems that every day a new dead hand rises from a misty Arkansas lake, but they are not the true measure of Whitewater. Whitewater flourishes only because the Clinton administration is condemned to rest in a politically short-sheeted bed of its own making.

What a bad idea to begin a messianic presidency with only 43% of the popular vote: less than polled by Wilkie, Dewey, Stevenson, Nixon, Ford and Dukakis when they lost. And of that 43% many were unaware of Hillary hiding in the bushes to the left of the candidate, like the 900-pound boyfriend of a voluptuous girl hitchhiker. As soon as Hillary got into the car, she bumped out all but the president's core constituency, the 25% to 30% who will be with him to the end.

You would think that with such a narrow base the White House "Hillarys" (highly inexperienced left-liberal academic righteous yuppies) would have trodden carefully. But they did not, for their abiding faith in the power of their own intelligence to manage the unmanageable amounts to nothing more than abject stupidity, and they acted accordingly. No president in living memory has exulted in his victory with the same immodesty, the immediate punishment for this being that the early Clinton administration came to resemble a science fiction character who ages 50 years in less than a minute.

They were blinded to their limitations by the slavish obedience of a press that, tempting the fates, portrayed the Clintons as saviors, saints, and divine beings, literally with angel's wings. And though flackery is just a rubber band—the more you stretch it out, the harder it snaps back—it did the impossible. It quintupled the arrogance of the most arrogant people in America, a triumphalist coterie of graduate students who accord to the hard left the same uneasy respect that most people reserve for the clergy, and grow teary-eyed over bats, squirrels and caribou as with barely concealable pleasure they sacrifice whole regions of rednecks.

This is not merely the arrogance of victory and of youth, but of lawyers. Lawyers, like undertakers, meddle decisively in everyone's business, but only after it fails. Most are redeemed by understanding that their power comes from this peculiar circumstance, but Clintillians seem to think it comes from a Christ-like glow within themselves. Is it surprising that they believe their first task is to heal the sick? And that to do so they need only redesign the country after they have given it "meaning," banished its greed, and put it on the information superhighway to lap-top heaven? They are the missionaries, and we are the Hottentots.

Not everyone in this group is as callow as the president's media director, who told the Journal last year of his plans for "'BC–TV,' Bill Clinton, on TV, 24 hours a day." And not everyone is a networked crony or a token Zoe or a chicken tycoon, all put in place (if not yet confirmed) in the most incompetent explosion of patronage since Caligula appointed his horse.

For at least half a dozen grown-ups have agreed to help Bill Clinton, mostly eminent retreads who in their days of glory were Carter's Little Liver Pills, and who, even now, after all these years, still move about on little marshmallow feet—Les Aspin, impotent even at his own speciality of gutting the military; Warren Christopher, breaking into every foreign garden and running away when the dog barks; David Gergen, hand welded to the ejection lever; Donna Shalala, praying that the next state dinner she won't be seated next to George Hamilton; Lloyd Cutler, happy but worried, as if Neil Diamond had been asked to conduct the Berlin Philharmonic.

Even the grown-ups cannot save Bill Clinton from himself, if only because they cannot have any idea of how to carry the quicksilver from the flames. Granted, in questions of sincerity the president is perpetually condemned to be upstaged by his vice president, though for the country's sake let us hope that Al Gore is not as sincere as he appears to be, for with sincerity like his, who needs fraud? Fraud is what Whitewater, and the administration, are all about: fraud—pious, tawdry, financial, sexual, political, plain, simple and habitual.

Fraud. Somewhere between the core of the left and the 43% plurality that made Bill Clinton commander in chief are the American voters who thought they were supporting a "New Democrat" and wound up instead with slightly more buttoned up version of the Village People. Boris Yeltsin, who ought to know whereof he speaks, calls Bill Clinton a "socialist," and General Jaruzelski, the former military dictator of Poland, looking more than ever like one of the three blind mice, says that he still retains the values of the left and that, "Actually, in Clinton's program I see elements I like a lot."

Fraud. Thomas Mann of the Brookings Institution states that "We would be condemning him if he didn't pull back [from his campaign promises], because he would be an irresponsible president." That is, the president had to lie to you for your own good. The president lies responsibly. Not only does he remain morally superior when he lies, his lying actually makes him morally superior. This goes beyond the normal corruptions of American politics onto the airless and unfamiliar plains of totalitarianism.

Fraud. In a wonderful reversal of Boss Tweed's immense public outlays for "Brooms, etc.," the president tells the New York times that he does not want a congressional inquiry into Whitewater because "it would not be worth the money it would cost." He doesn't want a congressional inquiry into Whitewater, because he wants to save money. Does the president think he leads a nation of idiots? The answer is yes, but he is just cautious enough to speak indirectly, when, of his wife, he says: "If the rest of the people in this country—if everybody in this country had a character as strong as hers, we wouldn't have half the problems we've got today."

These are not the words of Louis XVI, Juan Peron, or Nicolae Ceausescu, but of the president of the United States defending his overbearing wife by insulting the rest of the country. Had a Republican president said this, he would have been put in the ice cream case within minutes. Nor has any president of sound mind and body ever had the temerity to install the first lady in a virtual copresidency in which she stalks about the country giving speeches, appears before Congress, supervises at least one cabinet department, and is the chief of his (her?) administration's most ambitious initiative. Though in Whitewater mode it is to the Clinton's advantage to dismiss this with offended innocence, they and their supporters have been trumpeting it for more than a year.

The president has reinvented government, and the United States of America now has not one chief executive, but one and a half. This rather profound change is not the result of a constitutional amendment or even informed debate. It just happened. It has embarrassed Congress and escaped the condemnation of an anesthetized press. It is the solid and identifiable core of an otherwise mercurial cloud of hubris, arrogance and petty corruption. It is the ultimate expression of the nature of this presidency, in which the rules exist only for everyone else, because the work of the elect in remaking the world is too important to fetter with laws and truth.

Were it not for the fact that the president's own party dominates Congress, the press, the universities, public education, Hollywood, publishing, local and state government, the unions, and bureaucracies everywhere, the assumption by Hillary Rodham Clinton of the powers of an office to which she did not accede would be a constitutional crisis. It should be a constitutional crisis. But it is not. It is, instead, sublimated in

scandal. It is, instead, the driving force in the conflict of which Whitewater is but the instrument, the mere expression, and the shadow play.

JACQUELINE KENNEDY ONASSIS

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my condolences on the death of an extraordinary American, Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis.

Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis had a special place in the hearts of Rhode Islanders. Her youthful summers in Newport, her joyous wedding at St. Mary's Church, all of these affiliations with Rhode Island gave us a particular pride. This pride grew with each passing year as we saw her claim an equally special place in the hearts of all the world.

For those of us who grew up in the exciting days of the New Frontier, she will always be part of our consciousness. Along with President Kennedy, she brought a special energy and style to the national scene. In those heady days, with two youthful vigorous and accomplished residents of the White House, we felt that anything was possible.

Jacqueline Kennedy brought to the White House a sophistication and charm that endeared her to everyday Americans and world leaders alike. President Kennedy remarked after his historic trip to France that he would be remembered simply as the man who brought Jackie Kennedy to Paris.

She radiated a special beauty and serenity that captivated us all. I remember, as a young boy, watching her televised tour of the White House. I was enthralled with her evocation of our history. She conveyed not only the importance of the White House as a symbol of our political heritage and her commitment to recognizing American arts; she also made us feel at home in her home and the home of her family.

When one stops and considers her life, we are struck with myriad images. I recall her interview with President Kennedy on Ed Morrow's "Person to Person." She was a young woman whose soft-spoken grace and obvious love for her husband provided a spark of magic in the otherwise dreary routine of politics. I recall the extraordinary evening in the White House when she hosted Robert Frost, Igor Stravinsky, and Pablo Casals. She and her husband made the arts and culture fashionable not just in the salons of the privileged but throughout the land.

Sadly, it was the tragic death of President Kennedy that transformed her into a historic figure of courage and strength whose example calmed and reassured a grieving nation. No one can forget her quiet dignity as she endured the unendurable.

Her life after the White House was full of accomplishment. She remained to her last day an image of grace and elegance. We mourn her passing and express our sincerest condolences to her family.

TRIBUTE TO REV. HAROLD ADAM ARRINGTON

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Harold Adam Arrington of the Bethel Gospel Tabernacle Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Arrington commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas The Reverend Harold Adam Arrington is a native of Chicago, Illinois, a graduate of Roosevelt University, he is the esteemed Founder and Pastor of the Bethel Gospel Tabernacle Church, Harvey, Illinois, serving as a pastor for over thirty-four years; and

Whereas Reverend Arrington is a pioneer in Christian Radio and Television, creating the first Christian Television program in 1970 entitled "impact," emanating from WICU-TV Channel 26 in Chicago, Illinois, he has broadcasted continuously over the radio airways for the past eighteen years; and

Whereas Reverend Arrington is the Founder of "Page One" Ministries, providing housing and rehabilitation for men who want to overcome drugs, crime, and other problems, Bethel Gospel Tabernacle feeds the poor three meals a day, every day of the year; and

Whereas, Reverend Arrington is a family man, he is married to Barbara Arrington, celebrating thirty-nine years of holy matrimony, they have been blessed with nine children and six grandchildren, six of Reverend and Mrs. Arrington's children are college graduates, Reverend Arrington is a visionary, a builder, a humanitarian, a Gospel Preacher, a community leader, and a true living role model in our community: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Harold Adam Arrington, and the Bethel Gospel Tabernacle Church by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO REV. EUGENE CHERRY

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Rev. Eugene Cherry of the Christian Youth Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued the Reverend commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Eugene Cherry was born in Shelby, Mississippi, reared in Chicago in the Church, matriculating in the Chicago Public Schools graduating from Marshall High and receiving his theological education from the Chicago Baptist Institute, and

Whereas Reverend Cherry has served faithfully four years as the Assistant Pastor of the Christian Youth Missionary Baptist Church under the pastoral leadership of the Founder The Reverend Isaiah Clayton, Sr., in 1979 Reverend Cherry was elected Pastor of Christian Youth, and

Whereas the church has prospered under the pastoral leadership of Reverend Cherry increasing the church membership to over six hundred, expanding the church parking, remodeled the church facilities, purchased vans and buses for the evangelistic outreach ministry, and

Whereas Reverend Cherry has served as Moderator of the Chicago Southside District of the National Baptist Convention, a Board Member of the Chicago Baptist Institute, a churchman, a humanitarian, and believes in ministry to the total person: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Eugene Cherry by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and archives of the one hundred and third Congress.

A MAGNET TRIANGLE FOR WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. CHARLES H. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, most congressional offices generally divide their work into two areas, constituent casework and legislative services. But there is an additional dimension which my office provides to the people of western North Carolina: the utilization of congressional office resources to enhance regional economic development.

As part of our third dimension outreach approach to operating the congressional office, nonpartisan priority councils were created in each of the 11th Congressional District's 16 counties. These councils were comprised of more than 500 western North Carolina citizens from a diversity of backgrounds. The priority councils consisted of elected officials, economic development officers, chamber of commerce executives, small businessowners, farmers, and Federal officials. Together, they helped identify regional development projects that can be expedited with Federal assistance.

I am proposing one component of our plan to create more jobs in the region and augment the western North Carolina economy.

While the focus of this proposal is to increase jobs tied primarily to tourism, there are additional benefits to this approach. Tourism can be the catalyst for economic development in other sectors of the economy by bringing in visitors who then open or expand business or industry in the area.

Competition for tourism dollars is increasing. Gatlinburg, TN, has recently added 6 new attractions, Myrtle Beach, SC, has added 16 new attractions, and Chattanooga, TN, is opening a multimillion-dollar aquarium.

We know that Tennessee earns $15 to North Carolina's $1 in tourism-generated in-

come because it capitalizes on the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Gatlinburg, Cades Cove, and many other park facilities on the Tennessee side are responsible for much of their State's economic growth. Tennessee uses the park as an engine to drive economic growth. North Carolina has not had the capital investment to attract additional tourism revenue.

We are blessed with the most beautiful region in the world, but while more than 14 million visitors per year come into western North Carolina on the Blue Ridge Parkway, many of them do not consider us a destination, nor do they spend sufficient time in our region to boost the local economy.

On average, each visitor on the Blue Ridge Parkway spends only a fraction of a day with us. The majority pass through for other destinations.

Clearly, our region's goal must be to entice more of these visitors to stay longer. Currently, most of our local and State efforts are directed to that end, but they need to be supplemented and coordinated.

The triangle magnet plan is designed to augment local and State efforts to attract and keep more tourism dollars by developing Federal resources in the area.

We have three principal Federal assets in the region: the Blue Ridge Parkway; more than 1 million acres of U.S. Forest Service lands, and the majority of the Great Smoky Mountain National Park's land area.

We understand the need to construct the Blue Ridge Parkway Headquarters outside of Asheville in Buncombe County. The Priority Councils of Buncombe, Transylvania, and Jackson counties recommended it, the Blue Ridge Parkway Council and Superintendent of the Blue Ridge Parkway have requested it, and land was acquired for it by Congress in 1986.

I recommend we expand the plan from only basic headquarters building, to a headquarters and visitor's center that will present the assets of our region, possible through an IMAX Cinema presentation of the attractions in each county.

The Blue Ridge Parkway and Visitor's Center then becomes a magnet for our region.

For some time, I have been working with the U.S. Forest Service and the Cradle of Forestry in America Interpretive Association to augment the present plan in a modest way. I recommend that we expand our activities and re-visit the original 1968 Cradle plan that included utilization of the 8,000 acres of forest used by Gifford Pinchot in his pioneering forestry studies nearly 100 years ago.

The original Cradle plan called for an expenditure of $8.7 million. That has been increased to $12,000,000 to adjust for inflation. Our goal is to create a world-class education exhibit that teaches the wise use of our natural resources and interprets the history of modern resource management in the region, going back to the founding of modern silviculture by Mr. Pinchot.

The expansion of the Cradle of Forestry increases its draw as a magnet for the area.

The third leg of the Magnet Triangle is to move the Oconoluftee Visitor Center in the Great Smoky Mountain National Park to the front burner. This center will focus on the rich heritage of our families and the communities they built. It will be combined with other park activities and improvements.

This center was promised by the Federal Government to our people nearly 60 years ago when the Great Smoky Mountains National Park was established.

It is our objective to see that the three legs of this Magnet Triangle are developed in such a way that each serves as a window on the entire region. Each of these projects are unique, creating a desire for visitors to see the others, as well as the dozens of other attractions in Western North Carolina.

The objective of this Magnet Triangle is to, over the next 5 years, help double the economic benefits of tourism to the region, and increase the present $1 billion in tourism business to more than $2 billion by the turn of the century. This ambitious goal can be accomplished by increasing the average stay of the present 14 million visitors by 1 day, enticing one-third of those 14 million visitors to stay an additional 2½ days, or by doubling the present number of visitors.

Success will require a little bit of each.

We currently have $1 billion in annual tourism revenue in western North Carolina. If all tourism revenue in western North Carolina came from Parkway travelers, the average stay of each tourist would be the equivalent of only eight-tenths of 1 day. We know the average stay is actually much less.

A North Carolina State University study shows that if tourism dollars are doubled, related tourism job growth will increase between 30 to 50 percent. Doubled tourist dollars will increase the present 22,730 tourism jobs to more than 33,000 based on a 40 percent job gain. These 10,000 new jobs for the region may be supplemented by other jobs in manufacturing if longer stays by visitors inspire them to make business investments in the region. It has been said that tourism is the ambassador of economic development. There is much more at stake here than tourism.

Creating 10,000 new jobs in western North Carolina will take the continued support and participation of many community and business leaders across the region. The plan calls for some $50,000,000 in Federal appropriated improvements to the three magnets.

Parkway Headquarters and Visitor Center	$14,102,000
Cradle of Forestry	12,000,000
Oconoluftee Visitor Center	11,178,000
Facility Expansion and Upgrading	12,720,000

This plan is possible. In 1991, I proposed a 10-year $50,000,000 plan for the Veterans Administration Medical Center at Oteen is moving on schedule with the first phase, a 120-bed nursing center, now under construction. And we saved the jobs at the Climatic Data Center in Asheville by winning approval of some $30,000,000 for construction of the new Federal building which is nearing completion. The building is expected to open this summer.

We are committed to the Magnet Triangle goal and are dedicated to accomplishing it on a regional basis, with the effort and cooperation of everyone on the region.

CONGRESSIONAL FIELD HEARING ON CRIME

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to report to my colleagues on a special congressional field hearing that took place in Raleigh, NC, on April 11, 1994.

The field hearing was conducted under the auspices of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary and Related Agencies and focused on the topics of crime, crime prevention and law enforcement. I am grateful to Chairman NEAL SMITH for authorizing the hearing and to my colleague and fellow-member of the subcommittee, JIM MORAN, for traveling to North Carolina to help conduct the hearing.

Representative MORAN and I received testimony from three panels of expert witnesses on the topics of youth and crime, law enforcement, and innovations. In addition to the panels of experts, North Carolina Governor Jim Hunt and North Carolina Attorney General Mike Easley appeared as independent witnesses.

The most riveting testimony of the day came from the four teenagers who opened the hearing, two from local high schools and two from a State detention center.

Jason Otey of Garner High School and Kathy Oates of Millbrook High School were members of a teenage focus group constituted after a tragic shooting at one of my district's high schools. They told of the troubling level of violence in our schools and of the alarming number of young people coming to school or school activities with weapons. They reported favorably on having police officers accessible in the schools and on peer mediation programs where students are trained to help other students resolve conflicts without violence.

Two other teenagers talked to the subcommittee only as Kwame and Israel, because they and their parents had given informed consent to come from juvenile detention and give us the view of youth in trouble with the law. Brought to our hearing by juvenile correction officers in leg shackles, these two articulate young men gave compelling testimony that was difficult for the adult witnesses that followed to match.

Kwame silenced the audience in describing the constancy and easy availability of drugs, weapons, and opportunities to commit crime on the street and the lack of competing positive influences. "It's easier to get a gun than to get a tutor," he said.

> You are bumping right into [criminal activity]; it is in your face every time you walk out the door. But there is not a job in your face [or] a tutor in your face to say let me help you in your school * * *. There is a person that says let me sell you this gun, let me give you this crack, let's go smoke some blanks * * *. there is a way out, but it is a struggle. You have to struggle a lot harder for the way out than for the way in [to trouble]. So I just chose the way in.

After the teenagers had concluded part I of the panel on children and crime, we heard

from several expert witnesses: Dr. Mike Durfee, the founder and medical director of Wake Teen Medical Services, who provides medical and counseling services to many teenagers in juvenile detention, spoke of the need to emphasize prevention programs. Dr. Durfee had also participated in a health care forum I hosted in January, and he cited statistics about juvenile detention from the 1980's indicating that 87 percent of youngsters in juvenile detention had health care problems, and in many cases, two to three health care problems.

Reggie Flythe, a teacher and counselor at East Cary Middle School, who works with school violence reduction programs, talked about the problems of alcohol and drug abuse, teen pregnancy, suicide, rape, robbery, and assaults facing many teachers today in rural, suburban and urban settings. He pointed out the successes of student peer mediation program he has worked with in reducing in-school suspension numbers and defusing volatile situations.

Flo Stein, assistant chief for substance abuse programs of the Division of Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities, and Substance Abuse Services, described the various ways children are affected by drug abuse, starting before birth, and the subsequent link to crime by youths. She also emphasized the importance of State and local agencies involved with children communicating and working together.

Sheila Sholes-Ross, director of comprehensive adolescent health services at the University of North Carolina Center for Early Adolescence, who provides technical assistance to crime prevention programs oriented to youth around the State. She described the sporting chance after-school and summer program which has provided a second chance for first-time offenders by focusing on counseling, supervised recreational activities, and conflict resolution.

Ilene Nelson, administrator of the Guardian Ad Litem Program Services Division, Administrative Office of the Court, spoke in support of the Federal Court Appointed Special Advocate [CASA] appropriation and Victims of Crime Act funding in order to represent abused and neglected children. She also advocated changes in title IV–E of the Social Security Act which she believed would enhance the permanence of guardianship relationships and provide more flexible transition assistance from adolescence to adulthood.

Charles Dunn, director of the justice for children task force and former director of the State bureau of investigation, emphasized the importance of strengthening families and the establishment of family resource centers, and urged a congressional review of all programs, especially social, housing and educational programs, to determine their impact on families.

After the children's panel, Governor Jim Hunt gave testimony about North Carolina's crime problems and the solutions proposed by his administration and ratified by the North Carolina General Assembly during a special session completed in early April. He also emphasized the need to fully fund the Byrne Grant Program which North Carolina and other States are using effectively in partnership with local communities in developing crime-fighting initiatives.

We then convened our second panel on the subject of law enforcement. Compelling testimony was heard from a number of local law enforcement officials, including Don Whitt, sheriff of Chatham County, and Lindy Pendergrass, sheriff of Orange County. Sheriff Pendergrass told of the work his department does with the U.S. Marshals Service and how the Cooperative Agreement Program has enabled Orange County to expand its jail to serve Federal needs as well as local demands.

Alana Ennis, chief of police for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill told of the special needs of college and university communities throughout the Triangle area and of cooperative ties with Federal and other Law enforcement agencies.

Joe Schulte, the FBI agent-in-charge of the Charlotte, NC office, said that North Carolina was a microcosm of crime problems nationwide, and that hundreds of bank robberies were a particular problem, although the FBI experienced a higher-than-average or 75 percent clearance rate for these crimes. He also outlined several task forces underway with Federal, State, and local law enforcement cooperating in targeting violent crime, drug trafficking, and health insurance fraud.

Janic Cole, U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina, gave an overview of all Federal law enforcement efforts underway in North Carolina including BATF, DEA, FBI, and the IRS among other Federal agencies. She also emphasized the usefulness of multi-district task forces to bring the various puzzle pieces to the table across jurisdictional lines, and the effectiveness of tougher Federal sentencing and parole standards in keeping repeat criminals behind bars.

At the completion of the law enforcement panel, we heard testimony from the Attorney General of North Carolina, Mike Easley. Easley gave a statistical outline of crime in North Carolina, citing an alarming rise in violent crime relative to other States. He expressed support for several components of the Federal crime bill which would complement initiatives underway in North Carolina, including those passed by the recent General Assembly session, to cope with crime.

After a brief lunch break, we convened the third and final panel of expert witnesses on the subject of Innovations, both in law enforcement and in crime prevention.

Thurman Hampton, secretary of the North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety, spoke of the experimentation and innovation resulting from Federal funding of State and local initiatives to create advances in juvenile justice services, drug control and rehabilitation, prison reform, drug testing protocols, alternatives to incarceration, and improved sharing of information among criminal justice agencies. He advocated full funding of Edward Byrne Memorial Grant Program to continue such initiatives.

Frank Jackson, an assistant district attorney, told about the use of Byrne grant funds to administer the dangerous offender task force, which has produced a greater than 95 percent conviction rate and reduced significantly the time for arrest to disposition by lessening attorney case loads and providing for guaranteed court time to try cases for targeted criminals.

John Taylor, commandant of the IMPACT, or boot camp unit, testified about the operation and effectiveness of North Carolina's demonstration program, which has recently doubled in size. He cited the effectiveness of such alternatives to regular prison for first-time criminals who respond to the strict discipline and still have the capacity to change.

Master Officer Kimberly A. Halsaver, with the CLEAN unit [Community Law Enforcement Against Narcotics] of the Raleigh Police Department, told about the operation and success of Raleigh's community policing initiative. Raleigh's newest innovation is a community-based police ministation that will operate as a demonstration at two community housing projects.

Catherine Smith, executive director of the North Carolina Victim Assistance Network [VAN], related the many services provided by her organization to victims of crime and for education of the public. She pointed to the Byrne Program as the original source of funds for hiring an executive director for North Carolina VAN, and also cited drug control system improvement moneys as essential to a recent survey of compliance with North Carolina's Fair Treatment of Victims and Witnesses Act.

Annette Sheppard, director of advocacy and community education, Orange/Durham Coalition for Battered Women, told of the compelling needs in domestic violence cases and the services provided by her organization. She cited the importance of Federal funding from the Victims of Crime Act, and emphasized that needs in this area went beyond shelters to community education, training and prevention programs in schools, and court advocacy.

Mike Rieder, director of Haven House, outlined a variety of programs operated by his organization, partially funded by Federal agencies, including a runaway shelter using funds from the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, Transitional Living funds for homeless youth, Preparation for Independent Living, and youth enrichment services and family preservation. He outlined various criteria for developing programs including flexibility, treating clients as customers, and being results-oriented, community-based, and family-oriented.

Finally, Ron Hawley, chair of the working group on crime prevention applications of the North Carolina information highway, told about some exciting plans to use this new technology to assist law enforcement personnel with criminal identification and recordkeeping. He spoke of using Byrne grant money for passing information between the Administrative Office of the Courts and the State bureau of investigation, and further linking that information with the Department of Corrections and the Division of Criminal Information as well as drivers license information. The information highway would be the enabler, but it would still require a tremendous effort to coordinate the agencies to provide key information at the proper time.

The subcommittee received significant first-hand information regarding the use of Federal appropriations in its jurisdiction, and a useful hearing record has been produced for the use of the Appropriations Committee and other interested Members of Congress. I thank all of those who organized and participated in this hearing, for it will help us appropriate more intelligently for the coming year.

UNITED COMMUNITY MINISTERIES—25 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a community-based organization in my district, which has played a pivotal role in providing for the human service needs of low-income and disadvantaged families in northern Virginia.

United Community Ministries is celebrating its 25th anniversary and, at its annual gala on June 3, is honoring the angels in the community who have made its work possible.

Without broad-based community support, UCM could not have made a difference in the lives of so many of my constituents.

Twenty-five years ago, with just two employees and a few volunteers, UCM began providing food, clothing, and crisis intervention services. UCM has grown to meet the ever-increasing needs of our less fortunate friends and neighbors with important, sometimes life-saving services, such as employment assistance, job training, transitional housing, education, and youth services.

Its Bryant Early Learning Center offers quality day care for children, ages 6 weeks to 5 years, of working families and teenage parents who live in the Route 1 community. This year it won accreditation by the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs—a distinction achieved by only 1.7 percent of all non church-affiliated programs nationwide. In addition to child care, it offers early intervention services to families whose children have special needs or some handicapping condition.

UCM believes in helping people help themselves. One client expressed it this way: "Had it not been for UCM, I don't think I would have been able to survive and be with my family. UCM extended a hand to give me a lift. I don't need them to hold my hand for the rest of my life * * * but they were there for me."

Nearly 700 volunteers help staff its 11 programs and over 4,000 supporters provide financial assistance. These strong community roots are the foundation upon which UCM has flourished.

"When times are tough, UCM is there to help." That's what someone who was helped by UCM in the past has said, and it is still true today. Last year, UCM served 4,623 families; performed 260,322 emergency and advocacy services; provided 130,358 meals, 4,555 medical services and 10,368 services to children at risk; and assisted 8,189 people with housing and 1,279 people with employment and job training. UCM works to keep families together.

UCM is celebrating its 25th year because caring people have committed themselves to our community with both financial donations and volunteer talent. I join with UCM in thanking our Community of Angels for their strong support; and I join with the community in thanking UCM for its concerned and steadfast presence. It's a partnership that works.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE MULTIPLE CHOICE HEALTH CARE ACT OF 1994

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 20, 1994

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a comprehensive health care reform bill, which I call Multicare. Actually, it is the latest version of a bill I first introduced in 1984. I hope this bill will contribute to the critical debate on this issue, for besides provisions on which many of us already agree, it contains a number of unique elements.

First, Multicare provides everyone with a contribution toward the purchase of a competitive health care plan by converting the current regressive tax exemption for employer paid premiums into a voucher that varies only by age and enrollment category, not income. Using 1994 numbers, the average voucher would be at least $1,586 for a couple with children, $1,096 for a childless couple, $1,019 for one parent with children, and $550 for a single person. This provides a degree of universal coverage with no net tax increase.

In addition, Multicare provides the widest possible latitude for market forces to influence the types of health plans offered in the marketplace. It does not assume that only certain kinds of plans are best. In fact, health plans may offer any cost-sharing arrangement and any benefit package which includes at least catastrophic coverage, the most readily insurable and cost-efficient coverage. The premium contribution—or voucher—everyone receives should go a long way toward purchasing at least basic catastrophic coverage.

Without a standard benefit package, the health insurance market could be driven toward minimum benefit plans. Multicare prevents this by requiring all plans to pay a portion of premiums into a reinsurance pool, which redistributes those payments to plans as compensation for covering individuals at high risk for large health care expenses. This keeps plans covering higher-risk populations from becoming uncompetitive.

Employers could still pay for employee health benefits and deduct the cost as a business expense. In that case, the employee's voucher would cover first any premium he owed, and second any cost-sharing incurred, with any balance remaining at the end of the year rebated to him. ERISA preemption would continue, but all employer plans would have to participate in a State or Federal reinsurance pool.

Like other health reform plans, Multicare provides a big incentive for States to sever the link between welfare eligibility and health care coverage, by subsidizing care for the poor and near poor on a sliding scale according to income. Also, like many other reform plans, Multicare includes malpractice reform and administrative simplification features.

But Multicare goes beyond most other bills in the extent of its market enhancement features, including patient access to medical records, mandatory price disclosure, and publication of the average prices prevailing in a market, information on common patterns of practice, and indicators of the quality of plans and providers. It does everything possible to empower consumers with the financial incentives and comparative value information needed to make cost-conscious decisions. And it facilitates innovative fee-for-service plans in which cost-sharing is based on average prices prevailing in the market and consumers have strong incentives at the margin to use lower price providers.

Finally, Multicare proffers simplicity in the health care marketplace. With competitive health plans being marketed to all comers at uniform prices with no exclusion for pre-existing conditions and premiums varying only according to age and personal behavior factors, the marketplace should be able to secure the best price for health care coverage. There's no need for mandatory health insurance purchasing cooperatives, health alliances, or the bureaucracies that accompany them.

In short, Multicare provides access to competitive health plans for all Americans with no net tax increase and no employer or individual mandate.

Mr. Speaker, I include a summary of the bill for the RECORD.

MULTICARE: HOW EVERY AMERICAN BENEFITS

All non-elderly individuals receive a government contribution toward the purchase of a competitive health plan that offers guaranteed issue, portability, and no preexisting condition exclusions.

The government contribution toward health care plan premiums should be enough to cover most of the costs of a catastrophic plan.

All plans must offer at least catastrophic coverage, but there is no standard benefit package. So there should be a wide variety of health plans from which to choose.

Health plans may charge a single community premium rate that varies only according to family size, membership in broad age bands, and personal behavior factors clearly related to health care utilization, such as smoking.

To keep health plans from "cherry picking" and appealing only to healthy individuals by offering minimum benefit packages, plans participate in a reinsurance mechanism. Plans contribute a portion of premiums received on behalf of low-risk individuals to the applicable reinsurance pool and receive from the pool compensation for covering high-risk individuals.

Employers may continue to offer and pay for health care coverage, but their plans must participate in the applicable reinsurance pool.

Consumers have access to comparative value information on Multicare plans, the average prices of health care services prevailing in the market, and physicians' prices and patterns of practice. Plan benefit packages are compared to a national list of standard services to help consumers make choices about which plans are right for them.

So that they may easily switch providers at any time, consumers are ensured access to their own medical records.

Various medical malpractice reforms restrain liability costs and "defensive medicine," and uniform claims standards and electronic medical data standards serve to lower administrative costs.

MEDICAID RESTRUCTURED

A State Multicare Program must restructure the acute care portion of its Medicaid program. States receive federal dollars pre-

viously dedicated to acute care services under Medicaid but redistribute those funds and others to the poor and near poor to provide additional subsidies for the purchase of multicare plans.

In restructuring their Medicaid programs in this way, states make health care coverage independent of welfare eligibility, giving welfare recipients an incentive to choose work over welfare.

Plan premiums and cost-sharing for the poor and near poor may vary on a sliding scale according to income but are limited to specific ceilings.

FINANCING

Federal and state contributions toward plan premiums are generated primarily by replacing the current tax exclusion on employer paid health benefits with a voucher for all eligible individuals.

Average employees will be at least as well-off financially as they are today. Existing tax benefits are simply redistributed more fairly, while every consumer benefits from protection against catastrophic expenses, guaranteed issue, portability and the long-term effect of restraining costs throughout the entire system.