

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRANSFORMATION: HELPING THE
NEEDY BECOME NON-POOR

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. On this floor, I've often discussed the book "The Tragedy of American Compassion," where author Marvin Olasky examined over 300 years of what has worked in American social policy. His main point: You do not want to maintain the poor, you want to transform them. The goal of helping is to get them to be non-poor. You help an addict by getting them to give up their addiction. You help an alcoholic by getting them to be a recovering alcoholic. You work to transform people, because if you only maintain them, you will ruin their lives.

One of our colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. MFUME, knows more than a little bit about this kind of transformation. His life is a testimony to it. He recently announced his decision to leave this body to assume the Executive Directorship of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. His very personal journey is detailed poignantly in Courtland Milloy's excellent column from the Sunday, December 17 Washington Post. As the gentleman embarks on a very different mission of transformation, we wish him well. I submit the Post column into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Certain lessons should transcend either party or ideological lines:

[From the Washington Post, December 17, 1995.]

TRANSFORMED, MFUME LEADS BY EXAMPLE
(By Courtland Milloy)

In explaining his transformation from street dude to political leader, Kweisi Mfume talks of having had a "spiritual experience." This is not to be mistaken for a religious occasion, such as going to church. It's more akin to a spiritual emergency, or crisis, in which Mfume tried for years to change his ways but found willpower alone to be insufficient.

Mfume recalls the days when his name was Frizzell Gray, and how he and his buddies used to stand outside a liquor store in Baltimore, drinking alcohol and telling lies. On one particular night while in his early twenties, he was overpowered by a feeling of ruination, of being a man on a road to nowhere. It was in that moment of truth, he says, that he received the courage and strength, some would say grace, to start a new life.

Now that Mfume has been selected to serve as president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People much is being made of the man he became after that night on the street corner. He went on to become a radio disc jockey, a Baltimore city councilman and a member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

But Mfume's true value has little to do with his job descriptions. It is the process of

his personal change that holds the key to the transformation of the NAACP; it is the spiritual emergency of Frizzell Gray that points the way to real advancement for African Americans.

"People thought I was crazy," Mfume told Peter J. Boyer of the New Yorker magazine last year. "But that night I left that corner and prayed and asked for God's forgiveness and asked my mother to please forgive me this one time for letting her down. I had let her down—that was not the way I was raised."

"I said that if I had just one more chance, I would never, every again go back to that, and I would try to find a way to atone for it. And I cried on the floor that night on my knees. I made a very real promise to myself, to my mother and to God that night—that if I could just get to that point and get one more chance I would do everything I could do to make a difference."

Mfume had to fight to get off that corner. His former drinking buddies would not let him just walk away. He says they regularly beat him up until they decided that he was a "lost cause" and finally left him alone.

Mfume learned a most important lesson from those struggles: Sometimes you may have to take a fall to take a stand.

Among the most difficult tasks facing Mfume now is redefining the struggle for civil rights; no one seems to know for sure where to go from here. But Mfume has a pretty good idea. His story suggests that we don't have to go anywhere, that we need only stand where we are and begin to treat those around us with courtesy, kindness, justice and love.

"You are not a man because you killed somebody," Mfume said last year during a Father's Day service at St. Edwards Catholic Church in West Baltimore. "You're a man when you know how to heal somebody." As Boyer described the scene, "it was no greeting card homage to dear Dad, but, rather, call to arms in a war for cultural survival."

Some would say that Mfume won that war when he went back to school and earned a high school equivalency degree in 1968. But it was when he began taking responsibility for the children he had fathered out of wedlock that he became a real winner.

Some would say that he won when, as a disc jockey, he stopped playing jock rap music in favor of political dialogue and jazz. But more important was Mfume's newfound attitude of gratitude that had allowed him to work at the radio station as a low-paid gofer until he had learned some skills.

Mfume, now 47, has been elected to Congress five times since 1986. He has served on the powerful House Banking Committee and, in 1992, became chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

But he sacrificed a secure job to help resurrect the NAACP, an organization that, for all intents and purposes, is dead. It died the day black Americans forgot where we came from and began to act as if the modicum of success that some of us enjoy had somehow been won through personal charm and good looks instead of the struggles and sacrifice of others.

This misguided sense of self-reliance, brought on in part by a profound ignorance

of history, is probably the single most important reason black America has been brought to its knees.

To make his change, Mfume had to admit that he was spiritually bankrupt and that he needed help from a power greater than himself. That honesty paid off with a new consciousness, and his willingness to be of service to his fellow man has resulted in a new energy, insight and intuition worthy of his new name, which means "conquering son of kings."

The NAACP, like much of black America, is in the same boat that Frizzell Gray had been in. But with Mfume at the helm, there is hope that what happened to him can happen to others as well.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. MAJ. JAMES
JUSTIN HEINZLER

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize Cmd. Sgt. Maj. (Ret.) James Justin Heinzler for serving over 42 years in the Missouri Army National Guard. He served from April 22, 1952, to September 11, 1994.

Command Sergeant Major (Ret.) Heinzler's most recent service with the Missouri Army National Guard was with the 1st Battalion, 128th Field Artillery. He served in this position for his last 16 years of service. Throughout his career, he has strongly committed himself to all that is required. He has gone beyond to provide guidance and support for his fellow officers.

He has received numerous military awards throughout his career. The awards are the Army Service Ribbon, the National Defense Service Medal, the Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal with silver oak leaf cluster, the Armed Forces Reserve Medal with three 10 year devices, and the Army Commemoration Medal. He is submitted for the Meritorious Service Medal.

Command Sergeant Major (Ret.) Heinzler has not only provided faithful and dedicated service to the Missouri National Guard, but to his country as well. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on his service.

THE CLINTON DEFENSE POSTURE
WILL RATTLE OUR MILITARY
FOR YEARS TO COME

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, newspapers being delivered across the country are hitting the doorsteps of military families hard

● 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.

enough to rattle their households. The papers, radio, and the television are carrying President Clinton's message that it is no longer worth the trouble to serve your country in the armed services.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has made the difficult choices that will take this Government to a balanced budget by 2002, while at the same time re-establishing the security of our Nation. Just this week, we sent the President H.R. 1530, a Defense authorization bill that restores a reasonable quality of life for our military, sustains basic military readiness, reinvigorates the Pentagon's efforts to modernize weapons, and makes a downpayment on our effort to make the Pentagon run more like a business.

The bill gets the Pentagon back into the business of defending our country, without a skyrocketing Defense budget.

Despite the fact that this bill includes a long overdue 2.4-percent pay raise, a 5.2-percent increase in housing allowance for our troops and their families, and \$35 million to educate children of military personnel, the newspapers now tell us that President Clinton will veto that bill.

Any sergeant, colonel, admiral, or general will tell you that their most important asset is a well-trained and dedicated man or woman. Unfortunately, because of a declining quality of military life and number of broken Government promises, the rank and file soldier and sailor is becoming an increasingly rare asset.

We have American soldiers and sailors trying to feed their families with food stamps. Some of the kids that the President is sending into harm's way in Bosnia are leaving their families behind in housing that is substandard. Clinton's historic 1993 tax hike not only forced more taxes on hard-working middle-income American families—despite a promise to actually cut taxes—it also delayed COLA's for military retirees by three-quarters of a year—breaking a promise that was made to many of those men and women while they served this country overseas and at war. The Defense authorization bill fixes the Clinton COLA grab.

The veterans, retirees, and active military families that I talk to every day tell me that they don't trust the Government anymore. Fully half of this country's new military enlistees come from military families, and those families are beginning to tell their kids that it just isn't worth it. As a 20-year veteran of the U.S. Navy, I dedicated my life and service to this country in exchange for a few promises of pay and benefits. If the Government, led by President Clinton, continues to break those promises and deny a reasonable quality of life, our military families will find it even more difficult to dedicate themselves to military service.

Mr. Speaker, what the President is doing is wrong. I challenge him to change his ways and demonstrate a commitment to our men and women in uniform. At a time when he plans to send over 32,000 troops into war-torn Bosnia, enactment of the Defense authorization bill is a good place to start.

HONORING THE LUDLOW BOY'S SOCCER TEAM'S STATE CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to Coach Tony Goncalves and his Ludlow High School Lions boy's soccer team for their outstanding 4-to-1 victory over Somerville High School to win the Massachusetts Boys Division I State Soccer Championship. The impressive performance by the Lions in the championship capped off a tremendous 17-2-3 campaign for Coach Goncalves and his team and earned them a spot in the top 25 of the Umbro Boys High School Soccer Poll. Over the years Ludlow High School has enjoyed a rich tradition of soccer excellence and this team will certainly be remembered as one of the best in Ludlow High School history.

I would also like to recognize Coach Goncalves' assistants Jack Vilaca, Greg Kolodziej, and Jon Cavallo for their outstanding efforts throughout this championship season. It is the unsung efforts of people like these that often make championships possible, and Ludlow was quite fortunate to be assisted by such able individuals.

Finally, I would like to recognize the players who delivered this spectacular victory: Seniors, Bob Nascimento, Eddie Pires, Rich Huff, John Summerlin, Aaron Majka, Carlos Gomes, Adriano Dos Santos, Wesley Manuel, Chris Goncalves, Mark Eusebio, Jeff Leandro, Juniors, Robe Gomes, Matthew Goncalves, Adriano Genovevo, Danny Elias, Jason Alves, Ryan Lemek, Sophomores, Alex Carvalho, Dave Garcia, Jon Haluch, and Justin Larame.

The achievements of these young men are a tremendous source of pride for not only the town of Ludlow but for the entire Second Congressional District. I am honored to represent such outstanding individuals and I join with the citizens of the Second Congressional District in offering a most heartfelt congratulations. I would also like to wish the returning players the best of luck as they embark on their title defense next season.

HONORING A MCCREARY COUNTY LEADER

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my good friend Napoleon "Nip" Perkins who recently passed away just shy of his 90th birthday. My family and thousands of others throughout McCreary County and southern Kentucky are deeply saddened by this tragic loss.

Our area has lost a topnotch businessman, an inspiring civic and community volunteer, a political leader, and a good friend. He helped everyone he could and always was willing to sacrifice his time for others.

Nip Perkins was a retired land agent and an engineer for Stearns Coal and Lumber Co., where his high energy, friendly style is what always stood out most.

Politics was where Nip was most influential. Serving as a field representative for my two predecessors in Congress, Congressmen Eugene Siler and Tim Lee Carter, he has been a recognized leader for more than seven decades.

Nip was also a great confidant for me, always keeping his ear close to the ground and my best interests at heart. He was wise, informed, and always positive.

Nip served six terms as the McCreary County Republican chairman and was the first inductee of the Fifth Congressional District Lincoln Club Hall of Fame for his honorable and dedicated service.

I could not think of a better person to be our first Hall of Fame inductee.

In addition to his political service, Nip was a former McCreary County master commissioner and served on the County Selective Service Board. He was a 65-year member of the Orie S. Ware Lodge in Stearns and the 32d degree Mason in the Valley of Covington.

My heart goes out to Nip's wife of 62 years, Evelyn Anderson Perkins, and his wonderful family. He was a great friend and a good man, and he will be sorely missed.

ADDRESS BY CAPT. MARTY SMITH

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, On October 14, 1995, Capt. Marty Smith, commander of the U.S.S. *Jefferson City* addressed the annual Mid-Missouri Navy League Navy Birthday Ball in Jefferson City, MO. This speech is set forth herein:

SPEECH GIVEN AT THE 1995 MID-MISSOURI NAVY LEAGUE NAVY BIRTHDAY BALL HELD ON OCTOBER 14, 1995 IN JEFFERSON CITY, MO

Congressman and Mrs. Skelton, President Green, members of the mid-Missouri Navy League, and citizens of Jefferson City, it's a great honor and privilege for me to speak to you all tonight in the ship's namesake city. I, along with my eleven shipmates, have had a wonderful time since we arrived here Friday. Crew members who have been here before have told us of the friendliness and hospitality of the great state of "Missoura", and we are finding it all true. Everyone has been wonderful, starting with Herman Smith and Petty Officer Wall who picked us up in St. Louis early Friday morning, to the host families who have gone out of their way to make us feel like adopted sons.

Well, we missed you all last year, because as most of you know, last October, the ship was in the middle of a Western Pacific deployment, having all sorts of adventures in the Sea of Japan with the Kitty Hawk Battle Group. And yes, next year you'll have toast us in absentia because we'll once again be deployed, this time with the Karl Vinson Battle Group in the Arabian Gulf. Perhaps you'll be able to delay the festivities for awhile until we return in mid-November!

I don't get paid to make speeches, but if there's one thing about public speaking I do

know, it's that the hardest audience in the world is a bunch of submariners and submariner supporters sitting around waiting for the speech to end so they can resume the party. So let me just fill you in briefly on what we've been up to in the past year, and what our future schedule holds.

We got back from our maiden deployment last year a couple of days before Christmas, and what a deployment it was *** So unique, with so many challenges, for such a relatively inexperienced crew. I can't possibly convey to you how proud I was of the crew as they put in 110 percent every single day for six months away from their friends and loved ones. They did such a good job, as a matter of fact, that as Congressman Skelton can tell you, I was asked to give a debrief of the deployment to the top admiral of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Boorda. This kind of recognition, by the way, only happens to a very few ships every year. In addition, the crew was awarded a total of 4 Navy Commendation Medals, 25 Navy Achievement Medals, and over 50 Flag Officer Letters of Commendation. I can't give you the details of our deployment, obviously, for security reasons, but JFC, as we're known in message traffic shorthand, accomplished many unique firsts, achieved innovative and significant tactical breakthroughs across the spectrum of submarine operations, including anti-diesel ASW, tomahawk strike warfare, and very shallow water operations. We visited Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong for Thanksgiving, and Pearl Harbor on the way home. The crew was underway, underwater, for over 78 percent of the six months, enjoyed great liberty visits, and even found time for a humanitarian project at an orphanage in Singapore. The ship steamed more than 40,000 miles on nuclear power with no major equipment problems, which was especially notable since we had only a single ten-day maintenance period over the entire six months. The contributions Jefferson City made to the Kitty Hawk battle group were real and played a major role in helping Admiral Blair, the Battle Group Commander, to complete his assigned mission—to provide a stabilizing and influential presence in the Western Pacific after the dictator of North Korea, Kim Il Sung, died in early July 1994, with no apparent successor. As you may remember, there was more than a little concern because of the leadership void and the vast military forces which North Korea has poised just north of the 39th parallel. So Jefferson City and the rest of the Battle Group remained tethered to the South Korean peninsula, instead of going to the beautiful Arabian gulf, and we followed the traditions of several famous WWII submarines, such as CDR Mush Morton and Electrician's Mate Herman Smith seated in the back there, in seeing just how yellow the yellow sea can be. In recognition of our efforts, Jefferson City received the first of many unit commendations she will undoubtedly receive during her 30-year career, a Meritorious Unit Commendation, which is represented by a ribbon you see on our chests tonight and a pennant which we fly proudly from our sail in port.

Anyway, I or any of the crew here tonight will be glad to answer your questions about the ship or the deployment. We also brought the ship's photo album here, which you're welcome to take a look at. It's too bad that the old COB, Master Chief Harden, isn't here to explain a couple of those pictures!

Since the deployment, Jefferson City has been tasked with several local operations in the Southern California area with other

ships and submarines, some torpedo testing in the Pacific Northwest on a couple of trips, a major tactical inspection which we did very well on, and had the distinct pleasure of hosting some of you for a VIP cruise last June. In August we started a 3-month shipyard modernization period in San Diego. Right now the boat is in drydock, getting many improvements, which will make us quieter, faster, and deadlier to our potential adversaries. When Jefferson City returns to sea in late-November, we will head up to Alaska for sound trials and then return to port just before Christmas following a big engineering inspection. In February and March we conduct training exercises with our new boss, the Karl Vinson Battle Group, and then start our second six month deployment in mid-May. And for those of you waiting to visit the ship until we move to Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, that date has been firmed up and is now November of 1997.

You may have also heard about another VIP cruise we hosted, this one for Mr. George Will, the national political columnist who writes in Newsweek and over 250 news papers nationwide. After his cruise he wrote a very impressive essay for Newsweek magazine which resulted in several nice accolades for the ship. I'd like to quote the beginning paragraph from Mr. Will's essay for those of you who didn't get a chance to read it. The back cover page of the Sept 3 issue of Newsweek begins thusly: "Aboard the USS Jefferson City (SSN 759) underway off San Diego—Submariners say there are just two kinds of ships: submarines and targets. Feel free to disagree, but smile when you do, because the 140-man crew of this fast attack nuclear submarine is armed. It carries torpedoes, Harpoon anti-ship missiles for distances torpedoes cannot travel—far over the horizon—and Tomahawk land-attack cruise missiles. (Two submarines of this class, one in the Red Sea and one in the Mediterranean, launched a total of 12 tomahawks during the Gulf War). The Jefferson City can cruise quietly at above 25 kts submerged and its acoustic detection systems can find quiet adversaries. The psalmist didn't know the half of it when he wrote that they who go down to the sea in ships see "wonders in the deep." This ship is a wonder of tightly packed technology. End quote. Mr. Will then goes on with an insightful and accurate discussion of the contribution of the nuclear submarine to modern warfare and why the United States needs to keep on the leading edge of undersea warfare, in front of the Russian submarine force and other countries with modern submarines.

What Mr. Will doesn't discuss is the sailor or officer, the Petty Officer Campbell's and the LT Smiths, standing watch, day and night, 6 hrs on and a quick 12 hrs off, for weeks on end away from his friends and loved ones, deep under the ocean's surface. These men and women are something that no country can buy from a Russian army-navy surplus store, and is, and will always be, the difference between the United States Navy and all other navies. These people are why we are here, celebrating the 220th birthday of the greatest navy in the world. Our top boss of the Pacific Fleet, Admiral Zlatoper, who toured our ship last summer in Japan, sent out the following message this past week: quote "The Navy's 220th birthday finds the Pacific Fleet emerging from its restructuring as a lean formidable, combat ready force with a strong commitment of quality of life for our people. America needs its navy more than ever as we contend with regional conflicts, proliferation of weapons, and political

uncertainties around the globe. Today the Navy-Marine Corps team is forward-deployed, first on the scene, and flexible enough to respond to almost every contingency from the sea. With fewer U.S. bases overseas and uncertain access to bases of the nations, the Navy will be the primary guarantor of American interests in the Pacific for decades. End quote."

And the Navy needs your continued support as Navy League members, educating the public on the need to maintain a strong maritime armed service and helping to recruit quality people like the officers and crew you see here tonight. I was on a Trident ballistic missile submarine on alert patrol in the Northern Pacific when the Soviet Union dissolved, ending the Cold War. Yet there was no celebration or overt glee—just the feeling that our mission had changed in ways we didn't quite know yet. And today, one gulf war later, the world is not a safer, more stable place for you and your children, but more unstable than ever before. And the United States is the only country which will make the right things happen, when we choose, because our Navy, first on the scene, has the "right stuff." As George Will concludes his Jefferson City essay, "And the history of this century teaches a grim truth: When at peace the nation should always assume that it may be living in what subsequent historians will call "interwar years."

But now I'd like to conclude my remarks so that we can all enjoy these interwar years. (Pause) And I'd like to especially thank Melody Green for her dedicated work as President of the Navy League in maintaining what is undoubtedly one of the strongest and closest ties between a ship and her namesake city. I know that this visit is one of the highlights of my naval career, and I think it is for my crew here tonight as well. Knowing how much you support us, and your warmth and friendship, makes us work a little bit harder every day and puts a proud gleam in our eyes when we say we are on the USS JEFFERSON CITY. On behalf of my crew, I would like to express our heartfelt appreciation for your wonderful hospitality, and your work as members of the Navy League in keeping the United States Navy such that generations to come can continue to enjoy such birthday celebrations as we enjoy tonight. Thank you all very much.

POTABLE DRINKING WATER FOR PARTS OF MONTANA

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today there are folks who are forced several times each week to travel miles to fill tanks and barrels with pure water to drink. The situation I refer to is not somewhere in a Third World country, but—remarkably—in Valley County, Montana. Because groundwater supplies in this part of Montana are not potable, the residents of these communities drive in their trucks for hours each week, both summer and winter, to deliver this water to hundreds of people.

The irony of this situation is that these folks live adjacent to one of the largest bodies of water ever developed by the Federal Government in the West, the Fort Peck Reservoir, which stores over 18 million acre feet. The bill

I am introducing today will authorize the development of a rural municipal water system for the residents of the Fort Peck Rural Water District. This much needed project will tap into Fort Peck Reservoir to construct a safe and reliable drinking system for both municipal and agricultural purposes. When this project is completed, it will also enable this area of Montana to attract economic development, which up to now has been stifled due to the unavailability of water.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Reclamation has completed a needs assessment and feasibility study on this project, and I am proposing its construction through a partnership arrangement where State and local interests will contribute 20 percent of the cost toward its completion. The feasibility study estimates that the total Federal expenditure will be less than \$6 million. If we can afford to spend much more than this to help undeveloped nations all around the world to develop safe supplies of drinking water, we can certainly afford to do this for folks living in Montana.

A TRIBUTE TO CARL L. "PAT"
PATRICK

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a real gentleman of Georgia. Carl L. "Pat" Patrick of Columbus is a man who is known and admired greatly by industrial, civic and community leaders throughout our State. He is the founder and chairman of Carmike Cinemas Inc. which operates movie theaters throughout Georgia and the South.

And while he is known best for his work in the cinema industry, it is his generosity and selfless charitable acts for which I commend this man. Pat and his wife, Frances, have long been supporters of and contributors to Columbus community causes such as Columbus Technical Institute, the Columbus Museum and the John B. Amos Community Cancer Center at the Medical Center.

Pat's most recent contribution, however, is one of his greatest. He donated \$1 million to St. Francis Hospital of Columbus—the hospital where his son was born during the facility's first year of operation in 1950. St. Francis now specializes in cardiac medicine and the Patricks want to ensure the hospital is able to purchase the necessary equipment to keep pace with the strides being made in this field.

On a more personal note, when Julie and I received our Christmas card from Pat and Frances this year, we had a most pleasant and touching surprise awaiting us. In addition to the wonderful holiday message, the card informed us that a contribution had been made by the Patricks in our name to the Will Rogers Memorial Fund.

Again, I commend Carl L. "Pat" Patrick. He has touched the lives of so many people in so many ways with his warmth and generosity. Thank you Pat and Frances.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SINGLE-ASSET BANKRUPTCY

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to address an injustice that exists within title 11 of the United States Code regarding single asset bankruptcies.

This injustice stems back to the 103d Congress when an 11th hour decision placed an arbitrary \$4 million ceiling on the single asset provisions of the bankruptcy reform bill. The affect has been to render investors helpless in foreclosures on single assets valued over \$4 million.

To rectify this problem, my bill eliminates the \$4 million ceiling, thereby allowing creditors the ability to recover their losses. Under the current law, chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code becomes a legal shield for the debtor. Upon the investor's filing to foreclose, the debtor preemptively files for chapter 11 protection which postpones foreclosure indefinitely.

While in chapter 11, the debtor continues to collect the rents on the commercial asset. However, the commercial property typically is left to deteriorate and the property taxes go unpaid. When the investor finally recovers the property through the delayed foreclosure, they owe an enormous amount in back taxes, they receive a commercial property left in deterioration which has a lower rent value and resale value, and meanwhile, the rent for all the months or years they were trying to retain the property went to an uncollectible debtor.

My bill does not leave the debtor without protection. First, it is only as a last resort when the investor brings a foreclosure against a debtor. This usually is after all other efforts to reconcile delinquent mortgage payments are unsuccessful. Second, the debtor retains up to 90 days to reorganize under chapter 11. It should be noted, however, that single asset reorganizations are typically a false hope since the owner of a single asset does not have other properties from which he can recapitalize his business.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, my bill helps all American families by making their investments more secure and more valuable. The hard-working American families who depend on their life insurance policies and who have paid for years into their pensions will save millions in reduced costs. My bill protects the "little guy" from being plagued with years of litigation while the commercial property owner continues to collect the rent to line his own pockets.

WHAT'S WRONG ON THE RIGHT

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the following article from the "Outlook" section of the December 17 Washington Post. The author, noted Boston University economics professor

Glenn Loury, has a valuable lesson for both conservatives and liberals alike. Though condemning the paternalism of the left, which has helped exacerbate the awful conditions of our inner cities, he observes that "a conservatism worthy of majority support would not view with cool indifference a circumstance in which so many Americans suffer such unspeakable degradation." I enter the full article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and urge all my colleagues to read it.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 17, 1995]

WHAT'S WRONG ON THE RIGHT: SECOND
THOUGHTS OF A BLACK CONSERVATIVE

(By Glenn C. Loury)

The recently deceased British writer Kingsley Amis, celebrated by conservatives on both sides of the Atlantic, was never comfortable with political movements nor those who champion them. In the poem, "After Goliath," Amis wryly noted that "*** even the straightest of issues looks pretty oblique when a movement turns into a clique." As a black American who nevertheless came to call himself a conservative, I have recently watched with growing dismay how this "movement" has dealt with racial issues, and have thereby gained new appreciation for the wisdom of Kingsley Amis.

Looking back, three factors seem to have been paramount in my move toward conservatism. The first attraction was that it was not liberalism. By the end of the 1970s I had become disgusted with the patronizing relativism that white liberals seemed inevitably to bring to questions of race. Wearing their guilt on their sleeves, they were all too ready to "understand" the shortcomings and inadequacies of blacks. Obsessed with the wrongs inflicted by society on the supposedly hapless victims of discrimination, they were blinded to the desperate need of these "victims" to take responsibility for their own lives. They therefore supported and reinforced what I saw as the debilitating tendency among many blacks to avoid facing squarely the real challenges of the post-civil rights era.

There was hypocrisy in this liberal stance. Though advocating racial equality, liberals did not treat blacks and whites as moral equals: Historic oppression precluded blacks from being held accountable for their actions; whites, suffering no such disability, warranted criticism by liberals because they could choose to stop being racists, or to become more generous and compassionate. In effect, the liberals were saying that whites were powerful moral agents, and blacks were pitiable subjects shaped by forces outside themselves. This smacked of racism, and I hated it.

The second attraction of conservatism was that, on the range of policy issues with which I was most concerned, it made intellectual sense to me. As a professional economist, I have always been sensitive to the deep incentive problems that plague the liberal social vision. High taxes, heavy-handed regulation, bureaucratic service provision and expansive social benefits tend to reduce economic growth and foster dependence. Some social programs would always be necessary, of course, but liberals seemed too little concerned about the costs of their ambitions. Moreover, again in the late 1970s, I watched workers in the auto and steel industries price themselves out of their burgeoning international markets while liberals cheered them on. Public employee unions often seemed to be feathering their own nests, with little apparent concern for the

public interest, and with the broad support of the Democratic Party.

Finally, the cultural assumptions of social conservatism seemed like an appealing alternative to those of liberal secularism. In no small part, my move to the political right has been a move away from the people on the left who seemed unremittingly hostile to any evocation of spiritual commitments in the public square. With the family disintegrating before our very eyes, liberals could only heap ridicule on "traditional values" advocates who expressed alarm. In the face of over 1 million abortions per year, liberals could find no place in their political lexicon for a discourse on the morality of this course of action in our society.

For all of these reasons, I was drawn to embrace conservatism. Yet now, some years later, these same beliefs are provoking my growing discomfort with the conservative ascendancy, particularly on the issue of race.

It is certainly true that liberals adopted a condescending posture on racial questions. Their methods—such as strong affirmative action leading to racial double standards, or an excessive concern to avoid "blaming the victim" that precluded acknowledgment of social pathology—were definitely flawed. But there was never much doubt that liberals sought to heal the rift in our body politic engendered by the institution of chattel slavery. The liberal goal of securing racial justice in America was, and is, a noble one. I cannot say with confidence that conservatism as a movement is much concerned to pursue that goal.

This is not the old canard that conservatives are inherently racists because believers in states' rights opposed the civil rights revolution. Rather, my concern is that too many conservatives seem blind to the need to constructively engage the problem of racial division. Yet the success of any governing coalition, whether it is the conservative "revolution" or something else, will ultimately depend largely on how well it deals with a problem that cannot be wished away.

It is now fashionable for conservatives to attribute the catastrophe unfolding in the urban ghettos to some combination of mistaken liberal policies and the deficiencies of inner-city residents themselves. Yet a conservatism worthy of majority support in this country would not view with cool indifference a circumstance in which so many Americans suffer such unspeakable degradation, from lack of shelter, health care, education, nutrition or any hope for a better life. The efforts of various conservative writers to attribute this deep-seated, complex problem to the disincentives of federal assistance programs, the so-called pathologies of black culture, or the cognitive disabilities of certain group of Americans, seem designed mainly to rationalize their disengagement from it.

Where is their passion? Where is their moral outrage? In light of the scale of the tragedy unfolding in cities across the land, the narrowly academic and highly ideological posture of conservative intellectuals—who are in effect saying, "Too bad about what's happening, but we told you liberals so"—is simply breathtaking. Is it paranoia for a black to wonder whether this posture toward urban problems would be embraced with such confidence among conservatives if those inner-city hell holes were populated by whites?

Conservatives should view with skepticism the notion that economic or biological factors ultimately underlie behavioral problems like those involving sexuality and parenting. After all, behaviors of this sort reflect peo-

ple's basic understandings of what gives meaning to their lives. The idea that the mysteries of human motivation within the family are susceptible to calculated intervention by the state would have been rejected out of hand by a classical conservative like Edmund Burke, to whom the phrase "conservative revolution" would have seemed an oxymoron. Yet, today's conservative revolutionaries would have us believe that only by dismantling the federal establishment can the deepest social problems of American society be solved.

I doubt that the most clever of economists (and I know some smart ones) could design an incentive scheme to insure responsible parenting that would work as effectively as the broad acceptance among parents of the idea that they are God's stewards in the lives of their children. The best pregnancy deterrent may be to inculcate in the heart of each adolescent the belief that, as Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "Your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit . . . Therefore, honor God with your body."

There is also wisdom in the New Testament for those conservatives who see in America's black communities another country, separate from and unrelated to the one in which they live, inhabited by a different kind of man. In Acts 10:34-35 one finds Simon Peter saying, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." The point here is that the problems observed in the darkest corners of our society are human problems, not racial ones. The fault-line between civilization and barbarism runs down the middle of every human heart, and the grace of God remains available to provide a way out for all who would seek it. While we reject moral relativism, and so stand ready to judge between better and worse ways of living, we should strive to avoid self-righteousness. We certainly should eschew completely any notions of collective, racial condemnation or virtue.

Unfortunately, some conservatives now write about "the problem of black crime," about "the crisis of black illegitimacy," about "the threat of black social pathology." But what has race to do with these problems, per se? I am, of course, keenly aware that the rates of crime and illegitimacy among blacks are substantially higher than among whites. I am merely observing that neither the causes nor the cures of such maladies depend on one's skin color. Which group of Americans are innocent and which are the culprits in these affairs? These are problems of sin, not of skin. I would have thought that religious conservatives would be the ones objecting most strenuously and insistently to this lapse of social virtue on the right. Sadly, they have not been.

It is true that, in the recent history of American social policy, it was liberals who "played the race card" by arguing that the disadvantages of blacks justified race-based remedies. Some liberals even claimed that the self-esteem of black youngsters could not be secured without rewriting history so as to provide minorities with equal time. But, while these liberal efforts are largely discredited, we now find conservatives, with the political initiative in hand, acting to maintain and reinforce this inordinate focus on race.

Thus, when conservatives talk of the "culture of poverty" in reference to urban black communities they miss the deeper truth—that America's real problem is its reluctance to affirm those common moral standards

that could guide the behavior of blacks and whites alike. Similarly, one conservative critic now declares victory over Afrocentrists by noting that the latter's search for a black Shakespeare has ended in failure. But surely the larger point is that such a search was unnecessary all along, because Shakespeare belongs every bit as much to the ghetto-dwelling black youngster as he does to the offspring of middle-class whites. Why are conservatives, who make so much of the importance of being "color-blind" in public policy, not the first to stress this point?

There is hypocrisy in this conservative stance. Though advocating race neutrality, conservatives do not treat blacks and whites as moral equals. Critics of affirmative action often invoke Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who in 1963 said famously, "I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character." It is a corollary of this principle that, when gazing upon Americans who are welfare mothers, juvenile felons or the cognitively deficient, we should see human beings with problems, not races of people plagued by pathology. Yet, as I have argued, conservatives do not always do so.

Perhaps more significantly, this selective remembrance of Dr. King's moral leadership diminishes the challenge which his life, and death, should pose for all Americans. Two years before his most famous speech, in a commencement address at Lincoln University, Dr. King made a less well known reference to his dream for our nation:

"One of the first things we notice in this dream is an amazing universalism. It does not say some men [are created equal], but it says all men. It does not say all white men, but it says all men, which includes black men. . . . And there is another thing we see in this dream that ultimately distinguishes democracy and our form of government from all of the totalitarian regimes that emerge in history. It says that each individual has certain basic rights that are neither conferred by nor derived from the state. To discover where they come from, it is necessary to move back behind the dim mist of eternity, for they are God-given. Very seldom, if ever, in the history of the world has a sociopolitical document expressed in such profoundly eloquent and unequivocal language the dignity and the worth of the human personality. The American dream reminds us that every man is heir to the legacy of worthiness."

This too would be a worthy dream for conservatism: to insure that every American can lay claim to his most precious civic inheritance—a legacy of worthiness. To secure it, conservatives must learn not to look upon poor urban blacks as the Others—aliens apart from and a threat to our civilization. Instead, these Americans should be seen as inseparably interwoven constituents of the larger social fabric.

MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT CLINTON: END IMPASSE, BALANCE THE BUDGET

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday December 20, 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues this editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on December 20, 1995:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Dec. 20, 1995]

MESSAGE TO CLINTON GROWS LOUDER: END IMPASSE, BALANCE THE BUDGET

Wall Street may have accomplished something that the public—which, in opinion surveys, tilted toward President Clinton's position on a balanced budget—had failed to do. Traders and investors sent a strong message to Washington about the urgency of ending the impasse over a balanced budget.

The message came in the form of a decline in the value of stocks and bonds as the street expressed its concern over the collapse of budget negotiations between the White House and GOP congressional leaders. By the end of the day Monday, the White House was setting a new round of talks in motion.

For such indications of urgency have come from the general public. Clinton's approval rating has risen to a two-year high since he began characterizing the GOP budget as an act of cruelty against the poor, the sick and the elderly. Republicans, in effect, have been punished in the polls for trying to keep their 1994 campaign promise to balance the budget.

Not all Democrats, however, were buying the White House line. On the same day that Wall Street roared its disapproval of the impasse, a bipartisan group presented a position paper at a symposium in Minneapolis. The group included former office-holders Paul Tsongas, Richard Lamm, Gary Hart, Tim Penny, Lowell Weicker and John Anderson. All but Weicker and Anderson are Democrats.

Their statement included this "core principle": "We can no longer stay the course, spending more than we earn." They said, "We are maintaining our standard of living by borrowing from our children." They urged that the nation's leaders commit to a policy of economic stability, which means no inflation and no federal budget deficits "to soak up an already inadequate national savings pool."

Sacrifice will be necessary, they said. Among other things, Social Security and Medicare must be reformed to prepare them for the retirement of large numbers of baby boomers after the turn of the century. Clinton has described even the modest adjustments the Republicans have proposed as draconian. He simply must compromise on Medicare and Medicaid, bring himself to take the decisive actions that moderates in his own party are increasingly coming to consider necessary.

Another message was leveled at Washington Tuesday morning. In a "bipartisan appeal from business leaders," published as a newspaper advertisement and carrying the names of more than 90 business executives, Clinton and Congress were urged to remember that the health of the economy rests on the ability of the government to agree on a credible plan.

Among other things, the business leaders said, it's time to accept the economic projections from the Congressional Budget Office—projections that Clinton has opposed because they would allow less spending than the more optimistic White House figures. The bipartisan business leaders also said long-term entitlement spending should be "on the table" for reconsideration, as should any proposed tax cuts.

Little by little, Clinton's attempts to exploit the situation for political gain are being called to account by members of his own party. Something has been needed to neutralize his tacky insistence that the struggle has been between an enlightened,

compassionate White House and an evil gang of GOP extremists. Some Democrats have helped set the record straight by adding their voices to bipartisan messages.

LEGISLATION DEPLORING HOLOCAUST DENIERS AND COMMENDING THE HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM, HOUSE RESOLUTION 316

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution, House Resolution 316, on behalf of myself and my House colleagues on the Holocaust Memorial Museum Council, Mr. YATES, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. LANTOS, which deplores the persistent, ongoing, and malicious efforts by some persons in this country and abroad to deny the historical reality of the Holocaust, and which commends the vital, ongoing work of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Yesterday, the House adopted legislation that will facilitate the museum's annual Days of Remembrance ceremony in the Rotunda on April 16, 1995. Yet, the work of the Holocaust Memorial Museum is conducted year-round, as evidenced by the larger than expected attendance at the museum, which is steadily increasing.

One of the reasons for the museum's existence is to counter Holocaust deniers. Those who promote the denial of the Holocaust do so either out of profound ignorance or for furthering anti-Semitism and racism. The Holocaust Memorial Museum, through its permanent exhibitions, traveling programs, and educational outreach efforts, both memorialize the victims of the Holocaust, and counters these accusers through its honest and sensitive approach to one of the most ferociously heinous state acts the world has ever known.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I request that the full text of the legislation be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my colleagues' review, and urge all Members of the House of Representatives to express their support for the work of the Holocaust Memorial Museum by cosponsoring this legislation, House Resolution 316.

H. RES. 316

Deplores individuals who deny the historical reality of the Holocaust and commending the vital, ongoing work of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Whereas the Holocaust is a basic fact of history, the denial of which is no less absurd than the denial of the occurrence of the Second World War;

Whereas the Holocaust—the systematic, state-sponsored mass murders by Nazi Germany of 6,000,000 Jews, alongside millions of others, in the name of a perverse racial theory—stands as one of the most ferociously heinous state acts the world has ever known; and

Whereas those who promote the denial of the Holocaust do so out of profound ignorance or for the purpose of furthering anti-Semitism and racism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) deplores the persistent, ongoing and malicious efforts by some persons in this country and abroad to deny the historical reality of the Holocaust; and

(2) commends the vital, ongoing work of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, which memorializes the victims of the Holocaust and teaches all who are willing to learn profoundly compelling and universally resonant moral lessons.

H.R. 1804, THE JUDGE ISAAC PARKER FEDERAL BUILDING

HON. Y. TIM HUTCHINSON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, recently the House passed H.R. 1804, which would name the Federal building in Fort Smith, AR, after Judge Issac Parker.

While this legislation was overwhelmingly supported by 373 Members of the House, there were 40 Members who voted against H.R. 1804. It was subsequently reported that a number of Members who voted against the bill did so because they believed Judge Parker was a racist and one was even quoted as saying Parker "Hung blacks because they were black."

This past year our country faced the issue of race in ways it never had before. It is a sad and unfortunate fact that racism is alive and well in our society today. It is also a fact that racism knows no color or ethnic boundaries. People of all races are subject to their own prejudices. We must all fight to overcome our own personal prejudices and biases.

That is why I cannot allow the statements about Judge Parker to go unanswered. I think it is important for people to know the real Judge Parker and the man that he was. He was a man who was ahead of his time. He was a man who freely gave of himself to his community. He was a man who had a deep respect for the law and a deep concern for those who came before his court. His reputation is so respected that 100 years after his death the citizens of Fort Smith, AR still want to honor him and his legacy.

I would, therefore, bring to your attention letters which were sent to me from the Department of the Interior the day after the vote on H.R. 1804. One is from the superintendent of the Fort Smith National Historic Site and the other is a letter to the editor by the park historian. I hope this information is helpful to Members' understanding of the real Judge Parker.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Fort Smith, AR, December 6, 1995.

Hon. TIM HUTCHINSON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HUTCHINSON: We have been following your efforts over the last few months to rename the Fort Smith federal building in honor of Judge Isaac C. Parker with great interest and support. I read the news article in this morning's paper and was surprised and disappointed to read the statements calling Judge Parker a racist and the unsubstantiated remarks that he hanged blacks "just because they were black". There is no historical record supporting these statements. In fact the record

proves just the opposite. Our historian has written the attached letter to the editor to hopefully clarify the issue. She also received a call today from the AP service in Little Rock about this and she provided the same information to them. We are forwarding similar letters to Senators Bumpers and Pryor in the hopes that they will also support your efforts.

I am sorry that we did not offer you more substantial support earlier in the process. I was frankly surprised that there would be much protest. If we can provide you any further details or information please call on us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM N. BLACK,
Superintendent.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Fort Smith, AR, December 6, 1995.

EDITOR,
Southwest Times Record,
Fort Smith, AR.

TO THE EDITOR: In response to criticism of Isaac C. Parker leveled by lawmakers opposing the House bill to name the federal courthouse in Fort Smith after the judge, I would like to make the following comments. The statement that Parker hanged African Americans "just because they were black" is simply not true. Of the 87 men who were executed on the Fort Smith gallows (79 of those while Parker was on the bench), 33 (38%) were white, 36 (41%) were Indian and 18 (21%) were black. Of those 18 African Americans, 17 were convicted of murder and one of rape in jury trials. Federal statute at that time ordered that anyone convicted of rape or murder was to receive the death penalty. Parker had no choice except to sentence these people to death.

Furthermore, Parker provided opportunities for African Americans that otherwise would not have been available. He appointed Bass Reeves the first African American deputy U.S. marshal west of the Mississippi in 1875. Other blacks served prominently on the deputy force throughout Parker's years in Fort Smith, including Grant Johnson, Zeke Miller, Robert Fortune, John Garrett and Bynum Colbert. Parker's personal bailiff while he was in Fort Smith was a former slave named George Winston. Other African Americans served on the staff of the federal jail at Fort Smith.

Nothing in the historical record supports the idea that Parker was a racist. The Ohio native, Union Civil War veteran and Congressman from Missouri used his position as a federal judge to empower African Americans. Yes, there were black men hanged on the gallows, but these were convicted criminals guilty of severe crimes. By the time they reach Parker's courtroom, there was little he could do but provide them a fair trial and then, if necessary, sentence them as the law provided.

Sincerely,

JULIET L. GALONSKA,
Park Historian.

AWARD-WINNING ENVIRONMENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues for the future of our Nation is

the application of responsible environmental policy. Our natural resources are most precious, and cannot be replaced. Our policy decisions must be based upon careful deliberations sounded in credible, objective, and thorough information. I am proud to say that the Bay City Times has been tremendously successful in meeting this test with its award-winning series, "Cleaning our Troubled Waters".

Over an 8-day period last year, the Bay City Times carefully examined the facts surrounding the condition of the Saginaw Bay and Saginaw River. The State of Michigan had dedicated this waterway as the most contaminated body of water in the State. The people who live around the Saginaw Bay and River, and who depend upon it as a source of water, recreation, and commerce, deserved and needed accurate information, and they got it.

Nearly half of the editorial staff of the Times worked on this series over a 10-month period, carefully checking and rechecking information to provide as accurate a view of the situation as possible. Their hard work resulted in four major awards: the 1994 Associated Press Division 2 News Sweepstakes Award; 1st place in the 1994 AP Division 2 Public Service for News; Michigan United Conservation Club's Ben East Award; and 2d place for Local News Reporting from the Michigan Press Association.

Following an exhaustive review of environmental records, numerous site visits, extensive interviews, this series has enlightened many of us who truly care about how we preserve the Saginaw Water Basin, how we keep funding alive for the Saginaw Bay Watershed Initiative, and what each of us can do to be more aware of the impact that we have on our environment.

I want to offer my heartiest congratulations to the dedicated staff who worked on this series: Reporters Eric English, Kelly Adrian Frick, Tom Gilchrist, Greta Guest, Lydia Hodges, John Herbst, Jenni Laidman, and Amy Reyes; photographers Wes Stafford and Dick Van Nostrand; graphic artist Tammie Stimpfel; and editors Elizabeth Gunther, Pam Panchak and David Vizard. These people contributed to the work of a lifetime, and their efforts should have a major impact on public policy designed to safeguard the Saginaw Bay and River. I also want to compliment Bay City Times publisher Kevin Dykema and editor Paul Keep for having the foresight to devote this level of skilled resources to a project that could be very unpopular, but was, nonetheless, vital for the long-term environmental health of our area.

Mr. Speaker, in this instance a marvelous case was made to justify action to preserve a vital resource. All communities should be so lucky to have such a thorough and professional review of a vital resource. I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in complimenting the Bay City Times and its award-winning staff for truly trying to help clean our troubled waters.

TRAVEL AND TOURISM PARTNERSHIP ACT

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus, I ask all Members to support H.R. 2579.

Embodied in this bill are some of the bold-est new ideas to ever come out of the private sector.

H.R. 2579 will strengthen U.S. tourism promotion efforts in an expanding and highly-competitive international market.

Our bill builds on the strength of the travel and tourism industry, rather than putting another item on the Federal Government's tab.

The 1,700 delegates to the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism have already endorsed our public-private partnership plan that does just that.

Some in Congress may ask why it is so critical that we focus on tourism, particularly tourism from abroad.

I can tell you in very clear terms—this is a \$535 billion business.

But this year, we will have 2 million fewer visitors from abroad than 2 years ago.

What is 2 million visitors here or there?

That drop has cost us 177,000 jobs which should have gone to American workers.

H.R. 2579, the Travel and Tourism Partnership Act would change this.

Through partnering government with the resources and creative talents of the American tourism industry, we can recapture our share of the world market.

For future jobs and economic growth in your district, join me in supporting this ground breaking legislation.

COMMUNITY OF IMLAY CITY

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the citizens of Imlay City, MI, as they celebrate the official opening of their new city office building.

In 1850 the Township of Imlay first was recognized by an act of the Michigan Legislature. As the area developed, it became apparent to the city officials that they must plan for the future, and therefore on April 14, 1872, Imlay City was incorporated. Since that time the population has grown from less than 500 to approximately 3,000 residents.

The first city office building was finished in 1904, the second was opened in 1975; this third facility is to be dedicated today, December 20, 1995. Planning for this facility has been long in the works with the many and growing needs of the community taken into account in order that this new building will serve for many years to come. As planning began, the city commission and city manager were particularly concerned and committed to

making sure that the building would be accessible to all their residents and be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

I stand before my colleagues today to compliment all the citizens of Imlay City on the opening of their new city office building that is dedicated to serving the needs of all the residents.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN DINGELL ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS ELECTION TO CONGRESS

HON. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the dean of this House and a very good friend, Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL.

JOHN DINGELL is, without question, one of the most respected Members of this institution. And so it is highly appropriate that we gather to recognize his remarkable 40-year record of service and achievement.

When you look at that record, you have to marvel at Congressman DINGELL's sphere of influence, for it is far reaching.

Most Members of Congress, either through conscious choice or subconscious tendency, choose a level at which to focus their energies. For some, it is on national policies. For others, it is on local issues. It is rare to find a legislator who has the energy, the intellect, and the political savvy to do both.

JOHN DINGELL is just such a legislator, one who shapes national policies and works with great diligence for Michigan's 16th District.

I would invite you to first look at the national policy arena, where JOHN DINGELL has worked to better the lives of the American people through his powerful committee position.

He has been—and remains—an effective advocate of consumers and taxpayers, whose interests he vigilantly defends. He also has worked to help disabled Americans gain access that the rest of us sometimes take for granted. And his service has benefited all who value a healthy environment and the protection of rare lands and species.

Closer to home, well, the citizens of the 16th are hardworking people; people who understand and appreciate the value of a hardworking Representative. That's why, 20 times and by overwhelming margins, they've chosen JOHN DINGELL as their voice here in the Nation's Capital.

And he's a powerful voice for them. Congressman DINGELL works hard here to protect Michigan jobs and create new ones. He fights for working families, for veterans, for seniors, for students. He also has developed important environmental initiatives on local waterways.

Finally, I would like to point out that this House, too, benefits greatly from Mr. DINGELL's service. He is a man of integrity. Of course, he is also a tremendous source of institutional knowledge. And he is a master of House rules and procedures. I am honored to serve with him and count him as a personal friend.

Let me note again, Mr. Speaker, that it is a true pleasure to recognize the gentleman from Michigan and commemorate his four decades of distinguished service.

THANK YOU FOR THE GIFT FROM PETER NICHOLAS TO DUKE UNIVERSITY

HON. DAVID FUNDERBURK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, my district is proud to be the home of Duke University, one of our Nation's finest institutions of higher education. On December 7, that university happily announced a gift of \$20 million from the family of Peter M. Nicholas, a Massachusetts business executive and trustee of the university as well as the founder and president of Boston Scientific, a leading manufacturer of medical devices. His family's gift will support Duke University's School of the Environment, which the university has renamed in honor of the Nicholas family.

The Nicholas School of the Environment is unique among university programs dedicated to environmental research and education, in that it bases its approach to complex environmental problems in an interdisciplinary perspective. As a former academic myself, I know that a broad focus grounded in the insight and understanding of different scientific disciplines provides a powerful way of unraveling the most complicated problems. Other institutions tend to approach problems of the environment from either a scientific or public policy perspective, and advances in understanding our environment have certainly come from this traditional approach. But my constituents at Duke are excited about the potential that is offered by looking at environmental problems from an interdisciplinary perspective including natural sciences, public policy, economics, and management. I too share their optimism, and look forward to hearing of significant advances made at the Nicholas School of the Environment.

At the university's news conference announcing the gift, there were many comments made about the importance of the school's programs of research and education, and about the importance to all life on earth of understanding our environment better. However, when asked the reasons why his family had chosen to make this generous gift to support environmental research and education at Duke, Peter Nicholas stressed an important theme that echoes something many of us in public service have been saying.

"Government . . . can't do everything. What the government is trying to do is come to terms with what its role is with respect to the priorities of the country," Mr. Nicholas said.

Mr. Nicholas went on to note his belief that educational institutions have a responsibility to help understand issues, set priorities, "and then galvanize the resource that exists throughout society—industrial, academic, government and others—to in fact make a difference."

"I think we shouldn't misinterpret what our government is saying," Mr. Nicholas continued. "[I]t is clear that the government has a leadership role in terms of being sure that we understand what our priorities are, what the urgencies are, as it relates to the environment," he said. "It is also important that the ground rules and the incentives are in place at the federal level to ensure that behavior by all elements of our society is consistent with what everyone's goals are. But it is not clear that it is a central government role to fund the environmental objectives that we have."

Mr. Nicholas' comments at Duke, and, more important, his family's gift of \$20 million for the university's school of the environment, constitute a welcome signal that some leaders of the private sector understand and appreciate the value of the partnership by government, academia, and industry in problem solving. His words, and his family's personal investment in that effort, are thus worthy of note by this body, and I commend them to my colleagues in the House.

TRIBUTE TO DON FAUROT, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI TIGERS FOOTBALL COACH

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Don Faurot, a legendary figure in University of Missouri athletics, who died on October 19, 1995. He was 93.

Don Faurot, who coached the Tigers football team from 1935 through 1956, was credited with creating the split-T formation at Missouri in 1941.

He was 101-79-10 in his coaching career. Coach Faurot's 1939 team won his first Big Six title and the Tigers' first trip to the Orange Bowl. As an 8-year-old boy, I was present in Miami, FL, when his M.U. team played Georgia Tech.

Missouri's football stadium is named for him. Through the years, he had continued to attend every Missouri home game.

Coach Faurot, who set the cornerstone for the Missouri football program that exists today, was even more respected for the integrity he brought to the game.

"If everybody in collegiate athletics was a Don Faurot," Big Ten Commissioner Wayne Duke once said, "then collegiate athletics would be what it is supposed to be."

Don Faurot was born in Mountain Grove, MO, on June 23, 1902. Despite losing the first two fingers on his right hand in a boyhood farming accident, he was a 145-pound fullback at Missouri in 1923 and 1924, and played basketball and baseball.

He took over the football program at Missouri in 1935 after coaching 9 years at Kirksville State Teachers College, now Northeast Missouri State University. At Kirksville, his teams went 26-0 from 1923-32, the best small college record in the country.

When he returned to Missouri, he took over a team that had won just two games in 3 years and the athletic program was \$500,000 in debt.

Under Faurot's direction, though, the Tigers won three conference titles and went to four bowl games. When he retired as athletic director in 1967, the program was in the black and the stadium's seating capacity had doubled to more than 50,000.

This despite rigorously adhering to recruiting policies and relying primarily on homegrown players.

"If you lose with home-state boys, that's bad," he said. "But if you lose with out-of-state boys, that's terrible. If you win with imported athletes, that's good. If you win with your own, that's great."

A member of football's National Hall of Fame and the Missouri Sports Hall of Fame, Faurot remained active in his later years as talent procurer and coach for the Blue-Gray game in Montgomery, AL, and as executive secretary of the Missouri Senior Golf Association.

In 1972, Coach Faurot received what probably ranked as his greatest personal honor when the Missouri football stadium was officially named Faurot Field.

In 1926, Don Faurot, an agricultural student at Missouri, helped lay sod for the field, then known as Memorial Stadium.

Coach Faurot is survived by his wife, Mary, of Columbia, three daughters, seven grandchildren, and a brother, Fred, of Columbia.

JUSTICE, COMMERCE, STATE
APPROPRIATIONS

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to express my great disappointment that this appropriation bill would replace the COPS programs, which have enjoyed such unequivocal support, with a law enforcement block grant. In my congressional district in Houston, TX, the COPS programs have placed 529 more officers on our streets. The COPS programs have played an integral part in reclaiming our neighborhoods.

Throughout the Nation, in the course of 1 year alone, the COPS programs have been a proven success and have enabled local law enforcement to hire or redeploy 25,933 new community policing officers, who will serve 80 percent of all Americans.

The COPS program has guaranteed more patrol police for our neighborhoods and cities, but the block grant which replaces the COPS program would jeopardize this guarantee and goes against the promise that the U.S. Congress made to the American people under the Violent Crime Control Act of 1994.

Community policing has been successful at meeting public safety needs. Having police officers on foot patrol fosters stronger bonds between community residents and police officers. This partnership is particularly important at a time when there are many heightened tensions between law enforcement officers and residents of inner-city neighborhoods. The National Organization of Black Law Enforcement [NOBLE] has supported community policing as the only hope to regain the trust and respect

necessary to providing quality police service to our citizens in many of these neighborhoods.

Local law enforcement groups across the Nation have unequivocally endorsed the COPS programs. The majority of Americans also support community policing. In August 1995, the National Association of Police Organizations survey found that the American public overwhelmingly supports the COPS program over block grants to State and local governments for public safety use by 65 percent to 35 percent.

Community police patrols are an essential line of defense against crime. We need to maintain our national commitment to carry out our promise of safety and increased police manpower.

The public wants us to listen and not play politics with a program that is a proven success story. The COPS program has worked—keep it working to help prevent crime.

Additionally, as a member of the women's caucus I fought for dollars for the program fighting against violence against women. If we pass a clean continuing resolution we will keep that money.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN BUTLER,
T.L.C. MEDICAL SERVICES, INC.

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives today to join me in paying special tribute to an industrious individual with a good heart. A constituent of mine who in addition to dedicating his life to a business which saves people's lives, has shown the ingenuity to rise above the hundreds who provide a similar service by coming up with an idea that helps drunk drivers help themselves back to respectability.

The man's name is David J. Butler of T.L.C. Medical Services, Inc., an ambulance service in Cortland, NY. Mr. Butler recently was honored by his peers in the American Ambulance Association when he won the Public Safety Program Award in a national competition.

Working in conjunction with the Cortland County district attorney and the county sheriff, Mr. Butler developed a program which allowed first-time DWI offenders who were not involved in a serious infraction connected with their offense to benefit from a plea bargain which required them to do community service.

The community service, as you might guess, was to ride with ambulance personnel to drinking-related calls so as to experience, while sober, the devastating effect alcohol can have on drivers and on domestic situations.

The program is called Riding for Life. It is to the credit of David J. Butler, who 22 years ago acquired his ambulance company and since then has shown what commitment means. He has increased the number of ambulances and other vehicles, and he still works very hard himself.

Mr. Butler is a civic leader in central New York. I am very proud to call him a neighbor and thank my colleagues for acknowledging his accomplishment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DEBORAH PRYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, due to inclement weather in my district, I was unavoidably detained and not able to vote earlier this week. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 866, "aye" on rollcall No. 867, "aye" on rollcall No. 868, "no" on rollcall No. 869, and "aye" on rollcall No. 870.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH ROLF
EKEUS OF UNSCOM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1995 I wrote to Mr. Rolf Ekeus, the Executive Chairman of the Office of the U.N. Special Commission [UNSCOM] in charge of weapons destruction and monitoring in Iraq. My basic question was: Why doesn't UNSCOM release the names of companies providing dual-use or military items to Iraq?

Mr. Ekeus' basic answer is that UNSCOM cannot carry out its weapons dismantlement tasks without the help of sovereign governments, sovereign governments—often because of ongoing legal cases—want to control the release of information about companies, and releasing the names of companies without the approval of sovereign governments will undermine the ability of UNSCOM to carry out its important mission.

I appreciate Mr. Ekeus' response, but I am still of the belief that sunshine is a powerful deterrent, and I will want to pursue this question further.

The text of the correspondence follows:

COMMITTEE ON

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,

Washington, DC, November 1, 1995.

HON. ROLF EKEUS

Chairman, U.N. Special Commission on Iraq,
United Nations Headquarters, New York,
N.Y.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write with respect to the question of companies that supplied or are supplying dual-use goods, services or technology to Iraq, and the use of those dual-use items in Iraq's programs to build weapons of mass destruction.

At the time of the creation of UNSCOM by UN Security Council Resolution 687 in April, 1991, it had been my impression, from both you and from U.S. officials, that the names of companies supplying dual-use items to Iraq eventually would be made public. Thus far, to my knowledge, no such list has been made public.

I continue to think that it is important to make a list of all such companies public, on the theory that sunshine is the best deterrent of such transfers of dual-use items in the future.

I would like to ask a number of questions:
1. Why has a list of companies supplying dual-use items to Iraq not been made public?

When will a list of such companies be made public?

2. What is the policy of UNSCOM on the publication of such a list of companies?

Does UNSCOM set policy on disclosure of names of companies itself, or is it acting on instructions of the Security Council or members of the Security Council?

Is it the policy of UNSCOM to defer to individual governments on the publication of such information? If so, why?

3. Do you agree that the publication of such a list of companies would serve as an important deterrent on future dealings with Iraq in dual-use items?

What steps can be taken to bring about the publication of such a list?

What additional steps can be taken to deter future transfers of dual-use items to Iraq?

Thank you for your time and attention, and I look forward to your early reply.

With best regards,
Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Ranking Democratic Member.

UNITED NATIONS
SPECIAL COMMISSION,
December 14, 1995.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Ranking Democratic Member, Committee on International Relations; House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: Thank you for your letter of 1 November 1995. I appreciate your letting me know of your concerns and inviting me to give my response. I regret the delay in this letter, but I was away from the United States much of November, principally in the Gulf region.

Your personal attention to our mission is highly appreciated and important as Iraq's insistent efforts in retaining and reacquiring weapons of mass destruction is and should remain of public concern.

Given the importance of foreign acquisition for Iraq's WMD programmes, the Special Commission gives priority to the task of securing as much information as possible on foreign suppliers to Iraq. It is especially important to map out Iraq's supplier network. In this respect, UNSCOM has so far been quite successful, thanks very much to the support from governments of those States from which supplier companies have been operating. Each case of export to Iraq of prohibited or dual-use items has to be carefully explored and investigated. Access to the companies concerned is crucial for the in-depth investigation. To get such access, UNSCOM has in practice to get the approval of the government concerned. Otherwise, governments would, no doubt, be upset were UNSCOM to initiate investigations without consent on their national territory. Our experience is that governments are cautious in providing access, and that without government support to the Commission's investigations, companies are at liberty to refuse talking to our experts. Over time, the Special Commission has learnt that a primary concern of governments appears to be the question of confidentiality. This requirement is applied almost on a universal basis. It means that if data like the name and identity of a company, and of the country of a supplier could be suspected to be published, the government would refuse access for investigation of the company concerned. Without government pressure, the supplier company would tend to be even more uncooperative. Thus, publication of data on supplier companies would have a devastating effect on the continuous and future efforts by the Special Commission to effectively block Iraq

from retaining or reacquiring proscribed weapons.

These explanations should serve to set the background to the answer to your first question, namely that at the present, it is not advisable for the Special Commission to make public the names of foreign suppliers.

Concerning the policy of the Special Commission on the publication of names of suppliers, I can state that the data on suppliers are kept safely within the Headquarters in New York. Information concerning a supplier is, as a matter of policy, shared with the government of the supplier-country, with requests for further information (through interviews with visits and/or interrogation) of the company concerned.

This policy was originally formulated by the Special Commission and presented in briefings to the Security Council. A strong and vigorous support for the policy so defined has been the answer to these briefings.

I agree that the publication of a list on the names of supplier companies could serve as a deterrent on future dealings with Iraq in dual-use items. But such a publication would at the same time bring an end to practically all efforts of the Special Commission to get indispensable support and intelligence from the governments and information from the named companies. That would seriously compromise the task of the Special Commission to identify and eliminate all proscribed weapons in Iraq.

When our policy was originated, it was considered that publication of a list of names of companies could lead to certain presumptions which might very well be unjustified. Prior to the Gulf War, there was no ban on many of the dual-use items and chemicals exported to Iraq. Furthermore, Iraq frequently used agents and front companies to purchase items which were banned or controlled under certain multilateral export control systems, and resorted to false declarations as to destination and end-user. The supplier company, in such circumstances, could have been completely ignorant of the ultimate destination of the items concerned. It is because of these difficulties that the Special Commission reports the name of a company, which it identifies as the source of now proscribed items or materials in Iraq, only to the government in which that company is established. The government then, in most cases, assists in the investigation of the circumstances, of the export concerned and, where those circumstances so justify, undertakes prosecution of the offender. The Special Commission can support such prosecution through the supply of evidence in its possession and, in certain circumstances, through the provision of expert witnesses. Prosecution of a company, which is necessarily public, is surely the most powerful deterrent in convincing other companies not to engage in illegal trade. The Special Commission has every reason to believe that its policy has led to its gaining a much wider knowledge of Iraq's procurement networks, and the names of many more suppliers, than would otherwise have been the case. The cooperation with governments which has been obtained, and national prosecutions which have or are taking place, testify to the effectiveness of the policy. A complete understanding of Iraq's supplier networks is the most potent instrument in preventing the reactivation of these networks. The Special Commission already has evidence of certain attempts by Iraq to do so and has been able to prevent the export or to interdict the items concerned on their way to, or upon their arrival in Iraq.

In addition to measures already taken, especially those under the plans approved by the Security Council, the most effective step to deter future transfers to Iraq of dual-use items would be the early adoption by the Security Council of a resolution approving the mechanism for export/import control of Iraq designed by UNSCOM and the IAEA. Under the mechanism, all states would be obliged to notify UNSCOM and the IAEA of intended exports (including transshipment) to Iraq of such items. The proposed mechanism has just been transmitted to the Security Council where we hope for very early action.

I would be happy to meet with you on one of my visits to Washington to explain this matter further to you if you consider this would be useful. One of your staff could telephone my office at (212) 963-3018 to make arrangements.

Yours sincerely,

ROLF EKEUS,
*Executive Chairman,
Office of the Special Commission.*

HONORING MAYOR ROBERT
ROSEGARTEN

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my constituents and the members of the Great Neck Lawyers Association as they meet to present Robert Rosegarten, mayor of the village of Great Neck Plaza with their most prestigious Community Service Award.

While maintaining an active business enterprise, Mayor Robert Rosegarten established a model of civic responsibility and participation that served to enhance the lives of all the citizens of Great Neck. He has received both State and national acclaim for developing the economic revitalization programs in the downtown shopping region of Great Neck Plaza and for his work to enhance the beautification of Great Neck Plaza. He has served as mayor of the village of Great Neck Plaza since 1992, and as its deputy mayor for 8 years. Under his leadership, the village of Great Neck Plaza has emerged as an effective municipal government with many of its programs being replicated throughout New York State.

In his role of enhancing the village of Great Neck Plaza, Mayor Rosegarten has shared his many talents with a wide array of community organizations providing both leadership and creativity in addressing community concerns. Among his many community roles, Mayor Rosegarten serves as president of the Great Neck Village Officials Organization, commissioner of the Great Neck Central Police Auxiliary, and board member of Great Neck's United Community Fund, Chamber of Commerce, and the Great Neck Arts Center. In addition, he is the vice-president of the Great Neck Plaza Management Council and director of the Water Authority of Great Neck North. In 1988, Mayor Rosegarten received the Great Neck United Community Fund's prestigious Leo M. Friend Award for community service.

Mayor Rosegarten's guiding tenet in public service has been to make a positive difference in the lives of his village's citizens. In that undertaking, he has dramatically succeeded. I

am most proud to join with so many in honoring him.

THE REPUBLICANS' ATTEMPT TO
DISGUISE THE PRESIDENT'S
PROPOSAL

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the Republicans' attempt to draw attention away from their life threatening budget, by attacking the President's budget proposal, are trying to disguise his proposal as a legislative measure. The President continues to be upfront with the Republicans. He has openly voiced his commitment to protecting Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. And, the President has openly warned the GOP that he will veto measures which threaten the quality of life of the American people.

Yet, for some reason, our Republican colleagues just don't get it. What does it take for them to realize that they cannot hide from their budget massacre. The GOP budget will adversely affect the lives of millions of children, seniors, the disabled, veterans, and families across the country.

No matter how many times the Republicans show that they can pass a measure that will devastate the lives of the American people for generations to come—still does not make it right. As we gather here now, to vote on the Republicans' spin on the President's budget, the GOP is attempting to take the American people through another smoke and mirror budget maze.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have time for more of the GOP's pranks. The time the Republicans are wasting here today should be being invested in completing action on the rest of the appropriations bills that are needed to reopen the Federal Government. If the Republican budget could stand on its own merit, the GOP would not have to resort to extremist tactics like we see here today. This action, coupled with the Republicans' politically staged shutdown of the Federal Government, to avoid real debate and serious negotiations on their budget, is not only ridiculous, it is in fact irresponsible.

The American people must be asking themselves, when will the Republicans stop playing games with our lives: When will the Republicans take the needs of the American people seriously? And, most important, are the Republicans capable of negotiating, and passing a budget that is compassionate to children, seniors, the disabled, veterans, and hard-working families?

Mr. Speaker, so far the Republicans' positive response to these critical questions remains to be seen. I urge my colleagues to put an end to the Republicans' pranks, and to strongly urge our Republican colleagues to negotiate a compassionate budget. The American people deserve nothing less.

RETIREMENT OF JOHN M. COLLINS
FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a distinguished servant of the Congress and the Nation in the area of national defense and national security. On Wednesday, January 3, 1996, John M. Collins will retire after 22½ years as the Senior Specialist in National Defense of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress. Since 1972, Mr. Collins has provided authoritative, in-depth, and profound analysis and advice to the Congress on a range of national defense issues unparalleled in its breadth and scope.

Mr. Collins' retirement closes a lifetime of Government service which mirrors the tumultuous history of the past 50-odd years. A native, I am proud to say, of my State of Missouri, he began his public service with his enlistment in the U.S. Army in May 1942—after being rejected by the Marine Corps, a fact he reiterates with great delight and good humor to numerous marines and friends over the years. As a young enlisted soldier he came ashore over the Normandy beaches a few days after D-day, in 1944. As a captain he served in the Korean war. As a colonel he served as Chief of the Campaign Planning Group in General Westmoreland's headquarters in Vietnam during 1967–68—managing to get involved in, and survive as the winner, a point-blank shootout with a North Vietnamese soldier in the ruins of Hue City in early 1968.

In between these wartime duties he served in intelligence and contingency planning posts in Japan and the Middle East; training assignments in the United States; commanded a battalion in the 82d Airborne Division; was one of the principal planners for the possible invasion of Cuba which, fortunately, never had to take place during the fateful days of the Cuban missile crisis in October–November 1962; and graduated from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. He closed his 30-year Army career as a faculty member and chief of the strategic studies group at the National War College during 1968–72.

Immediately upon retirement from the Army, Colonel Collins joined the Congressional Research Service as Senior Specialist in National Defense. From the beginning of his CRS career he showed a willingness to examine fundamental assumptions. One of his first CRS reports examined whether the strategic nuclear triad of bombers, ground-based ICBM's, and submarine-launched ballistic missiles had been arrived at rationally, and whether it was in fact the only possible method of constructing U.S. strategic nuclear forces. At the height of the first Arab oil embargo, in 1975, he and a CRS coauthor, Clyde Mark, poured cold water on the idea that seizing Arab oil fields by military force would be an easy task. He wrote a book-length examination of overall U.S. defense planning processes, and how they might be improved.

John Collins' single greatest service to the Congress and the Nation, however, was pro-

vided in the form of a series of book-length reports, beginning in 1976 and running through 1985, which meticulously documented the relentless military buildup and geostrategic expansion of the Soviet Union and its client states in almost every category of military power and area of the world. His comparisons of United States-Soviet military forces, together with the respective allies of both countries, demonstrated with clarity and precision how American military capabilities, relative to our interests, were steadily declining, and those of the Soviet Union were increasing. Widely read, quoted, and debated, John Collins' works on the United States-Soviet military balance unquestionably played a role in persuading the American people and their elected representatives that, by the early 1980's, major increases in United States military forces and defense spending were required to restore our national credibility and deter and prevent Soviet expansionism. This was not an easy time for John Collins. Some were not happy with what he had to say about the shifting balance of military power in favor of the Soviet Union, and he had to withstand considerable bureaucratic and political pressure to continue to do his job. However, those who exerted such pressure against him are gone. He and his works remain.

By helping alert the country to the growing menace of Soviet military power in the late 1970's and early 1980's, Mr. Collins also said to have played a role in the ultimate demise of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. Without the American military resurgence of the 1980's, it is difficult to see how the Soviet military-political juggernaut of the mid and late 1970's could have been halted, turned inward, and forced to collapse of its own internal strains. Indeed, in October 1985, only a few months after Gorbachev assumed power in the Soviet Union, he presciently suggested that "the whole Soviet security apparatus in Central Europe is coming unraveled."¹

The thawing of the cold war and the eventual demise of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact in no way lessened Mr. Collins' output. He produced authoritative studies of military space forces, United States and Soviet special operations forces, lessons learned from America's small wars, and a host of other reports and analyses. During the Persian Gulf war, he was frequently interviewed on national and international radio and television, and wrote numerous short analyses of possible issues and problems related to war with Iraq. At one point, well over a hundred congressional staffers gathered to listen with rapt attention to this veteran of three wars outline not the possible nature of a ground war with Iraq—not just in academic, and analytical terms, but how ground combat was "close up, and personal, and dirty." Within the past few years, his talents have turned to as diverse a set of subjects as counterproliferation, U.S. prepositioned military equipment, nonlethal weapons, and criteria for U.S. military intervention overseas. His last CRS report, finished just days ago, deals with the military aspects of NATO enlargement.

¹Collins, John M. What Have We Got for \$1 Trillion? The Washington Quarterly, Spring 1986: 49, based on testimony before the Defense Policy Panel, House Armed Services Committee, October 9, 1985.

Mr. Speaker, although John Collins is completing almost 54 years of total Federal service when he retires from CRS, he has no intention of remaining inactive. General Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has had the eminent good sense to agree to provide Mr. Collins with some office and study space at the National Defense University at Fort McNair. With the time he now will have, plus the assistance from DOD, Mr. Collins intends to write books on military geography and military strategy. He will have more time to spend with his wife Gloria, to whom he has dedicated many of his books; his son Sean, holder of a doctorate in aeronautical and astronautical engineering from MIT, and a contributor to national defense and security in his own right in the field of ballistic missile defense; and his grandchildren.

Few people have devoted so much of a long life to the service of the United States as has John Collins. I wish him well as he enters yet another stage of that service.

OPPOSES SECURITIES LITIGATION
CONFERENCE REPORT VETO
OVERRIDE

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. DE FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the motion to override the President's veto of the Securities Litigation Conference Report.

The laws governing securities litigation can certainly stand to be improved, but the language of this conference report does much more harm than good. This legislation—written by and for the large securities firms—is anti-small investor and antiworking family.

The conference report reduces consumers protection. An investors ability and right to sue unscrupulous securities firms should not be stifled or circumscribed by Congress. For example, the language includes a sweeping loser pays provision that will make it extremely difficult for anyone without a multimillion dollar trust fund to challenge a large corporation in court.

Supporters of this legislation claim that there is an explosion of frivolous suits. The fact is that the number of securities class action suits has shrunk over the past 20 years. During the last several years, suits have been filed against only 120 companies annually—out of over 14,000 public corporations reporting to the SEC.

The President was correct in his veto. This conference report goes against the interests of working people and small investors. I sincerely hope that the Congress will sustain the veto that we can then enact true reform of our Nation's securities litigation laws.

OPPORTUNITIES TO CHANGE

HON. SUSAN MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the December 8, 1995, editorial from one of my local papers, the New York Post, which sums up exactly a sentiment most of us, I think, feel about Newt Gingrich. In these times of overt partisanship, the editors write that they,

[H]ope that Gingrich takes heart, stands his ground and stays the course. Opportunities to change the direction in American politics don't come around often; and if the Republicans don't succeed in disrupting business as usual in Washington now, the chance will likely pass.

We have no choice, for the sake of our children, but to balance the budget and I urge Speaker GINGRICH to continue his effort to focus this Nation into realizing fiscal sanity.

[From the New York Post, Dec. 8, 1995]

THE GINGRICH INQUISITION

House Minority Leader David Bonior (D-Mich.) and other congressional Democrats have been trying for more than half a decade to pin ethics violations on Speaker Newt Gingrich. To this end, they and their allies in the land of the left leveled endless charges against Gingrich. Indeed, over the course of the last 15 months, the House Ethics Committee has considered 65 separate counts.

On Wednesday, the committee ruled that with respect to 64, the speaker has been completely or partially exonerated. (It should be noted that one of these charges turned on Gingrich's book contract with HarperCollins, a publishing concern owned by News Corp., which is also this newspaper's corporate parent.)

Only one of the 65 charges was deemed worthy of further exploration by an independent counsel. Pardon us if we suggest that this six-year fishing expedition has produced decidedly unimpressive results.

The committee voted to retain a special counsel to explore whether or not the speaker violated the law by using tax-deductible contributions to finance a college course he taught at Kennesaw State University in Georgia. Gingrich has expressed confidence that he will be fully exonerated on this seemingly narrow and highly technical charge. In light of the fate of all the other accusations lodged against him, it's hard not to credit this possibility. Many critics on both sides of aisle have contended that, in general, the standards for appointing independent counsels are exceedingly low; the Ethics Committee's decision here would seem to confirm this observation.

It is worth recognizing a distinction between the ethics problems allegedly swirling around Gingrich and those that brought down ex-House Speaker Jim Wright, a Democrat. The latter came under investigation after years of abusing his power. While Gingrich (as a back-bencher) played a leading role in the campaign against Wright, even loyal Democrats—in the end—couldn't ignore the ex-speaker's transgressions.

House Democrats, by contrast, have tried to demonize Gingrich ever since his success in that effort. And from the day the Georgia Republican became speaker, the "get Newt" campaign has been a central concern of the official Democratic party leadership.

Such prejudgment suggests that what bothers Bonior & Co. about Gingrich has nothing to do with whether or not tax-deductible contributions were mistakenly used to help finance his political science lectures at Kennesaw State. The Democrats object to the fact that Gingrich—the most able parliamentarian in recent memory—is an energetic conservative who's mounted a serious challenge to the national ideological status quo.

Similarly, it is not the mere existence of the speaker's political action committee, GOPAC, that disturbs the Democrats (though they are, in fact, urging the special counsel to expand his inquiry to include some of GOPAC's activities). What really distresses the Democratic leadership is the fact that Gingrich has used GOPAC to forge a spirited GOP congressional majority that's serious about welfare reform, tax reduction and shrinking the power of the federal government.

To a considerable extent, the Ethics Committee's willingness to order just one charge probed vindicates the speaker. We hope, therefore, that Gingrich takes heart, stands his ground and stays the course. Opportunities to change the direction in American politics don't come around often; and if the Republicans don't succeed in disrupting business as usual in Washington now, the chance will likely pass.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 134
MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL
YEAR 1996

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 134, a measure that will provide the payment of compensation and pension benefits for our Nation's veterans and their families for fiscal year 1996. I am glad to see that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are at least concerned about some aspect of their obligation to these patriots who answered the call of their Nation.

Despite the fact that this resolution has a noble objective, it is clearly incomplete. It simply does not go far enough. While our veterans and their families will be somewhat comforted by the passage of this resolution, who will give some financial assurance to the millions of Americans who continue to face uncertain futures because Congress has not fulfilled its obligations regarding the remaining appropriations bills? These remaining bills, which are not included in this resolution, are so harmful and unreasonable that the President has had to veto them and no action has been taken by the House to improve them or continue them in a continuing resolution.

Take for example, the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. Action on this measure is still pending. While the Department of Health and Human Services is closed, Medicare and Medicaid applications cannot be processed. While the Department of Labor is closed, unemployment applications cannot be processed.

In addition, the drastic cuts in the appropriations measure for the Department of Education will deny critical resources to schools

