EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AUSA LUNCHEON SPEECH

HON. IKE SKELTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 17, 1995, the new Army Chief of Staff addressed the annual AUSA luncheon here in Washington. Gen. Dennis Reimer stressed the need to have quality and sufficient numbers in the U.S. Army. This speech is set forth herein:

AUSA LUNCHEON SPEECH

(By General Reimer)

Thank you very much, Mr. Paul, for that kind introduction. I must say that I have been on the dais for this luncheon for the last 5 years but not in this particular spot. I also want to say that it's a great view from up here.

This vantage point gives me the opportunity to recognize America's Army—Active, United States Army Reserve, Army National Guard, and DA Civilians—and what a great group they are—what a wonderful group and I'm honored to be part of such an organization.

It also gives me the opportunity to tell our Allies who are here today in great numbers that your presence is important to us. Most of all, we appreciate your support and willingness to carry your share of the load.

To our supporters from Capitol Hill, the Members of Congress, the Professional Staff Members, let me say how much we appreciate all you've done. I know that your choices are not easy but you need to know that all of us are inspired by your willingness to stand up and be counted and your example of dedicated service to our Nation.

To corporate America, thanks for being here. You've been here with us through the good times and the bad and I would just simply say that we need you more now than ever.

To AUSA, 45 years old this year, I must also say thanks for being such a great friend. And thanks most of all for your efforts to improve the quality of life for our soldiers. You have helped us recruit and retain the best soldiers in the world.

And, finally, to all our friends—friends of the United States Army, let me say that your friendship means everything to us.

This is my first opportunity as Chief to address such a large and important audience and I want to share with you some thoughts on Today's Army and where we are headed in the future. As this audience certainly knows, the primary mission of the Army is to be trained and ready to defend the Nation's security and freedom. Clearly, the fundamental responsibility of any Chief of Staff is to ensure that the Army is ready to execute this mission.

Recently I participated in two events which highlighted for me the importance of maintaining a Trained and Ready Army. I was in Hawaii in early September for ceremonies celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the end of the War in the Pacific. I was also fortunate to participate in a ceremony dedicating the Korean War Memorial in late July. The contrast between these two events, separated by less than 5 years in history, was striking. I could not help but reflect on the differences the 5 years between the end of World War II and the outbreak of the Korean War had made on our Army. In August 1945, the American Army was the largest and most powerful Army in the world. Its 89 divisions had been instrumental in destroying the military might of the Axis powers—a tribute to the millions of brave men and women who served and the tremendous capabilities of corporate America. However by June 1950, America's Army had been reduced to a shell of its former self. We had rapidly gone from 89 divisions and 12 million soldiers to 10 divisions and less than 600,000 soldiers.

As a consequence, at 0730 on 5 July 1950, a hastily assembled, ill-trained, and poorly equipped group of brave American soldiers waited in the cold rain—just north of Osan, Korea—as 33 North Korean tanks advanced toward their position. Behind these 33 tanks on the highway, in trucks and on foot, was a long snaking column stretching for over 6 miles. Due to poor weather the American soldiers had no air support. Due to the rapid drawdown they were poorly trained and under-manned. They were called Task Force Smith because we had to take soldiers from other battalions to make a battalion-sized organization. Their equipment reflected the lack of maintenance which is inevitable when readiness is not the top priority.

In the next few hours of fighting—these conditions were starkly played out on the battlefield. Our weapons could not stop their tanks—but they tried. One young lieutenant fired 22 rockets—from as close as 15 yards, scored direct hits on the tanks—but could not destroy them. Courage alone could not stop those tanks. Rifles and bayonets were no match for tanks and the wave of infantry behind them. In this short engagement, 185 courageous young Americans were killed, wounded, and captured; and the history of Task Force Smith was burned into the institutional memory of our Army forever.

In the summer of 1950 we were not prepared. We sent poorly equipped and untrained soldiers into battle to buy time for the Army to get ready. it certainly wasn't the fault of these soldiers or their leaders that they weren't ready—the system had let them down. Once again we were surprised and once again we paid a very steep price for our unpreparedness. As General Abrams said to this same gathering in 1973, "We paid dearly for our unpreparedness during those early days in Korea with our most precious currency—the lives of our young men. The monuments we raise to their heroism and sacrifice are really surrogates for the monuments we owe ourself for our blindness to reality, for our indifference to real threats to our security, and our determination to deal in intentions and perceptions, for our unsubstantiated wishful thinking about how war could not come."

In the harsh crucible of combat we relearned the lessons of tough training, good organization, and proper equipment. We must never again learn these lessons on the battlefield. As I shook hands with those veterans—at the dedication of the Korean War Memorial—I was reminded that the monument is not the only tribute to their courage, selfless service, and dedication. The real legacy can be seen in America's Army today. Our quality soldiers—Active, Reserve, and Guard—have the best equipment that the Nation can provide; and our tough, realistic training program has resulted in our status as the world's best Army—trained and ready for victory. No one with a lick of common sense really disputes this. As a footnote to this chapter, let me cite a personal experience. In 1987 when I was serving in Korea, General Brad Smith, that brave battalion commander whose courageous soldiers fought so well in 1950, came over and conducted a battlefield tour of where his task force fought. When he returned he sent me the handwritten training guidance that he had given to the battalion after the Korean War. That guidance talked about tough, realistic training and lots of live-fire. Today, the Gimlets—his old battalion—have that guidance—and more importantly they execute it. That's the real legacy of Task Force Smith.

However, there are similarities between 1950 and the situation we face today. in 1950: We lived in an uncertain world; the US was the world's greatest economic power; the US was the world's greatest super power; the US had a virtual nuclear monopoly; the US had the world's best Air Force and the most powerful Navy; the next war was expected to be a push button war with new weapons and machines taking over from men; and because of that we felt we could greatly reduce the size of our ground forces—and we did so very rapidly.

Today: We continue to live in an uncertain world; again, the US is the world's greatest economic power and the greatest super power; the US has the largest Navy in the world, capable of sweeping any conceivable adversary off the seas in a matter of days, assuring us access to all the world's oceans; the Nation also has the most powerful Air Force in the world, capable of sweeping any adversary from the sky in a matter of hours. It is right, and proper, and necessary for the US as a world super power and leader to have these naval and air capabilities. I wouldn't want it any other way.

However, today the active Army is the eighth largest in the world. Size by itself is not the most important thing, and America can still take pride in having the world's best Army because what we lack in quantity we more than make up in quality. Our world-class young men and women—who receive tough, realistic training and are equipped with the best equipment and weapons systems in the world—thanks in large part to what many of you here have done and continue to do—are the envy of every nation. But no amount of training or abundance of sophisticated equipment will suffice if we do not have enough quality soldiers to carry out the Nation's bidding. Numbers matter.

To accomplish our missions many of our soldiers have had back-to-back deployments and extended separations from their family. The average American soldier assigned to a troop unit now spends 138 days a year away from home—and many special units such as

MP's, air defense and transportation have been carrying a heavier load. To accomplish the requirements of our national security strategy, we must be a credible and effective ground fighting force. Peace is the harvest of preparedness. We must, however, temper our desire for peace with the realities of history. In 1950 we learned that deterrence is in the eye of the beholder. Stalin and Kim Il Soong looked at South Korea and were not deterred by the 10 under strength and ill equipped American divisions. We must always have an Army of sufficient quality and size to deter potential adversaries and meet our international obligations. While the quality of today's force is unquestioned, I must tell you in all candor that I am concerned that we have reached the limit on how small our Army can be and still credibly accomplish the tasks currently assigned to us.

Today we do not have the luxury of time—nor will we in the future. We must be ready to deal with the world as it is now, not as we wish it to be. We have paid the price—in blood—too often—to relearn that lesson. With your help—we will not have to pay that price again.

The best example that the lessons of history are sinking in is that during the past 6 years—under the leadership of Generals Vuono's and Sullivan—we have reshaped ourselves and still remain trained and ready. It's been over 5 years since Operation DESERT STORM and in many ways it is tempting to pat ourselves on the back and rest on our laurels. But we cannot afford to do that. We must build the Army of tomorrow, the Army that will be required to meet the needs of a vastly different world.

Let me share with you our vision of that Army. A vision that is a direct legacy of the bloody lessons learned on the battlefield. A vision that is rooted in the tradition of 221 years of selfless service and mission accomplishment—it is a vision which—will ensure our ability to meet the Nation's needs of the 21st century.

In our vision we see the world's best Army—trained and ready for victory—a total force of quality soldiers and civilians: A values based organization; an integral part of the joint team; equipped with the most modern weapons and equipment the country can provide; able to respond to our Nation's needs.

Changing to meet the challenges of today, tomorrow, and the 21st Century.

It's not just the words but the meaning behind these words. Let me explain. The world's best Army. A bumper sticker that has been earned by our soldiers. Trained and ready for victory. The most important job for any army, a job in which we must not fail. A total force of quality soldiers and civilians. We tend to take for granted, I think, the dedication, selfless service and sacrifice of our great citizens soldiers in the National Guard and Reserves. We are also fortunate to have a quality civilian force that embodies the best of this great Nation. This recognizes that as General Abrams said, the Army is not made up of people, the Army is people. A values based organization. Values are important to us; selfless service, dedication, sacrifice, duty, honor, country are not just words but a code by which we live.

An integral part of the joint team. We recognize the tremendous contributions of our sister Services and are happy to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with them as we keep this great Nation free. Equipped with the most modern weapons and equipment the country can provide reflects our realization that we must invest in a modernization program for the 21st Century. Able to respond to our Nation's needs. We must be relevant to the needs of our country. And changing to meet the challenges of today, tomorrow, and the 21st Century simply reflects that the only constant in the world today seems to be change. We are dealing with it, we are growing more comfortable with it every day, and we will continue to have to deal with it in the 21st Century.

Our vision is set against the world as we see it. It reflects an environment in which missions are expanding both in terms of quantity and diversity. It reflects decreased resources, a loss of 34 percent of our buying power since '89. It recognizes, as President Clinton said, a world in which the line between domestic and foreign policy has becoming increasingly blurred. We live in a Global Village. It recognizes a modernization program that is currently at the irreducible minimum and badly in need of more resources. Today the Army allocation of the DOD Modernization dollars is only 13 percent. We have the smallest piece of a small pie.

Our vision recognizes that we must not repeat the Task Force Smith scenario. We must realistically face the challenges of today. Sacrificing our youth is not the solution. We will build no new monuments to our blindness to reality. We are trained and ready today, but our ability to dominate land warfare is eroding. And our modernization plan does not forecast filling the gap fast enough.

We have a plan to make this vision a reality—Force XXI. Simply stated Force XXI projects our quality people into the 21st Century and provide them the right organization, the most realistic training, an adequate and predictable sustainment package during both peace and war, and the best equipment and weapons systems our Nation can provide given the resources available. We intend to leverage technology in order to arm our soldiers with the finest most lethal weapons systems in the world. The power of information will allow the ultimate weapon—the individual soldier—to successfully meet the challenges of the 21st century and achieve decisive victory. Force XXI provides the framework for the decisions we must make today so that tomorrow's force will remain as trained and ready as we are right now.

That vision is very clear in my mind—however, achieving our vision is not preordained. We face a number of resource challenges as I have alluded to already. The basic challenge is to balance near term readiness, quality of life, and future modernization. Internally we will do our share to ensure the most effective use of our limited resources. We will continue to improve our operational and institutional efficiency in order to ensure we devote a many dollars as possible to modernization. In this regard, we intend not to be bound by traditional approaches. We are willing to make profound changes in the way we do business as long as they increase our efficiency and do not degrade our core competencies. Efficiencies such as velocity management, total asset visibility, integrated sustainment maintenance, and improved force management are all keys to becoming more effective.

Most people talk about the four tenets of the revolution of military affairs. I believe the Army, in order to be successful in this revolution, must embrace a fifth tenet; efficiencies. We must get the most bang out of every buck. We owe that to the taxpayer—but, more importantly, we owe it to our soldiers.

The key to achieving this vision—as it has been since 1775—is high quality soldiers. We must never forget that quality soldiers are the essence of our Army—always have been and always will be. For the past two decades we have demonstrated that an All Volunteer Army can be the world's premier fighting force. Quality soldiers attracted by a profession that allows them to be all they can be deserve adequate pay and compensation. They deserve to have their entitlements and benefits safeguarded from erosion. They deserve a quality of life equal to that of the society they have pledged their lives to defend. We must never allow our commitment to quality soldiers to diminish.

As I travel around the world I am continually impressed by the sacrifice and dedication of our soldiers. The state of readiness of the Army is more than its weapons, equipment, and doctrine. A key but intangible part is the spirit of our soldiers. General Patton said "It is the cold glitter in the attacker's eye not the point of the questing bayonet that breaks the line. It is the fierce determination of the drive to close with the enemy not the mechanical perfection of the tank that conquers the trench." Today nothing has changed. When I met the survivors of the Bataan Death March in Hawaii they still had that glint in their eye and you could feel the indomitable spirit that allowed them to fight on against overwhelming odds. In Germany, Korea, Hawaii, at the NTC, JRTC, and CMTC I see the same thing in our soldiers today.

When I see those soldiers doing their job so magnificently I'm reminded of a story from the 8th Division in World War II. In September of 1944 on the Crozon Peninsula the German General Herman Ramcke asked to discuss surrender terms with the American Army. General Ramcke was in his bunker when his staff brought in the 8th Infantry Division's Assistant Division Commander, Brigadier General Charles Canham. Ramcke addressed Canham through an interpreter and said "I am to surrender to you. Let me see your credentials." Pointing to the American infantrymen crowding the dugout entrance, Canham replied "These are my credentials."

This is as true today as it was then. Soldiers are still our credentials. Yesterday we honored some of these magnificent soldiers and we are fortunate to have some of them with us today. I would like for you to have a good look at the heart and soul of America's Army.

Sergeant First Class Anita Jordan, the Active Duty Drill Sergeant of the Year from Fort Jackson, South Carolina. SFC Jordan said that the reason she entered the Army was "I knew I wanted to do something and be somebody." As a drill sergeant, she coaches, teaches, and develops soldiers—one at a time—24-hours-a-day. She is somebody.

Sergeant First Class Bruce Clark, the Reserve Drill Sergeant of the year from the 100th Division, at Fort Knox, Kentucky. He is a real estate developer and a law student. Successful in two careers, he is indeed twice the citizen.

Sergeant First Class Cory Olsen, the Active Duty Recruiter of the Year from the Denver, Colorado Recruiting Battalion. An infantryman, he was deployed to Panama, Honduras, Scotland, and the Sinai. He understands selfless service.

Sergeant First Class Alan Fritz, the Reserve Recruiter of the Year from the Syracuse, New York Recruiting Battalion. An MP, he served on active duty in both Germany and Korea before he joined the Reserves. He illustrates the seamless blend we seek for America's Army.

Specialist Hellema Webb, the Soldier of the Year from Eighth Army in Korea. A mortuary affairs specialist, she deployed in 1992 to Mogadishu and now serves with the distinction across the world. She received a max score of 200 on the promotion board and is presently on the Sergeants Promotion Standing list. A model NCO who will help lead soldiers into the 21st century.

Specialist Troy Duncan, the Soldier of the Year at USAREUR. An MP, he has already served his 6-month tour of duty in Macedonia, is married with a 3-month-old daughter, and voluntarily teaches bicycle safety classes and assists young children in learning the sport of bowling. He understands the true meaning of commitment to the nation and service to the community.

Specialist Anthony Costides the FORSCOM Soldier of the Year. Born in Greece, he is a graduate of the Combat Life Saving Course, PLDC, and has 2 years of college. He is a Tracked Vehicle Mechanic in the 1st Infantry Division at Fort Riley, Kansas. He found an environment where he could be all he could be.

Sergeant Christopher Uhrich, the Virginia National Guard Soldier of the Year. A Fuel Handler who served in the United States Air Force prior to transferring to the National Guard in Virginia. He has over 7 years of service to his Nation. He embodies the sacrifice, dedication and commitment to our citizen soldiers.

Ladies and Gentlemen, these soldiers represent the best of America's Army. They are indeed special. They ask for so little. We owe them a great deal and I couldn't be more proud to say to you—these are our credentials.

ST. PAUL, MN SAYS GOODBYE TO REV. WALTER BATTLE

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate a fellow Minnesotan, and a friend, who devoted his life to the children of the Twin Cities and the world, Rev. Walter L. Battle. Reverend Battle was the head of a proud family, most of whom I have come to know personally because of their positive activities in our St. Paul community, especially Bob Battle, who is a friend and civic activist. Reverend Battle's interest and commitment to family extended to the greater neighborhood and community of St. Paul.

Reverend Battle was an advocate for children and active in many efforts to assist disadvantaged youth. Recognizing that every child has the potential to succeed, Reverend Battle worked tirelessly to give children opportunities to achieve success. During his 46 years of service as pastor of St. Paul's Gospel Mission Church, he led several efforts to help children. Among these efforts was the establishment of the Institute of Learning. The institute helps guide teenagers away from involvement with crime and drugs and find positive alternatives and goals for their lives. He also enabled countless numbers of inner-city youth to participate in summer camps, an activity that the children's families could not have afforded otherwise. Reverend Battle pursued this interest with a real passion, establishing a site and staffing it with volunteers.

Efforts were not confined to the Twin Cities community; they extended to children around the world. In the 1950's, Reverend Battle traveled to Haiti to help build schools and teach Haitian students to read. Just last year, demonstrating his long-term commitment to the children he helps, he collected over 1,000 pounds of food and medicine to send to Haiti.

Reverend Battle passed away last week, and the Twin Cities community is mourning the loss of our most beloved and devoted citizens. By making investments in the lives of our children, Reverend Battle has given our community a legacy that will live on in the successes of future generations that were influenced by his efforts.

Investing in our children is a fundamental ingredient for America's continued success and prosperity. Unfortunately, here in Washington, Congress is embroiled in a budget debate that is set to shift the priorities of our Nation away from this type of investment. The new Republican majority's budget package drastically cuts funding for initiatives that aid children in need, including education programs, welfare assistance, health care coverage and low-income tax credits. Dedicated advocates like Reverend Battle deserve better. As we lose soldiers like Walter Battle, who devoted their lives to children and the material and spiritual well-being of our communities, we honor them and must support their mission by providing reasonable programs and realistic funding at the federal level to support their efforts.

The funding reductions being advanced today will hit our Nation's most vulnerable citizens on all sides, reducing Federal support for many aspects of their livelihoods. At the same time, the funds being cut from these programs are being funneled into tax breaks for our Nation's wealthier citizens and corporations. If these funding reductions are enacted into law, efforts such as those begun by Walter Battle will run into expanded challenges in trying to create a better future for our children, especially the increasing population of children in poverty.

Reverend Battle's advocacy for our Nation's most precious resource, our children, and the positive influence he had on so many lives should be remembered, and it will be missed. His activities should not only be praised, but should be supported by a strong commitment from Washington to maintain the safety net our Nation has built to safeguard our Nation's citizens.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Dec. 19, 1995]

ACTIVIST WALTER BATTLE WORKED FOR KIDS

My children are going to have some food," the Rev. Walter L. Battle once told a reporter.

That particular time, he wasn't talking about his own kids or those of his St. Paul congregation, but the children of Haiti for whom he collected over 1,000 pounds of food and medicine last year.

Still, that attitude, strength of purpose and sense of mission permeated everything Battle did to keep kids on the right track. During a remarkable 46-year run as pastor of St. Paul's Gospel Mission church, community activist and youth advocate, he performed near miracles—all to give young people better lives.

His death last week, at age 74, of cancer deprived the community of one of its best champions of youth.

Among his many efforts for children were building schools and teaching youngsters to read in Haiti in the 1950s; taking inner-city kids to summer camps for many years; founding the Institute of Learning to give teens an alternative to drugs and street life, and fasting for 40 days to raise money for the Institute's programs.

Battle believed all kids were "his children." And so must we.

The best tribute to him would be to keep his legacy of service to children alive. So as not to lose more children to poverty, crime, illness, ignorance and inattention, we must all—like the Rev. Walter L. Battle—become advocates for children.

ONCE AGAIN REPUBLICANS SHUTDOWN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republicans "shutdown" of the Federal Government. It is absolutely essential for the American people to know "Why we are"—"where we are." Let's be perfectly clear in telling the American people what is going on.

It is not the Republicans' budget that caused the Government to close. The Republican budget is an issue that should be taken up, and negotiated on—separate from the continuing resolution. The problem with the Republican budget is that it is so devastating to the American people's quality of life that it cannot stand on its own merit.

The primary reason why the Federal Government was forced to shutdown is that more than 2½ months into the fiscal year, the Republicans have failed to complete action on the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills. Measures which provide agency operating funds.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative schedule provides sufficient time to pass each of the 13 appropriations bills which are needed to keep the Government fully operational. However, the Republicans put action on the appropriations measures on the back burner, while they gave priority—prime legislative time to their "Contract With America."

Mr. Speaker, that is "Why we are"—"where we are" today. There is no excuse for the situation the Republicans have placed the country in today. Just as there is no excuse for the pain and suffering that the Republicans will inflict on children, the disabled, seniors, veterans, and families just to give a tax break to the wealthy. This escalating situation—of Republican displaced priorities—is "Why we are"—"where we are" today.

All that is needed right now to open the Government, and to return an estimated 260,000 Federal employees to work is a clean continuing resolution. The Republicans are afraid to put forth a clean "CR," or to allow the Democrats to pass a clean "CR," because the GOP would no longer have the American people to use as their pawn in the negotiations on the GOP life-threatening budget.

The GOP must not be allowed to continue to hold the American people, and the country

hostage. It is time for the Republicans to stop playing games. No amount of smoke and mirrors can hide the pain and suffering that is in the Republicans' budget. Stop the game play—pass a clean "CR"—return Federal employees to work, return critical services to the American people, and let real budget negotiations begin.

CONGRESS' MULTIBILLION DOLLAR DRAFTING ERROR

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the following editorial appeared in the Washington Post regarding the windfall a few branded drug companies are receiving because of a drafting error in the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994, which is the bill that implemented the GATT trade treaty.

Conservative estimates indicate that correcting this oversight will save the health care system $2.5 billion, with $281 million of that amount saved by the Federal Government and State governments in Medicaid payments. Unfortunately, the Senate recently defeated by one vote an effort led by Senators CHAFEE, BROWN, and PRYOR that would have corrected this glaring mistake.

Opponents of the Senate amendment want to delay resolution of this issue by holding hearings. However, every day that passes is another day consumers are being denied access to lower-cost generic drugs because of Congress' multibillion dollar drafting error.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of New Jersey is known as the medicine chest of the country. I have long been a supporter of our domestic drug industry, whose products have alleviated so much pain and suffering. Unfortunately, some members of the press and some special interest groups continue to overlook the tremendous amount of good the drug industry does, and instead, are only interested in beating up the industry with tired cliches about greed and avarice. This controversy, which started due to the lack of a technical conforming amendment, plays right into the hands of the industry's critics. The House needs to fix this drafting error soon before long-term damage is done to the reputation of these fine companies, and more importantly, so that the millions of Americans who rely on generic drugs can continue to purchase them at affordable prices.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 4, 1995]

THE ZANTAC WINDFALL

All for lack of a technical conforming clause in a trade bill, full patent protection for a drug called Zantac will run 19 months beyond its original expiration date. Zantac, used to treat ulcers, is the world's most widely prescribed drug, and its sales in this country run to more than $2 billion a year. The patent extension postpones the date at which generic products can begin to compete with it and pull the price down. That provides a great windfall to Zantac's maker, Glaxo Wellcome Inc.

It's a case study in legislation and high-powered lobbying. When Congress enacted the big Uruguay Round trade bill a year ago, it changed the terms of American patents to a new worldwide standard. The effect was to lengthen existing patents, usually by a year or two. But Congress had heard from companies that were counting on the expiration of competitors' patents. It responded by writing into the trade bill a transitional provision. Any company that had already invested in facilities to manufacture a knock-off, it said, could pay a royalty to the patent-holder and go into production on the patent's original expiration date.

But Congress neglected to add a clause amending a crucial paragraph in the drug laws. The result is that the transitional clause now applies to every industry but drugs. That set off a huge lobbying and public relations war with the generic manufacturers enlisting the support of consumers' organizations and Glaxo Wellcome invoking the sacred inviolability of an American patent.

Mickey Kantor, the president's trade representative, who managed the trade bill for the administration, says that the omission was an error, pure and simple. But it has created a rich benefit for one company in particular. A small band of senators led by David Pryor (D-Ark.) has been trying to right this by enacting the missing clause, but so far it hasn't got far. Glaxo Wellcome and the other defenders of drug patents are winning. Other drugs are also involved, incidentally, although Zantac is by far the most important in financial terms.

Drug prices are a particularly sensitive area of health economics because Medicare does not, in most cases, cover drugs. The money spent on Zantac is only a small fraction of the $80 billion a year that Americans spend on all prescription drugs. Especially for the elderly, the cost of drugs can be a terrifying burden. That makes it doubly difficult to understand why the Senate refuses to do anything about a windfall that, as far as the administration is concerned, is based on nothing more than an error of omission.

DR. MARIE FIELDER HONORED

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to honor Dr. Marie Fielder for the work done and the leadership given over more than 30 years. I have known her for more than three decades, and her distinguished accomplishments in the behavioral sciences, her constructive organizational change strategies in school systems and in communities, as well as her towering strength and problem-solving ingenuity have contributed enormously to the goals and objectives of the San Francisco Bay Area and Berkeley community where she resides.

While serving as associate professor of education at the University of California, Dr. Fielder helped the Berkeley Unified School District, its board of education, administrators, teachers, students, parents, and citizens plan very carefully for the desegregation of its public schools. Despite an unsuccessful attempt to recall those particular board members, the city went on to become the first school system in the Nation to desegregate its schools, not by placing the burden only on minority students, but by two-way bussing which shared the responsibility across the city. This effort required enormous planning, building of trust, encouragement of participation, and the sharing of all points of view, and the empowering of parents and community members who had not been as active in the public schools before.

Dr. Fielder's genius in working respectfully with all kinds of people to help empower and enable them to solve their own problems became an inspiration for students in education at the University of California at Berkeley, at San Francisco State College, and at Stanford. Dr. Fielder herself became a role model, who encouraged and nurtured university students to pursue and attain their graduate degrees; and many of them went on to become impressive leaders in their respective careers in the decades which followed. Other campuses which called upon her for her expertise and assistance in multicultural and intergroup relations theory and practice included Oregon State university, Michigan State, the University of Miami, and St. Mary's College.

Similarly, over the decades, school systems across the Nation in at least 10 States have sought her assistance; and she has helped them. Dr. Fielder has shared her wisdom and skill in numerous California school districts; she has helped educators, students, and others learn very important things about themselves and about other human beings. She has been an exemplary public servant, bringing quiet dignity and distinction to every project on which she has worked.

Our local community, as well as our national community, are indeed fortunate in having amongst us the person, the work, and the leadership of Dr. Marie Fielder, and it is with great respect and admiration that I commend her to your attention.

THE TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSION ACT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill that could prove vital to the health and competitive position of U.S. companies that rely on imported components and raw materials, as well as their workers and communities. Specifically, my bill gives authority to the Department of Commerce to suspend the imposition of antidumping or countervailing duties temporarily on a limited quantity of a particular product needed by the American industry when users are effectively unable to obtain that product from U.S. producers.

Under current laws, antidumping and countervailing duties are imposed on all covered products, even where there is no domestic production. However, imposing such duties on products that cannot be obtained in the United States hurts U.S. manufacturers who must compete globally, but does not reduce injury to any U.S. industry. Current U.S. trade laws simply do not provide adequate redress for American firms that need products subject to orders but cannot obtain them from U.S. producers. Present procedures are operative only

in situations in which domestic producers have no intention of ever producing a particular product.

By contrast, my bill would address situations in which a product is only temporarily unavailable—i.e., situations in which the domestic industry is not currently producing a product but may wish to leave open the option of doing so in the future. The bill provides the Department of Commerce with the flexibility to suspend duties temporarily until the domestic industry is able to produce a particular product. The temporary relief will encourage the domestic industry to develop new products since it will enable U.S. downstream users to stay in business in the United States until the U.S. industry begins to manufacture the needed input product—thus assuring that there will be U.S. customers for new products produced by the domestic industry.

This proposal is a substantial departure from the short supply proposal considered by the Ways and Means Committee last year. Last year's proposal was modeled on the short supply provision in the U.S. voluntary steel restraint agreements and limited the discretion to be exercised by Commerce. My proposal is modeled on the temporary duty suspension provision that the European Union included in its antidumping regulation last year. It increases the degree of flexibility and discretion that Commerce will have in administering a temporary duty suspension provision, thereby responding to Commerce's concern about the burden of administering such a provision. With this increased flexibility and discretion, the proposal should not impose any significant burden on the Department.

My temporary duty suspension provision would not in any way undermine the effectiveness of the antidumping or countervailing duty laws or the protections that these laws afford to U.S. producers and workers. This provision would apply only in situations in which no U.S. producer benefits from the protection of antidumping laws and downstream U.S. producers and their suppliers would be harmed because the product cannot be obtained in the United States.

The current failure of U.S. antidumping and countervailing duty laws to consider domestic availability of products subject to these proceedings continues to hamper the competitiveness of numerous U.S. companies. A large and diverse group of trade associations and companies employing well over 1 million American workers supports including a temporary duty suspension provision such as this one in the trade laws because it gives Commerce the flexibility and control necessary to address changing market conditions.

I look forward to moving this provision forward at the earliest opportunity.

THE "REAL FRIEND" OF U.S. EDUCATION

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues the following editorial from the December 13, 1995, edition of the Norfolk Daily News.

[From the Norfolk Daily News, Dec. 13, 1995]

THE "REAL FRIEND" OF U.S. EDUCATION

Who is helping education in the United States more?

President Clinton, is resisting Congress' balanced-budget plan, says that federal lawmakers are being too zealous in cutting government education programs. By resisting those cuts, the president said he's making a strong stand for education.

Members of Congress, on the other hand, say their budget plan does much more for education in the United States by providing all American families with a $500-per-child tax credit—even if some current government education programs are reduced in scope.

So, who's right?

We'll side with Congress on this one.

Consider this. If an average American family saved the entire $500-per-child tax credit for a period of 18 years and invested it, that same family would be able to accumulate an amount of money equal to what $14,000 buys today. That's a long way toward paying the cost of education at a public university.

Or, that same American family would be able to use the tax credit to pay a portion of tuition at a typical private elementary school.

What's more, Congress' balanced-budget plan—if passed—would cause interest rates to drop by at least one-half percentage point. That kind of reduction in rates would save a student more than $400 on the cost of an average student loan. That kind of money can pay for books, some tuition costs or a big portion of a personal computer.

The reality is that Congress' plan would cut less than 2 percent per year during the next seven years from a federal education budget that represents only a tiny fraction of the total amount of dollars spent on education in the United States, according to figures from the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C.

So, here's the real choice: Cut a tiny portion of a budget that itself is a small fraction of America's educational effort or deny 28 million American families a financial gain that would help provide for a better education for their children.

We shouldn't have to struggle long on this one. We hope President Clinton realizes the same, too.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration made a commitment a month ago to balance the budget in 7 years using the honest numbers of the non-partisan CBO. My Republican colleagues and I responded to that commitment by offering smaller reductions in the rate of growth in Government spending in certain areas favored by the President while still achieving balance in 7 years.

Through hard work and compromise, we obtained a promise from the President. Congress has held up its end of the bargain both to the President and the American people. The question now is whether Mr. Clinton's word and his signature mean anything—whether his administration has any intention of balancing the budget. Yesterday, the President finally agreed to take personal charge of the budget negotiations—instead of using various members of his staff—and once again committed to work toward crafting an agreement by New Year's eve.

Perhaps I do not have to reiterate this point, but a balanced budget is essential for the future of the country. A recent survey by the Joint Economic Committee shows that the financial cost of not balancing the budget would be about $2,300 per family. A failure to balance the budget would cause slower economic growth, higher interest rates, and taxes. This in turn would result in mortgages, student loans and car loans costing families more each year.

Mr. Speaker, this renewed interest in the budget negotiations by the President is a step in the right direction. We now have reason for optimism in the new year, but only if the President remains committed to his word.

TRIBUTE TO SANFORD M. LITVAK

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Sanford M. Litvak, a distinguished attorney who currently serves as the senior executive vice president and chief of corporate operations of the Walt Disney Co.

Mr. Litvak is greatly respected both in the legal community and among the advocates of legal reform and legal services for the poor. He has led the crusade to make the law a field of humane service, and not merely a remunerative profession.

On January 27, 1996 Bet Tzedek Legal Services will honor Sanford M. Litvak for his unstinting work in bringing high quality legal services to the poor the elderly, and others in need.

Under Mr. Litvak's vigorous leadership, the goals of Bet Tzedek have been realized even beyond the expectations of the organization's founders and staunchest supporters. He and his colleagues have assembled a well-organized, efficient, humanitarian organization that individuals can turn to for competent legal counsel when all other paths are closed.

Sanford Litvak sets a standard for us all to live up to. He has been able to balance his full family and professional life with energetic and creative contributions to the organization and leadership of Bet Tzedek and other humanitarian and philanthropic efforts.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sanford Litvak for his important work with Bet Tzedek Legal Services. I wish him every success in all of his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID CHITTICK

HON. DICK ZIMMER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. David Chittick, whose dedication and leadership helped AT&T become a model corporate citizen and a protector of the environment. Mr. Chittick passed away on November 19, 1995, after a battle with cancer.

David Chittick helped AT&T set goals that eventually led to its elimination of ozone-depleting chemicals and significant reductions in toxic air emissions. His career and work as an environmental leader earned Dave much well-deserved recognition. In 1991, he was awarded the Environmental Protection Agency's stratospheric ozone protection award for outstanding leadership in the industrial field. He was a member of the United States Mission to the People's Republic of China on stratospheric ozone depletion in the electronics industry and also served with the United States State Department and EPA delegations to the former U.S.S.R. and Hungary.

In addition, Dave was involved in a number of environmental organizations including the National Wildlife Federation's Corporate Conservation Council, the board of Resources for the Future, the Environmental Law Institute, the Management Institute for Environment and Business and the environmental advisory committee of the Vermont Law School.

Dave Chittick began his career at AT&T in 1955. He served the company well for 39 years until his retirement in 1994. We will all fondly remember him.

BROAD MEADOWS MIDDLE SCHOOL: CARRYING ON THE MESSAGE OF IQBAL MASIH

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Broad Meadows Middle School of Quincy, MA., which earlier this month received the 1995 Reebok Youth in Action Award for the work students have done to carry on the message and honor the memory of Iqbal Masih, a 12-year-old human rights activist from Pakistan who was murdered earlier this year.

Since their work is so inspirational to all of us who care about human rights, I would like to place in the RECORD a copy of a letter I wrote to the students and their teacher, Ron Adams. I would also like to include a copy of an article about the students, which appeared December 6, 1995, in the Patriot Ledger of Quincy.

The letter follows:

DECEMBER 21, 1995.

DEAR RON: I am delighted to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to you and the students at the Broad Meadows Middle School for winning the 1995 Reebok Youth in Action Award. The work you and your students have done to carry on the message and honor the memory of Iqbal Masih is inspirational to all of us who care about human rights.

I am also encouraged by the success of your fund-raising effort to build a school in Iqbal's name in his home village in Pakistan. The perseverance you have shown, as well as the ingenuity in using the World Wide Web, will be a lesson for the students the rest of their lives.

American students are not often directly exposed to the horror of human rights abuses in the Third World, but Iqbal's eloquent message obviously touched your students. I was impressed by the comments of Amanda Loos at the awards ceremony in New York earlier this month: "His visit made us realize how lucky we are to live in a country like America, to be free, to have an education and to have laws to protect us. We have all Iqbal ever dreamed of."

To commemorate your achievement, I will place this letter and the front page story in the Patriot Ledger on December 6 into the Congressional Record.

Again, congratulations for an award well deserved. I applaud the splendid efforts and dedication that you and your students have exhibited.

With kind regards, and best wishes for a happy holiday season.

Sincerely

GERRY E. STUDDS.

[From the Quincy (MA) Patriot Ledger, Dec. 6, 1995]

WORLD STAGE: QUINCY PUPILS INSPIRE MANY AT CEREMONY

(By Carol Gerwin)

The crowd at Harlem's Apollo Theatre in New York heard from rock stars, actors and world-renowned activists by the time Amy Papile and Amanda Loos took the stage at yesterday's Reebok Human Rights Awards.

But it was the eighth-graders from Quincy's Broad Meadows Middle School who stirred them to tears and spurred them to action.

Invoking the memory of their hero, a slain 12-year-old human rights leader from Pakistan, the girls asked the audience to help them continue Iqbal Masih's crusade to end child slavery and build a school in his name. Hundreds of them later asked for information about the campaign and many gave money.

"We realize building one school will not end child bonded labor . . . but building this school builds hope," Amy told the 1,000 people at the ceremony. "Please pass on our word."

Ending with a special message to Iqbal, she added: "Dear friend, rest in peace. We haven't forgotten you."

Amy, 13, and Amanda, 14, accepted the 1995 Reebok Youth In Action Award on behalf of their school to wild cheers and a standing ovation. It's the same award Iqbal received in Boston a year ago, just after he visited Broad Meadows and told about his escape from forced labor in a carpet factory and his efforts to free other children.

Inspired, the students immediately took up his cause and wrote letters to Pakistani officials asking for the enactment of child labor laws. They were shocked and devastated a few months later to learn Iqbal had been shot to death while riding his bicycle.

Ever since, they have been campaigning to build the school in his native village and to raise awareness about the 7.5 million children still in forced labor in his homeland. With a site on the Internet, and support from Amnesty International, the students raised about $29,000 from across the country.

By April, they hope to have $50,000—enough for a five-room community school.

Yesterday, Amy and Amanda shared the spotlight with Peter Gabriel, Richard Gere, Ziggy Marley and other celebrities, plus the four adults to win Reebok awards—a Mexican human rights lawyer, an American environmental activist, a Rwandan investigator and a Tibetan Buddhist nun.

Many in the audience wept as the students described how tiny Iqbal, his growth stunted from years of malnourishment, inspired them to take up his cause.

"His visit made us realize how lucky we are to live in a country like America, to be free, to have an education and to have laws to protect us," Amanda said. "We have all Iqbal ever dreamed of."

Film Star Susan Sarandon, who presented the crystal award, hugged the girls and praised the Broad Meadows students for channeling their anger into positive activism.

"They're a marvel of energy and commitment," Sarandon said. "It can be truly said of them they walk in Iqbal's footsteps."

Reebok has recognized outstanding activists each year since 1988. To many present yesterday, it was the youngest winners who best symbolize what the awards are all about—individuals, especially children, making a difference.

"Thank God, that's our future," master of ceremonies Angel Martinez of the Rockport Co. said as Amy and Amanda returned to their seats.

He told the crowd that Reebok will give Iqbal's prize money of $10,000, which was earmarked for his education, plus another $2,000, to the Broad Meadows campaign. Wiping tears from his eyes, he asked everyone to stand for a moment of silence in Iqbal's memory.

After the ceremony, a crush of people responded to Amy's and Amanda's pleas and picked up fliers from tables 10 other Broad Meadows students set up in the Apollo lobby.

The Quincy crew collected an estimated $800 and sold several dozen "School for Iqbal" T-shirts, as dozens thanked them for their efforts and encouraged them to keep up the good work.

"Amy and Amanda were only up there for a few minutes and so many people now want to help," seventh-grader Mary Kane said in awe. "It shows you can do a lot in a few minutes."

Later, their language arts teacher, Ron Adams, who coordinates the school's human rights curriculum, learned that singers Peter Gabriel and Michael Stipe of R.E.M. will donate a high-speed modem to make their cyberspace communication faster and easier. Also, superstar Sting and his wife, Trudie Styler, plan to donate $112 worth of stamps Adams said.

Richard Gere, who posed for pictures with Amy and Amanda, told them that he, too, will send a check.

Although both got as many autographs as they could at yesterday's news conference, they said they weren't fazed by the presence of so many stars or the national media interest in their campaign. It's the work that's most important, they said.

"This is really going to boost us up in our project and make people realize everything's not hunky-dory," Amanda said. "There are problems that need to be fixed right away."

Donations can be sent to A School for Iqbal Massih Fund, c/o The Hibernia Savings Bank, Quincy Hi-School Branch, 731 Hancock St., Quincy 02170.

A TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. NOLAN SKLUTE, RETIRING JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, U.S. AIR FORCE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention today the exemplary work and splendid public service of one of our country's outstanding military leaders, Maj. Gen. Nolan Sklute, the Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Air Force. General Sklute will be retiring after an especially distinguished military career on February 1.

General Sklute completed the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps Program in 1962 and entered active duty after completing law school in 1966. His assignments include Luke AFB, AZ; Athenai Airport, Greece; chief, general litigation branch, litigation division, headquarters, U.S. Air Force; staff judge advocate March AFB, CA; staff judge advocate, Bitburg AB, West Germany; deputy chief, claims and tort litigation division, headquarters, U.S. Air Force; executive to the Judge Advocate General; director of civil law, headquarters, U.S. Air Force; staff judge advocate, Air Force Logistics Command, and commander, Air Force Contract Law Center, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH; Deputy Judge Advocate General, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force; and finally, the Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Air Force.

He received a bachelor of arts degree from Union College, Schenectady, NY, in 1962, and a juris doctor in 1965 from Cornell University School of Law, New York. He is a graduate of the National War College, the Armed Forces Staff College, Squadron Officer School, and earned his master of laws degree in government contracts from the National Law Center, George Washington University, Washington, DC. General Sklute is admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States; the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces; U.S. District Court, Northern District of New York; and the New York State courts. General Sklute's military decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal with one oak leaf cluster, the Legion of Merit with one oak leaf cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters, and the Air Force Commendation Medal.

Since 1993, General Sklute has served as the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force. In that capacity, he has provided dynamic leadership and professional supervision for over 2,900 military and civilian lawyers, paralegals, and support personnel. During this time of unprecedented legal challenges, General Sklute's dynamic leadership, sound judgment, personal and professional integrity and unwavering dedication to duty were instrumental in the successful resolution of numerous difficult issues facing the U.S. Air Force. As a key and trusted advisor to two Chiefs of Staff, his sound, timely and cogent advice was a critical component in a host of complex issues with a multitude of dimensions.

General Sklute's early recognition of the legal implications of information warfare has placed the Air Force in the forefront of this new arena. As a prime mover in the coordination of international education and training efforts, he established a joint service committee to foster democratic principles in fledgling democracies. Under his leadership, the Air Force continues to access extremely talented lawyers and paralegals. He has been instrumental in expanding the role of Air Force paralegals, empowering them by shifting responsibility and authority to the lowest possible level. General Sklute has also spearheaded the enhanced integration of active duty and Air Reserve component judge advocates.

Perhaps General Sklute's greatest legacy will be his unrelenting focus on the need for greater emphasis on leadership and accountability. These efforts are already paying significant dividends to the Air Force worldwide. This continuing effort underscored and reinforced the vital importance of Air Force's core values at all levels of command.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you joint me, our colleagues and General Sklute's many friends in saluting this distinguished officer's many years of selfless service to the United States of America. I know our Nation, his wife Linda, daughter Stephanie and son Larry, are extremely proud of his accomplishments. It is fitting that the House of Representatives honors him today.

A 50TH ANNIVERSARY TRIBUTE TO JOHN AND MARY GAIL

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to John and Mary Gail on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. John and Mary were married on December 29, 1945, at St. Rose of Lima in west Philadelphia. They have been residents of Montgomery County, PA for 40 years, first in Merion Park and then in Bala Cynwyd, where they still live today.

Both John and Mary were born and raised in west Philadelphia, but they have made a mark in their Montgomery County community. They participate in local charities like the local Meals on Wheels Program. John and Mary are lifelong members of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia and remain active in St. Margaret's Parish in Narbeth.

John and Mary are two people with diverse talents—she the studious valedictorian at West Catholic Girls High, he the accomplished community theater performer—who together make a perfect pair. And now after a half-century together, they can take pride and comfort in their greatest achievement; together they raised a wonderful family. The Gails have four children; Brian, Barry, Kevin, and Eileen. John and Mary are proud grandparents to nine granddaughters and eight grandsons.

On December 30, the entire Gail family will gather at Philadelphia County Club to celebrate John and Mary's "Golden Jubilee." Let me add my best wishes for a wonderful golden anniversary. As John and Mary look back on their wonderful years together, on the life they built and the family they raised, all of us should raise our glasses to them and say simply "well done." Congratulations to this terrific couple!

TRIBUTE TO SYLVIA AND JULIE WETTER

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my aunt and uncle, Sylvia and Julie Wetter, who celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary on November 11, 1995.

Mr. Speaker, Sylvia and Julie Wetter were married on November 11, 1945 and were long-time residents of Bronx, NY. For the past 7 years, they have lived in Atlanta, GA.

Their marriage has been blessed by the birth of two children, Alice Wetter Paul of Marietta, GA and David Wetter of Bronx, NY. Alice is married to Danny Paul, and they have two lovely daughters, Michelle and Jillian.

Throughout their lives, Sylvia and Julie Wetter have committed themselves to serving the Nation and community.

Julie worked for years with the U.S. Postal Service before moving on to Empire Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

Sylvia, my father's sister, has been an animal rights activist and has been very involved as a volunteer assisting those who have been afflicted with multiple sclerosis. During World War II, Sylvia worked for the coordinator for international affairs at the Department of Commerce.

Julie Wetter served with great distinction with the 83d Division of the 9th Army during World War II. In fact, Julie was drafted when former Secretary of War Simpson selected the ball with his birthdate as the first group of young men to serve our Nation during the war. Julie served 5 years in the infantry, rising to the rank of staff sergeant.

Julie was the first in his division to reach the Rhine River, served in the Battle of The Bulge, and was awarded the Bronze Star, Silver Star, and Purple Heart for his service to his Nation and the cause of world freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Sylvia and Julie Wetter are two individuals who exemplify what is good and right about our Nation. They have served their Nation and community with pride, they have raised a wonderful family and they have shared a love that has lasted more than 50 years. I also want them to know that I love them very much.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and congratulating Sylvia and Julie Wetter on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary, and I know that their Congressman and my colleague, JOHN LEWIS, shares my heartfelt sentiments in wishing them the best.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SAY NO TO THE REPUBLICANS' BUDGET

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republicans' budget. According to the polls, the American people believe that the Republicans' budget cuts go too far.

Despite the fact that the American people continue to say no, to making seniors pay more for less health care; despite the fact that the American people continue to say no to taking health care services away from children and pregnant women; despite the fact the American people continue to say no to gutting Medicare, Medicaid, and education; despite the fact that the American people continue to say no to destroying the environment; despite the fact that the American people continue to say no to tax cuts for the wealthy; and most important, despite the fact that the people have spoken; the Republicans still want to force their life threatening budget down the throat of the American people.

Because the GOP budget cannot stand on its own merit, the Republicans are still trying to tie their budget mess to a continuing resolution. Because the President will not agree to the Republicans' devastating cuts and wants to protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, once again, the Republicans have shutdown the Federal Government. This is the Republicans' second shutdown in 2 months. The GOP's blackmail approach to budgeting is not just shameful, it is irresponsible. The GOP must not be allowed to continue to hold the American people, and the country hostage to their life threatening budget.

TITLE I, AN EDUCATION TOOL MEETING THE NEEDS OF CHILDREN

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an education program that is relied upon as an integral component of the Federal Government's commitment to ensure quality education for every American, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Funds from title I enable schools to provide additional academic assistance to at-risk students. These children are our most vulnerable students. They are children who are more likely to fail or slip behind academically, and they are moderate- and low-income families that often lack the network of support and enrichment that contributes to successful education and schooling.

A major element of the title I program is the involvement of families in the education of their children. Parents and educators share ideas and opinions through the title I Advisory Councils where innovative solutions are developed to help these at-risk students learn. Furthermore, the parent involvement continues into the classroom setting and the home through parent classroom visits and the heightened awareness the parent takes home with them regarding the child's educational needs. Seventy-five percent of the funds Minnesota spent to educate poor children in 1995 came from the $81 million title I fund, which Republican reconciliation and appropriation measures propose to cut. If these budget cuts are enacted, Minnesota is set to lose $14 million in title I assistance in 1996.

Title I is to education what preventative medicine is to health care. It assists students just slipping behind in their level of learning and achievement in school. By providing this extra assistance, especially early in their school years, students are less likely to be held back, and, therefore, benefit more fully from the schooling being provided to them. This type of key investment, made possible by title I resources, is a very important part of ensuring that students do not fall through the cracks and that all children receive the help they require and deserve to succeed. Unfortunately, prior year funding levels and demographic changes in our school settings across the Nation, including an increased number of children in need, have translated into a gap of needs that are going unmet.

Today, the shortfall will be compounded by the misguided attempt to shift our Nation's priorities away from making investments in our Nation's children. The new Republican majority's budget package targets title I for a 17-percent funding cut. Urban areas like the Twin Cities will be more severely impacted by these proposed cuts due to the higher number of low-income families housed by our Nation's cities. Schools that currently rely on these funds to give added attention to at-risk students will be forced to decrease the number of students receiving this aid, or reduce funding in other areas of their curriculum to maintain the same level of service.

Furthermore, when reductions in title I are considered together with the cuts being proposed to other programs that assist disadvantaged children, the impact becomes enormous on this vulnerable population. Funding cuts in programs such as welfare assistance, Supplemental Security Income for disabled children, health care coverage and even nutrition programs are included in the new Republican majority's budget plans that would hit low-income children on all sides at once, placing significant new hurdles in the already difficult path to educational success for these vulnerable students.

Investing in our Nation's children is an essential component for the future prosperity and competitiveness of our Nation, and education is an integral part of that investment. Scientific research has repeatedly demonstrated that sound educational investments early in the schooling years positively impacts not only a child's academic future, but it strengthens their post-school years as well. Every child has the potential to succeed, and title I gives at-risk students the opportunity to achieve that success. As a society, we should make these type of investments today. So-called savings by cutting education programs means less success for our Nation's children and, therefore, our Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter two outstanding articles by Thomas J. Collins and Bill Salisbury into the RECORD. They appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on December 10, 1995, and I think they are very accurate accounts of how much schools in the Twin Cities value the activities they are able to pursue through title I and how essential this program is to the students who receive extra help from it. We must provide these extraordinary teachers, Ray Simms, Mary Bakken, Paula Mitchell, Deirdre Vaughan, Audrey Bridgeford, Jean Jones, Myrtis Skarich, and Jeff Maday, adequate tools so that they are able to serve the needs of our children, our Nation's most important resource.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Dec. 10, 1995]

TITLE I'S TIGHTROPE: WILL POOR KIDS LOSE?

(By Thomas J. Collins)

For a fleeting moment Tuesday evening, the glass-enclosed vestibule of the Naomi Family Center in downtown St. Paul offers a silent, fishbowl view of lives in turmoil.

Teacher Ray Simms is about to step inside, as he does four evenings each week. Silly, isn't it, he says to himself. The better I do my job, the less need there may be for it in the future, he thinks.

In the lobby, he walks past the cacophony where young women and their children flood toward a counter to get evening meal tickets amid the heavy cafeteria odor of dishwater and cooking meat. Up a clanky elevator to the second floor, Simms on this night will test his sixth-grade student's ability to tally time.

Simms and Eugene Booker sit in overstuffed chairs for two hours, counting hours, minutes and seconds like those that have measures the sixth-grader's life since he and his family lost their home in April. Later, the two move on to complicated math problems.

This isn't a classroom. It's a homeless shelter. And to Simms a teacher at Benjamin E. Mays Magnet School, it's not the familiar clanging of lockers or chatter of students he hears outside this door.

The special instruction Simms provides, as well as one-on-one sessions he and other teachers offer to poor kids in schools throughout the city, is part of a program that makes up one of key education targets for those trying to keep the federal budget in line.

The bulk of education money in the United States comes from state and local sources. But when the budget cutting is finished in Congress, education, like many other services, will feel the pinch. And Simms' program, known as Title I, is likely to feel it more than most.

It won't be eliminated, but enough will be trimmed around the edges to allow some kids who cannot read or write to slip away.

Under a proposal in Congress, Minnesota's share of Title I money would decrease by $14 million next year from $81 million. The money pays for programs in every one of the state's 400 school districts, aimed at supplemental support to low-income or transient students at risk of failing in school.

As public schools increasingly come under attack for failing low-income and minority children, Title I has been a life raft for teachers trying to whittle classes that are too large, implement new teaching methods, extend school days if needed, shore up flimsy graduation standards and simply help kids keep up with their peers.

JUMP-START FOR LEARNING

Mary Bakken drapes her left arm around a tiny first-grader at Prosperity Heights Elementary School as he sounds out a simple sentence. She gets the magnetic letters that form the words and he pieces them together.

She mixes up the letters and he rearranges them, an act repeated several times. One of the words he is supposed to know is "how." Bakken asks him to write it and he does, finishing the "w" with panache.

Nearby another boy is struggling with the word "have." Paula Mitchell and her pupil go over and over the word, rearranging and writing the letters until he, too, moves on.

For an hour each morning, the two boys have the undivided attention of their teachers—a jump-start if you will—before they rejoin their regular classes.

"It has been wonderful," Mitchell said of the experience later. "These children are the most in need. They can be helped right away before they feel like they are failures."

Deirdre Vaughan, who coordinates Title I programming at Prosperity Heights, said about half of the school's 418 students need the extra help that the federal program finances. These are students who are scoring below the 30th percentile in national reading and mathematics tests, she said.

"Personally, I see great success with these children," she added. "I see children who like coming to school, whose attendance is improving, whose parents are involved in the program as well as the community."

Nationally, the programs have yet to be proved effective in raising test scores for low-achieving children. But experts claim they are a good start.

"A substantial portion of the enormous number of dollars spent annually on marginally, if at all, effective special education programs needs to be redirected toward preventing initial reading failure," said John Pikulski, who teaches courses in literacy education at the University of Delaware in Newark.

That makes sense to Trish Hill, whose 6-year-old daughter Alisha is a first-grader at Prosperity Heights. Alisha started school without knowing her alphabet.

"I tried working with her a bit at home but it didn't help," Hill said. After several weeks of the Title I regimen, in which Alisha reads simple sentences to her mother each night and reassembles a sentence from words that have been cut out in class, she is catching up.

"She's really excited about school now," Hill said. "The program makes kids like Alisha feel good about themselves."

ELIGIBILITY TEETERING

Propserity Heights on St. Paul's East Side is hanging on by its fingernails to the cusp of the Title I program. Seventy-five percent of its students receive free or reduced lunches; any fewer and it would be ineligible.

Prosperity Heights could be cut from the program next year as the district struggles with a reduced Title I budget. Teachers like Bakken and Mitchell could disappear as well.

"I would be very concerned about meeting the needs of our students if Title I was not here," Principal Audrey Bridgeford said.

Teachers Jean Jones and Myrtis Skarich say they couldn't meet those needs.

They now address them by pulling low-achieving students out of class for an individual tutoring or by breaking classes into small groups with the help of other instructors.

"I started teaching 25 years ago, and until we got this model I was never able to intervene when I needed to when a student was missing something," Jones said. "It's really less frustrating for me and for the children."

Richard Christian has a twin purpose when he visits Jones' class every Monday morning as part of the schools' Title I funded package. Sure, he wants to help his son Shawn and other first-graders improve their reading skills. But he's also on a mission to heighten the visibility of black men like himself in schools.

"It's very important for African-American males in particular to have a place in the classroom," he said after he finished helping another student with a difficult sentence. "The kids are too important for everyone not to be involved."

Jeff Maday barely has time to visit his own daughter between substitute teaching in St. Paul and working as a Title I tutor in homeless shelters six days a week. Tuesday he was trying to explain the symmetry between 24 inches and 2 feet. But his sixth-grade student, recently arrived from Chicago, is skeptical. How could 24 of anything equal 2?

They go over and over the concept until a broad grin breaks out on the student's face.

"The opportunity to work one-on-one doesn't happen in the regular classroom," Maday said. "You can't just write these kids off. It would be such a waste of potential."

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Dec. 10, 1995]

THE BUDGET ISSUE

(By Bill Salisbury)

One in five public school students in Minnesota has a stake in the outcome of the budget battle between President Clinton and congressional Republicans.

Those 80,000 pupils get special help from a federally funded program, called Title I, that tries to provide children from poor families with the basic skills they need to keep up with their classmates.

House Republicans, in their drive to balance the budget and shrink the federal government, voted to slash Title I funding by 17 percent this fiscal year—a cut that could for example eliminate funding for intensive reading services for nearly 14,000 Minnesota children who are at risk of failing in school.

President Clinton, a strong proponent of the program since his early days as governor of Arkansas, is resisting the cuts. He has proposed a modest increase in funding for the program.

Education funding is one of the five budget areas where Clinton and congressional Republicans have fundamental disagreements. The others are Medicare, Medicaid, the environment and tax cuts.

Title I is the biggest and most critical federal education program at stake in the budget negotiations. "It is our flagship program in elementary and secondary education," Marshall Smith, U.S. undersecretary of education, said in an interview last week.

The federal government provides only a tiny fraction of the money U.S. schools spend on kindergarten through 12th-grade education. But it supplies $3 of every $4 spent on special services for poor children.

The House bill would reduce Title I funding by $1.1 billion, to $5.6 billion in the fiscal year that began Oct. 1. (The Senate has not passed an education appropriation measure, although a Senate committee approved a 10 percent cut in Title I.)

"With that $1.1 billion, we could provide intensive reading services to every kid in first grade who is in the bottom 25 percent of his class," Smith said.

Minnesota, which got $81 million from the program this school year, would get $14 million less next year.

"The bulk of our Title I dollars go for teacher aides that work with (kindergarten through fourth-grade) students who are struggling in reading and math," said Jessie Montano, director of the office of state and federal programs in the Minnesota Children, Families and Learning Department. "If those funds are cut, some of those aides would be laid off, and many more children who are eligible for special assistance would not get it."

While all Minnesota school districts get some Title I money, Minneapolis and St. Paul schools would be hardest hit by the cuts because they get the biggest shares of the federal money, based on their large concentrations of students from poor families. St. Paul stands to lose nearly $2 million in Title I funding, while Minneapolis could drop $2.1 million. St. Paul school officials say about 1,250 students would be dropped.

Minnesota schools also face cuts in a variety of smaller federal programs. For instance, the House bill would reduce federal support for programs to combat drug abuse and prevent violence by 60 percent, or $3.5 million for Minnesota schools, according to the U.S. Education Department.

The House would eliminate all funding for Goals 2000, a program intended to bring schools up to higher academic standards. Minnesota, which is using the money to develop and implement new high school graduation standards, would lose nearly $1 million.

The House and Senate both would consolidate more than 100 separate job training and placement programs into three block grants to the states. Under that plan, Minnesota would get $1.3 million less for vocational education next year, the Education Department estimated.

Schools in the state would also get less federal aid for bilingual and migrant education, dropout prevention, staff professional development, experimental schools and several other small programs. It's highly unlikely that states or local school districts would replace the federal dollars they lose, said Michael Casserly, executive director of the Council of the Great City Schools. He said schools in the nation's 45 largest cities, which stand to lose the most Title I funding, are least able to replace it because their budgets are already tightly squeezed.

Republicans say Title I, along with most other domestic programs must be cut to balance the budget.

"Our bill cut $9 billion from education, and we're proud of that," said Elizabeth Morra, spokeswoman for the House Appropriations Committee. "Just about every program took some kind of hit" to balance the budget.

Education could use some belt-tightening, Morra said. "Those programs have been growing out of control in recent years."

The federal government is funding 240 separate education programs this year, up from 120 programs in 1983, and that growth needs to be reined in, she said.

She predicted Congress would settle on $6 billion appropriation of Title I, which would be a $700 million cut from this year's level but almost as much as the program received in 1994. "It's hard to argue that $6 billion is not a lot of money," she said.

Title I is "generally thought of as a good program," she said, but it does not appear to be closing the learning gap between the rich and poor.

Smith, the undersecretary of education, agreed. He said the program was closing the gap in the 1970s and early 1980s, but has not made progress in recent years, for two reasons.

First, he said, the Reagan and Bush administrations weakened the program.

Second, he said, "poverty, crime and a whole lot of other things got markedly worse in the cities during that period."

To improve the program's effectiveness, Clinton and Congress last year changed the law to focus more money and effort on improving needy students' basic skills, especially in reading and math, Smith said. It's too early to measure the results of that change, he said, and too early to dismiss the program as ineffective.

Montano said the program has been effective in Minnesota. Minnesota student participants have always exceeded the national average in gains in reading and math skills, she said.

Morra also criticized Title I for wasting money on school districts that don't need it. Ninety percent of the nation's school districts receive money from the program, including those in the nation's 100 wealthiest counties. "Title I needs targeting," she said.

"She's right," Smith said. The administration proposed targeting the money, but House Republicans and Democrats "shot it down for political reasons," he said. The lawmakers didn't want to take money away from the wealthy school districts they represent.

Rep. David Obey of Wisconsin, the ranking Democrat on the House Appropriations Committee, said Title I cuts are unnecessary. He noted that while the Republicans slashed $1.1 billion from that program, they voted to pay for 20 more B-2 bombers than the Pentagon requested at a cost of $1.2 billion per plane.