

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING GREEK INDEPENDENCE
DAY

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the Greek community to celebrate the 174th anniversary of Greek independence.

On March 25, 1821, the Archbishop of Patras blessed the Greek flag at the Aghia Lavra monastery near Kalavrita, marking the beginning of the Greek war of independence in which nearly 400 years of Ottoman rule was turned aside.

Since the war for independence, Greece has become a steadfast ally of the United States. But that alliance and freedom have not come without a price. More than 600,000 Greeks died while fighting with the Allied forces in World War II against fascism.

Ancient Greece was the birthplace of democratic values. It brought forth the notion that the ultimate power to govern belongs in the hands of the people. It inspired a system of checks and balances to ensure that one branch of government does not dominate any other branch.

These ideals inspired our Founding Fathers as they wrote the Constitution. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, "to the ancient Greeks * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness."

These democratic principles, formed more than 2,500 years ago, have affected change around the world. Witness our own Revolutionary War, the renewal of Greek independence, and the dramatic recent changes in Eastern Europe, the former Soviet States, and around the globe.

Today, the United States is enriched not only by Greek principles but also by its sons and daughters. Greek-Americans have made major contributions to American society, including our arts, sports, medicine, religion, and politics.

My home State of Michigan has been enhanced by the Greek community. In Macomb and St. Clair Counties, we are served by St. John's Greek Orthodox Church and Assumption Greek Orthodox Church. These institutions provide a multitude of community services and add to the rich diversity of the area.

In this changing world of ours, the challenges today include protecting the integrity of the borders of Greece and promoting the democratic ideals which originated in that country. Let us not forget the sacrifices Greeks have made to preserve freedom and enhance democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I join the people of Greece and those of Greek ancestry around the world celebrating Greek Independence Day. I salute all of them for the tremendous contributions to freedom and human dignity which they have made.

TRIBUTE TO LEROY HARRIS

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our respects and sympathies to the family of Leroy Harris, who passed from this life on March 20, 1995, at the age of 81.

Mr. Harris was born in Mobile, AL. He was both a businessman and professional athlete, having been a semi-professional baseball player in the old Negro Baseball League from 1935-45. After his career as a pitcher, which was reported to be exemplary, Mr. Harris worked at American Radiators and later was an employee for the New York Telephone Co. in Buffalo, N.Y. until his retirement in 1977. Always a hard worker, Mr. Harris bought a taxi cab business after his retirement from the telephone company and successfully ran the operation there until his health failed him in 1992. Since that time, he was fortunate to spend his remaining days with his family and friends in Chicago, IL.

Mr. Harris leaves behind a large family of sons, daughters, grandchildren, and great grandchildren. I ask my colleagues, then, to join with me in expressing our deep condolences to the extended Harris family. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back my time.

HONORING OLYMPIC DIVING
CHAMPION PAT McCORMICK

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Olympic Diving Champion Pat McCormick. Pat is America's most successful female Olympic diver, having won two Gold medals at the 1952 Melbourne Games and two more at the 1956 Helsinki Games.

At Melbourne, Pat won both the 10 meter platform and 3 meter springboard competition. She repeated her Gold Medal performance in both events at Helsinki. She is the only woman to have ever won four Gold Medals in these events. Adding to her Olympic Golds, Pat also garnered 27 National Diving Titles during her illustrious career. She received additional recognition in 1956 when she was awarded the coveted Sports Illustrated Sullivan Award as the Nation's most outstanding amateur athlete of the year.

Pat, a long-time resident of Seal Beach, CA, will be inducted into the Orange County Sports Hall of Fame, on March 25, 1995. On display at the Hall of Fame in the "Pat McCormick Exhibit," will be her four Olympic Gold Medals.

Following her retirement from competition, Pat established the Pat McCormick Education Foundation to provide at-risk students an opportunity to graduate from high school and pursue a college education. The Education Foundation provides motivation, counseling, tutoring, and funding all the way through college for participating students. As told by Pat on numerous occasions, the foundation has helped high school students destined for academic failure to become honor students at many of our Nation's top universities.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to recognize Pat McCormick on the occasion of her Gold Medal Retirement Celebration, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending best wishes and congratulations to Pat, our Gold Medal champion.

BART CHARLOW HONORED FOR
LEADERSHIP IN MENTAL
HEALTH CARE

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend Mr. Bart Charlow for his uncompromising advocacy on behalf of mental health care in Santa Clara County, CA, which includes the 16th Congressional District that I represent in this 104th Congress.

For 15 years, Mr. Charlow has actively helped families—and particularly children—touched by mental illness to overcome disability and lead rich and productive lives. As president and CEO of the Adult and Child Guidance Center in San Jose, CA, he fashioned mental health services specially designed to address the needs of many of the community's most neglected populations. As a result, the Adult and Child Guidance Center offers one-of-a-kind programs for adolescents, the hearing impaired, and Southeast Asian immigrants, among others. True to its charitable nature, the center strives to provide a treatment alternative for those who fall short of public-sector assistance.

Those who know Mr. Charlow know that his efforts carry far beyond his own organization. During my tenure as a local government official, I worked closely with Mr. Charlow and others to build a comprehensive system of mental health care for the needy and to preserve those vital health services as local government budgets for such services shrank. As president of the local contract agencies association and delegate to the countywide mental health board budget committee, he was key to these efforts.

Mr. Charlow has participated on too many community boards to mention at this time, yet it is worth noting that he has placed a particular emphasis—importantly—on efforts helping children.

● 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.

Mr. Speaker, on March 27, 1995, Mr. Charlow will be honored by colleagues and passionate leadership in the field of mental health. I would like to express my own gratitude to Mr. Charlow on behalf of my constituents in the 16th district and the U.S. House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM O. HIATT

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor an outstanding Missourian, William O. Hiatt, Jr., of Sedalia, who was recently the recipient of the Center for Human Services' Life Achievement Award. This lifetime achievement award is a tribute to his many years of service to the Children's Therapy Center located in Sedalia, MO.

Hiatt has been involved with the center since 1967. During those years he has been a member of the board and served as president from 1982 until 1992. Hiatt worked for Missouri Public Service, until his retirement 8 years ago. He is also actively involved with other community organizations, such as the United Way, Lions Club, and the Boy Scouts.

The Center for Human Services has benefited from the countless contributions by William Hiatt. I urge my colleagues to join me in commending him for his dedication and perseverance on all his achievements through the years.

CUT THE TECHNO-PORK

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. T.J. Rodgers, the CEO of Cypress Semiconductor located in San Jose, CA, wrote the following memo for the Red Herring magazine, January 1995 issue.

He makes some excellent points: Government megascience programs all too often become the grossest of pork projects. Keep it small, keep it simple, keep it seed money for merit-based research is his message. It is a message worth heeding.

The article follows:

CYPRESS SEMICONDUCTOR

January 9, 1994.

To: The Congress of the United States of America.

From: T.J. Rodgers, CEO of Cypress Semiconductor.

Re: Cut the Techno-Pork!

My advice to the new Congress on technology policy is to kill government science megaprograms, get out of the technology-subsidy business, and double science and technology funding for universities through thousands of small grants. These priorities are particularly important for Republicans who find big-science wonders hard to resist.

With the possible exception of the Manhattan Project, government science megaprograms have a terrible record of re-

turn on the taxpayers' investment. Remember synfuels? This scheme to create gasoline from coal followed the classic, eight-step scenario for wasteful government megaprograms:

(1) Scare the hell out of them. (What happens when the oil cartel shuts off the gasoline?)

(2) Declare that the program is so big, only the government can pull it off. (Translation: No other sucker could be convinced to invest in this loser.)

(3) Get expert advice. (Translation: Listen to oil industry lobbyists who are paid to know that what is good for the oil industry is good for America.)

(4) Create a consensus. (Translation: Spread the pork out to enough states to get the bill passed.)

(5) Execute. (Translation: Use government funds to hire a large P.R. staff.)

(6) Fail.

(7) Lose \$88 billion.

(8) Blame the Republicans for underfunding the project.

Remember the superconducting supercollider (SSC)? I debated a particle physicist from the University of Texas-Arlington on National Public Radio on its merits. He claimed that \$12 billion was a cheap price to discover the sixth and elusive "top quark" subatomic particle. I argued that the genius of the physics community would find a cheaper way to float the top quark in electric and magnetic fields long enough to take its picture. A few weeks later, Congress canceled the SSC. A few weeks after that, the top quark had its first snapshot taken at Chicago's Fermi labs. Then, a Texas entrepreneur proclaimed the \$4 billion 10-mile hole in the ground created for the SSC an ideal spot for growing mushrooms.

Boeing and Lockheed have just teamed up to work on Space Shuttle II. What did Space Shuttle I accomplish to justify the next multibillion dollar investment? Certainly, it launched many satellites, but they could have been launched more cheaply with disposable rockets. Indeed, if the American taxpayer had not been forced to subsidize those shuttle satellite launches (wiping out any possible competition that would have had to pay full cost), there might now be a viable private American corporation capable of launching satellites—a boon to the entrepreneurs waiting in line for years for a satellite launch.

NASA has run out of useful work for the shuttle, let alone its successor. So we are bombarded by reports of German and Russian astronauts using the Canadian robot arm to perform ecology experiments. The large P.R. efforts that form in step 5 of all government megascience endeavors have learned that spreading the pork (step 4) now must be both an international and a politically correct endeavor.

Some shuttle experiments—at a cost of about \$500 million each—are simply ludicrous. Who cares or will ever care if spiders spin their webs differently in zero gravity? And technology con men are having a field day. One University of Houston professor convinced NASA to spend \$2.5 billion on five shuttle flights to make space-grown gallium arsenide (GaAs) semiconductor wafers, the starting material for GaAs computer chips. The flight produced five wafers at a cost of about \$100 million each. The promise is that in the near-perfect vacuum of space, the shuttle will produce GaAs semiconductor wafers nearly perfect in crystal structure. Eventually, the space-grown wafer cost is projected to drop to \$10,000 per wafer.

I am a member of the board of directors of the largest GaAs chip maker in the United States. Here are the facts:

(1) Current terrestrial GaAs wafers cost \$500.

(2) The hypothesized improvement in the crystal structure of space-grown wafers is irrelevant, since the GaAs chip manufacturing process destroys and rebuilds the crystal as part of the process.

(3) All GaAs companies would go out of business if their wafers cost \$10,000 each.

The basic problem with megaprogram funding is that particle physicists, space scientists, and big-company technology experts can have their way with a lay Congress that barely comprehends the complex technologies it is funding. And even that minimal comprehension comes only when huge sums are expended on ever-increasing congressional staffs.

After eliminating the big-science megaprograms, Congress should attack the technology subsidies that Secretary of Labor Rober Reich reasonably calls "corporate welfare". The corporate subsidy most often touted as a success by the Clinton administration (yes, they speak on both sides of the issue) is Sematech, the Austin-based semiconductor research facility that has been given \$1 billion in two five-year grants so far. A reasonably well-run organization, Sematech recently announced it would not seek a third \$500-million grant. (Of course, the original Sematech promise was that it would not come back to Congress the second time.) The Clinton administration believes Sematech should be replicated in other industries. But its record is not one that warrants replication.

Sematech has as members only 12 of America's 200 semiconductor companies.

Two of Sematech's original 14 members quit because even with their dues halved by government subsidy they could not justify the investment.

The big companies that control Sematech's board designed the consortium's dues structure to prevent small, entrepreneurial companies from joining. A \$20-million chip company that may someday be the next Intel must pay 5 percent of revenue, while Intel itself pays only 0.15 percent of its revenue—a 33-to-1 ratio, which is the primary reason so few companies joined Sematech originally. Of course, Intel, which makes over \$1 billion a quarter in pre-tax profits, needs the subsidy a lot less than the small companies that were excluded. But the political system provides the opposite results: Only big companies can muster the lobbying resources to convince Congress to subsidize them. And why would they share the pork with the upstarts?

Sematech used its government subsidy to attack directly the other 100-plus American chip companies that were not Sematech members. After the checks were signed and the TV lights turned off, Sematech began granting funds to companies that make the critical equipment for the production of computer chips—in return for contracts to hold back the most advanced equipment from all but Sematech members for up to one year. (The deals, which Sematech denied repeatedly, were discovered during a lawsuit.) It is no wonder that Sematech insisted on and received antitrust immunity as part of its funding legislation.

If Sematech's silicon-chip subsidy represents the Clinton/Gore model for government subsidies, it's up to the new Republican Congress to stop its replication. Let's not copy a system that allows well-heeled corporations to use their lobbying clout to entrench themselves with taxpayer subsidies,

to the detriment of new companies with new ideals.

The flow of bright, well-educated technologists into industry is much more important to American high-tech businesses than are subsidies to prop up ailing giants. And by cutting out science megaprograms and corporate technology subsidies, the new Congress can both cut the federal budget and free up funds to increase university research funding.

Many Silicon Valley venture capitalists—no friends of big government—believe that the defunct DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency) was one of the most effective government technology programs. They credit it with funding such winning pre-venture capital investments as the UNIX computer operating system work done by Sun Microsystems founder Bill Joy.

DARPA funded my doctoral studies on transistor physics at Stanford. The high-performance chips I worked on may or may not have improved national defense, but I became one of the hundreds of DARPA-funded Ph.D.s who flooded into Silicon Valley from Stanford and Berkeley. What caused an unlikely agency like DARPA to provide decent return on government investment?

DARPA conducted classified military research, which kept Congress on a need-to-know basis. Thus DARPA projects avoided having to spread the pork or to hire a P.R. staff to maintain viability.

DARPA contracts were awarded by competent technical experts on a merit basis without much political consideration. DARPA also had a "customer," the Pentagon, that had at least a long-run interest in the usefulness of what it funded.

DARPA tended to fund the large number of small programs, rather than wasteful megaprojects. The agency was on the right side of the economic tradeoff that demands the sacrifice of 1,000 chances to fund the next Bill Joy/Sun Microsystems in order to fund one superconducting supercollider.

Unfortunately, today's ARPA, the non-defense version of the old DARPA, is drifting back into politics. Members of Congress fantasize about "dual use" (military and commercial) technology, with the hope of picking losers and winners, the latter preferably in their districts. There are debates about where the "retraining" funds should be spent when military programs are shut down.

Some of this is inevitable—ARPA's mission is hazier and more politicized than DARPA's. But the agency's best chance for success is if Congress leaves it alone, allowing it to set technical priorities and give out thousands of small grants to universities based only on a peer-review meritocracy.

The new Congress has an opportunity to shrink the federal government and simultaneously help America's technology industries. It involves getting politics out of the laboratory and supporting education on a non-partisan, merit basis.

OPPOSITION TO SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM RESCISSIONS

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the proposed elimination of the Summer Youth Program. I fully support the program and will fight to restore its funding

when the rescissions bill is sent to the conference committee later this year.

At the same time, I encourage private sector businesses to contribute to the Summer Youth Program so they may make a contribution to the communities in which they do business. In these times of tight budgetary constraints, it is my hope that local businesses can assist in ways that the Government can no longer afford.

Although I support the Summer Youth Program, I also saw the need for reducing the deficit. If we continue to spend money we don't have, we will be passing the financial burden on to our children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, especially the members of the Appropriations Committee, to work to restore the funds necessary to continue the summer youth program.

FAIR COMPENSATION FOR KRIS MURTY

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which would allow for the Federal Government to right an injustice wrought upon one of its own over 8 years ago. In January 1985, the Department of the Army extended a job offer to Mr. Kris Murty, then of Houston, TX, for a position at Ft. Bliss, TX. He received orders authorizing reimbursement for miscellaneous expenses, unexpired lease expenses, and temporary quarters subsistence expense. It was with this understanding that Mr. Murty accepted the position. Upon his relocation to Ft. Bliss Mr. Murty was awarded an advance for his travel costs.

Several months later, Mr. Murty was notified that the Army had erred. At that time, Mr. Murty was instructed that he must make restitution for the Army's mistake. Without recourse, his wages were garnished.

Mr. Murty acted in good faith with the Department of the Army. His acceptance of the position hinged on the Army's assurances that it would cover these expenses. Mr. Murty has spent the last 8 years exhausting all possible avenues of redress. His last recourse is the bill of private relief which I have introduced today.

The Comptroller General of the United States has reviewed Mr. Murty's claim and agrees that his case deserves to be favorably considered by Congress. I urge the committee of jurisdiction to take up this legislation expeditiously so that this issue will be fairly and judiciously settled once and for all.

TRIBUTE TO MR. AND MRS. HEINDL

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Heindl for the many

acts of kindness they have bestowed on our community. It is an honor and a privilege to express my gratitude to this generous couple. Truly, the Heindls epitomize the type of people that make our local communities great. These are the real life heroes that kindle the spirit of giving in each one of us.

When we look at role models in history, the ones who get recognized the most are sometimes the least worthy. I hope that volunteers like the Heindls continue to be recognized as they are most deserving. One of the traits that make people like the Heindls so special is that they do it out of the goodness of their heart. The only motives behind their actions is the hope that those around them will in some way be bettered by their hard work. I can speak for everyone when I say that we have all been touched by their philanthropy.

One of the most important facets in our society is the education system; it lays the foundation for future leaders. Contributions, like those of the Heindls, prove to enhance the system and benefit community members for years to come. The Ridgway residents I am speaking of today have made significant contributions to the Ridgway Area Public Schools. They have selflessly donated their time and resources to ensure that new facilities would be constructed for use by all students. By giving of themselves so freely, they set an example for all of us to follow.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Heindl for all of their kindness and dedicated service on behalf of the Ridgway community. I extend to them my best wishes for continued health and happiness.

WISHING "BO" WILBURN AND SUSIE BOWES WELL ON THEIR WEDDING DAY

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to take a moment to wish two very special people well as they prepare to join in holy matrimony this Saturday in Texas.

Mark "Bo" Bryan Wilburn of Dayton, TX, will marry Kathleen Sue Bowes of Houston at the Heaven on Earth plantation in Missouri City, TX, this Saturday. "Bo" is a peace officer in the Houston area, while Susie is a fifth grade teacher at Timber Elementary School in Humble. Following their wedding, the couple plans to live in the Humble area.

"Bo" is the son of Tom and Janet Wilburn of Dayton, TX, and Susie is the daughter of William and Barbara Bowes of Houston. Since I first took office in January 1981, Barbara has served as my district coordinator, while Bill has for many years served as chairman of my Service Academy Nominations Board.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me this opportunity to observe this upcoming union, and thank you for joining with me in wishing "Bo" and Susie much happiness on their wedding day and throughout their lives together.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JIM GRANT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week I was privileged to participate in a very special event to mark the life of Jim Grant, one of the most extraordinary public servants the world has ever seen, who died earlier this year at the age of 77.

Memorial services are often held at which the passing of a noted public figure is lamented. But, for those who gathered in the Russell caucus room to remember Jim Grant, it was in celebration of a life that was devoted with energy, enthusiasm, endless persistence and, yes, joy, to saving and improving the lives of children in the world's poorest countries.

Those who offered remembrances of Jim Grant included Congressmen DAVID OBEY and TONY HALL; Warren Unna, John Sewell, president of the Overseas Development Council; Dr. Richard Jolly of UNICEF; Mrs. Margaret Catley-Carlson of the Population Council, and two of Jim's sons, John and James D. Musical interludes were provided by the World Children's Choir.

One of Jim's greatest gifts was his ability to imbue others with that same sense of demanding dedication that motivated his own life, and that was how the speakers recalled him.

Jim Grant was one of the most remarkable men it has ever been my privilege and my pleasure to know and to work with.

Never elected to public office, he nonetheless was one of the most effective politicians and diplomats I can recall, particularly when it came to working the Halls of Congress.

His special constituents were the children in the world's poorest countries. He worked tirelessly to improve their conditions.

Jim used his role as executive director of UNICEF as a bully pulpit to prod, pull, and pummel the international community into facing the awful realities of malnourishment and disease that annually claims the lives of millions of children.

Jim Grant placed special emphasis on adapting new findings in the drug and health industries—immunization, breastfeeding, oral rehydration therapy—to low-cost applications that parents could use at home to care for their children.

He was relentless in pursuit of resources to support programs to save and improve the lives of children. Jim's motto was, the difficult gets done immediately, the impossible takes a little longer.

Jim was a leader who went out to see for himself. No project was too remote to escape his interest. Traveling with Jim in Africa meant bouncing around in Land Rovers and Jeeps to check on village health programs in the remote bush.

His flair for promotion and publicity enabled him to attract as celebrity spokesmen for UNICEF leading figures of the entertainment world such as Danny Kaye, Peter Ustinov, Harry Belafonte and Audrey Hepburn, to name just a few.

Shakespeare's Marc Antony lamented in his funeral oration for Julius Caesar that the "good that men do is oft interred with their bones." In Jim Grant's case the good he has done lives on.

During his tenure as the executive director of UNICEF, immunization levels in developing countries increased from 20 percent in 1980 to nearly 80 percent today the number of polio victims fell from 500,000 a year to fewer than 100,000. More than a million lives are saved each year thanks to the oral rehydration therapy works makes Jim strongly advocated.

Jim Grant was an American hero and a world treasure. His presence is greatly missed, but his spirit and his good works continue as a legacy of his persistence, his energy and his humanity. We shall all miss him.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN BYRNE

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to salute John Byrne upon his retirement from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the I.B.E.W.

Mr. Byrne graduated from Storey County High School in May 1943, and completed his electrical apprenticeship in Medford, OR, in 1947. He returned to Reno in 1950 as general foreman for Landa Electric and became a member of the I.B.E.W. Local Union No. 401, in Reno, in 1951.

From 1957 to 1966 he served as financial secretary/business manager of the I.B.E.W. Local Union No. 401, until his appointment as secretary/business representative of Northern Nevada Building Trades Council. He was reelected secretary/business representative in 1967 and 1969.

In January 1971 he accepted an interim appointment as secretary/business representative of the Honolulu Building Trades Council. However, he returned to Reno in July 1971 when he was reelected as financial secretary and business manager of I.B.E.W. Local Union No. 401, a post in which he served until 1987.

In addition, Mr. Byrne has been active in his community throughout his life. He served on the Washoe County Building Code Appeal Board from 1960 to 1964, the Reno Electrical Board of Examiners from 1960 to 1966, the Nevada Employment Security Board of Review from 1963 to 1971, the Nevada State Apprenticeship Council from 1963 to 1971, the Nevada OSHA Review Board from 1981 to 1985, the Governor's Committee for the Restoration of Virginia City, the Nevada State Industrial Safety Code Revision Committee, and the Construction Opportunity Trust. He also served as chairman of the Nevada OSHA Review Board from 1985 to 1989, president of the California State Electrical Association from 1982 to 1983, and coordinator of the Construction Opportunity Trust.

Further, Mr. Byrne's achievements were recognized by the Northern Nevada Chapter of the Associated General Contractors who awarded him their prestigious Service, Integ-

erty, Responsibility [S.I.R.] Award, the only time that award has been given to a labor representative in Nevada.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Mr. Byrne for his accomplishments and my warm wishes for an enjoyable retirement.

HONORING JAMES C. HOUGE ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE MONTEBELLO POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize James C. Houge, who is retiring from the Montebello Police Department after 30 years of dedicated and superior service. Lieutenant Houge will be honored at a special ceremony on Friday, March 24, 1995.

Born in Baldwin Park, CA, Lieutenant Houge attended local schools and earned his associate of science degree from Mount San Antonio Junior College. He enlisted in the U.S. Army on October 31, 1961, and was honorably discharged on October 21, 1963.

In 1965, Lieutenant Houge began his tenure serving the people of Montebello as a police officer. In 1971, his on-the-job performance earned him the status of senior officer. Three years later he was promoted to detective and, in 1979, sergeant. In 1985, Lieutenant Houge was instrumental in leading an investigation which resulted in the seizure of 131 kilos of high-grade cocaine, approximately \$300,000 of U.S. currency and the arrest of three foreign nationals. On March 26, 1987, he achieved his present rank of lieutenant and was assigned the responsibility of overseeing the department's K-9 unit.

In recognition of his dedicated and committed service, in 1992, Lieutenant Houge was awarded the Career Contribution Management Award.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to recognize one of Montebello's finest, James C. Houge, on the occasion of his retirement from the Montebello Police Department and I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting him for his 30 years of outstanding service to the residents and community of Montebello.

TRIBUTE TO THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY LEGAL AID SOCIETY ADVOCATES FOR JUSTICE HONOREES

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the five honorees who will be receiving awards tonight, March 23, on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County.

The honorees will include the Rotary Club of San Jose, the law firm of Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati, Santa Clara law professor

Eric Wright, and deputy district attorney Rolanda Pierre-Dixon. Plaintiffs cocounsel Morrison & Forester will be receiving the prestigious W. Robert Morgan Legal Services Award for donating its services to school desegregation suit against San Jose Unified School District.

President of the board of the Legal Aid Society, Susan L. Sutton said, "Our mission is to be the catalyst for community—we want to ensure that the right thing happens on behalf of our client community without regard to the client's ability to pay. We understand that in some segments of the country that's an idea that has gone out of fashion. But it's still a notion of some currency here in San Jose, good people of this community need to be recognized for their contributions. That is why we created our Advocates for Justice Program."

The Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County provides legal advice and representation for the indigent community in civil matters including family law, custody, visitation, support, and domestic violence, government benefits, health access advocacy, consumer rights, landlord-tenant law, fair housing, home financing and foreclosure issues, individuals rights and immigration, offers family law and housing self-help clinics, and mediation assistance in landlord-tenant matters.

The following honorees were selected for their community contributions:

Rotary Club of San Jose. This 435 member volunteer organization participates in a broad spectrum of community activities. The club is honored by LASSCC for its works in conjunction with the San Jose Housing Authority, building the 102 unit Marrone Garden complex off Branham Lane in San Jose.

Jim San Sebastian chaired the Rotary committee that had the mission to promote a moderate income senior citizen housing complex in San Jose, for which the club donated personal, professional, and financial assistance beginning in 1988. The project opened in September 1994, and since that time the club members continue to provide assistance to the residents. The Rotary Club's financial contributions totaling \$100,000 stacked a library, bought a piano, and provided art work for the project of one bedroom apartments that are available for seniors. The Rotary members' contribution of time was priceless.

Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati. For its pro bono and philanthropic aid to the community, particularly for the efforts of Larry Sonsini in setting the tone of the largest private law firms in the county. The work of Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati in the Silicon Valley has resulted in jobs for local residents of all ages, backgrounds, and abilities as various high technology clients have prospered. LASSCC believes a growing economy offers more access to the community's mainstream of its client base. That alone would be basis for an Advocates for Justice Award. But Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich, & Rosati has contributed generously to charitable causes with attorneys time and their money.

Prof. Eric Wright. Professor Wright has brought a number of agencies together in creating the East San Jose Community Law Center. Professor Wright sought and obtained two separate grants in 1993 to establish a low-income law office in East San Jose. Starting on

a shoe-string budget the law center represented day laborers on their wage and hour claims at the outset.

After receiving a grant from the Legal Services Corporation and from the U.S. Department of Education, the center branched further into employment law and immigration law services. Professor Wright is the unpaid center director and has added a community law practice class to the Santa Clara University Law School curriculums well as a street law class involving students in teaching law to middle school and high school students in low income areas of San Jose.

Deputy District Attorney Rolanda Pierre Dixon. Ms. Pierre-Dixon's job requires her to prosecute domestic violence crimes. It doesn't require her to give more than eight speeches a month on that issue to schools and community groups. She is recognized as the Advocate for Justice for her tireless voluntarism on domestic violence issues and her work with community legal groups, including serving on the board of LASSCC. She is past president of the South Bay Black Lawyers, the chair of the Santa Clara County Bar Association and committee on minority access to the Santa Clara County Bar Association.

Morrison & Foerster. The winner of the W. Robert Morgan Legal Services Award is Morrison & Foerster. Their activities cover a full range of public interest work from staffing of legal services clinics and counseling over 140 nonprofit organizations, to handling high impact litigation. The areas of greatest effort during the past year were assisting children in poverty, civil rights and civil liberties cases, representing immigrants, handling issues of housing and homelessness, and AIDS-related matters.

W. Robert Morrison is a founder and benefactor of LASSCC where personal and professional activities exemplify the highest possible commitment to community service.

Morgan & Foerster attorneys spent over 65,000 hours on pro bono work in 1993, an average of 123 hours per lawyer. Among other accomplishments, the firm won a \$1 million civil rights jury verdict for Latin women who were strip-searched after they were arrested while attending a school board meeting; obtained HMO coverage of life-saving home nursing care for critically ill infants; won an order safeguarding a Chinese citizen brought into a U.S. court to give testimony coerced with threats of execution; and sought writs of habeas corpus for persons under death sentence in four States.

All of these distinguished recipients should be commended on their extraordinary work in the service of others.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CAPT.
MARK P. MCCARTHY

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to pay tribute to a member of the U.S. Air Force 510th Fighter Squadron, Capt. Mark P. McCarthy, who died while participating in aer-

ial combat maneuvers over the Adriatic Sea on January 26, 1995. Captain McCarthy was a devoted aviator who faithfully served the Air Force and his country.

Hand-picked to assist the 510th Fighter Squadron as assistant operations officer, Captain McCarthy displayed leadership qualities which earned him the utmost respect as an aviator. In addition, his superb instructional abilities led to the squadron's 100-percent success rate supporting U.N. resolutions by enforcing the no-fly zone over Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Captain McCarthy's commendable military record is reflected through his abundant accomplishments. He was named distinguished graduate at the pilot instructor course, AT-38 Fighter lead in, F-16 RTU, and Squadron Officer School, and Squadron Top Gun on many occasions. In addition, he was twice named Air Training Command Professional Performer. His decorations include the Air Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Aerial Achievement Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal, Combat Readiness Medal, National Defense Service Medal, and the Southwest Asia Service Medal with one device.

I know that the Members of this body join me in sending the deepest sympathy to Captain McCarthy's entire family. A devoted husband and father, he is survived by his wife Patricia, his three children, Bryan, David, and Christina, his parents, General and Mrs. McCarthy, his sisters, Kathleen, Susan, and Ann, his brother Michael, and Patricia's parents, Colonel and Mrs. Harry MacGregor.

IN MEMORY OF EDWARD ROBERTS—WORLD LEADER FOR THE DISABLED

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Edward Roberts, a highly acclaimed activist for the rights of persons with disabilities and a personal friend, died March 14 of cardiac arrest at his home in Berkeley, CA.

Mr. Roberts was a tireless fighter for the rights of the disabled, even though he himself was severely disabled. At the age of 14, Edward Roberts became paralyzed from the neck down as a result of polio. Although this paralysis would dramatically change his life, Mr. Roberts found the courage to not only exist, but to excel. He became infuriated when a counselor informed him he would never work because of his disability. Ironically, Mr. Roberts later became the supervisor of that same counselor.

A driving force in Edward Roberts' life was his love of a challenge. Being able to move only one finger, Mr. Roberts was one of the first disabled individuals to attend the University of California at Berkeley. While attending college, he and a group of his fellow classmates organized a counseling program for persons with disabilities. This innovative program was named "Rolling Quads".

After graduation, Mr. Roberts continued his fight to enhance the lives of those who had

disabilities. In 1972, he cofounded the Center for Independent Living. This program won acclaim for the incredible work it accomplished and for the fact that it was the first organization run by and for persons with disabilities. This program was an inspiration to people around the Nation. It spawned 400 similar institutions throughout the United States.

In 1975, Gov. Jerry Brown appointed Edward Roberts to head the State Department of Rehabilitation. He utilized the organization's 2,500 employees and its \$140 million budget to implement programs that promoted self-reliance for those with disabilities. Mr. Roberts ran this organization until 1983, at which time he founded the World Institute on Disability [WID]. This think tank is involved in creating and monitoring programs that help individuals with disabilities.

Over his 56 years, Edward Roberts positively impacted a countless number of lives. Deborah Kaplan, the president of the WID Program and a disability rights lawyer, said "There are literally thousands of people whose lives have been influenced by Ed." Through his leadership skills as well as his intense drive to overcome discrimination, Mr. Roberts was a great role model for those with and without disabilities. Friends as well as colleagues will mourn this immense loss.

LIHEAP

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to an issue of utmost importance to my district in western New York.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud congressional efforts to trim Federal spending and reduce our deficit. We are making some bold and difficult decisions. The rescissions bill takes many steps in the right direction.

It is an injustice, however, to eliminate programs—which unlike the Small Business Administration's Tree Planting Program—people depend upon to meet their basic needs.

I am referring to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program or LIHEAP. I know this might not be a big concern to citizens in Florida or Arizona—but to those who live in areas like Buffalo, NY, it can be a matter of life or death.

LIHEAP provides fuel assistance to disabled, working poor, and low-income senior citizens who cannot meet their own total energy needs; 55 percent of households receiving assistance have at least one child under age 18 and 43 percent include senior citizens.

Some argue that LIHEAP was conceived in a time of energy crisis and that is no longer needed. We must remember, however, that energy is still not affordable to everyone.

LIHEAP recipients have an average income of \$8,257 per year—without some assistance their heat could be cut off; 18 percent of their incomes are spent on energy needs.

LIHEAP is a vital program which is certainly not pork or luxurious Federal spending.

I am very worried about the families and seniors from my district and districts across

the Nation who may be unable to properly heat their homes next winter. I hope that the good and bad aspects of eliminating the LIHEAP Program will be more properly addressed during the appropriations process.

TRIBUTE TO THE MURRAY HOUSE

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize a truly outstanding organization in the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, and the very special family who have done so much to support it over the years.

On February 19, 1995, I was honored to attend the annual dinner-dance on behalf of the Murray House, a facility in Passaic County, NJ, which provides for the needs of the developmentally disabled.

Murray House was the first group home in the State of New Jersey. It was created through the love and dedication of the family of Jimmy Murray of Passaic County. Jimmy, the first of five children of Kit and Jim Murray, was born a healthy baby. But during his first year, he suffered a fever that left him with brain damage.

As is so often the case, it was an unfortunate circumstance that has resulted in so much good for the people of northern New Jersey. Through Jimmy's situation, the Murray family came to know Monsignor John B. Wehren, who to this day is still fondly called Father Jack. Inspired by the need to create a new ministry to address the needs of families with disabled children, Father Jack founded the Department of Persons with Disabilities within the Diocese of Paterson.

It was through this relationship that Murray House came to be. Father Jack wanted to find a home, instead of an institution, for disabled adults whose parents had passed away or had no family to care for them. In 1970, he found his home—a 150-year-old diocese building on Main Street in Paterson.

It was with the help and efforts of special people like the Murray family that Father Jack was able to transform a once-vacant building into a home that could nurture and serve the needs of those with disabilities. With the help of others in the community, including churches, civic organizations and students, New Jersey's first group home was opened. It was named "Murray House," after Jimmy Murray.

Since then, Jimmy's brother, Dennis M. Murray, and other members of the Murray family, have dedicated their lives to helping others by raising much-needed funds for the Department for Persons with Disabilities, which operates Murray House and more than a half-dozen other group homes, supervised apartments, and vocational programs for the disabled of north Jersey.

I recently had the pleasure of meeting the Murray family and several hundred of their supporters. This family is a shining example of how a few committed and caring people can change the lives of hundreds or thousands. Their selfless dedication and concern for per-

sons with disabilities is remarkable, and reminds us all that there are lessons about love and compassion we can each learn from the tireless efforts of our friends and neighbors.

ZINGERMAN'S DELI'S PAUL AND ARI

HON. LYNN N. RIVERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to recognize Paul Saginaw and Ari Weinzeig, owners of Zingerman's Delicatessen in Ann Arbor, MI. Since opening Zingerman's in 1982, Paul and Ari have worked tirelessly to enrich the lives of the less fortunate people in their community.

To help alleviate the problem of hunger in the Ann Arbor area, Paul and Ari established Food Gatherers, which collects surplus food from restaurants, dorms, and stores and distributes the food to homeless shelters and halfway houses. Since the program was established almost 6 years ago, more than a half million pounds of food has been delivered.

Paul and Ari's generosity extends to their own delicatessen business as well. They hire, train, and promote recently arrived immigrants as well as employees with special needs and they offer job training for members of Trailblazers, an organization that helps those recovering from mental illness. Furthermore, Paul and Ari give financial backing to these employees who wish to become partners in new business ventures.

As a result of their kind endeavors, Paul and Ari are the recipients of the Jewish Federation of Washtenaw County's first annual Humanitarian Award. I can think of none more deserving of this honor than Paul and Ari. I would like to congratulate both of them as well as express my deep pride and admiration in having such fine citizens in my community.

LAWRENCE KORB: THERE IS NO READINESS GAP

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it has occurred to me that people who are thinking of launching military action against the United States are probably likeliest to do it in November of every year, because it is in November, just before the budget is prepared and sent to us, that our friends in the Pentagon and their supporters often argue that America is militarily vulnerable and must spend billions of dollars more than we were planning to spend to defend ourselves.

Most recently, this came in the form of an argument that our readiness was below where it should have been. Lawrence Korb, who was in part responsible for maintaining readiness during the Reagan administration as an assistant secretary of defense, very effectively refutes this argument in the article he published

in the Sunday New York Times of February 26. Lawrence Korb has done his country enormous service, both when he was in government, and even more so afterward by his willingness to speak out forcefully and honestly, even when this has unfortunately been at some cost to his own professional career. His refutation of the most recent arguments that have been advanced to send an already excessively high Pentagon budget even higher make an extremely contribution to our national debate and I ask that they be printed here.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1995]

THE READINESS GAP

(By Lawrence J. Korb)

To listen to Republicans and the military brass, you would think America's armed forces have fallen into the same 1970's morass that spawned the term "hollow military" and gave Ronald Reagan a potent issue for the 1980 campaign. Is it possible that just four years after one of the most stunning military triumphs in modern times the services could be suffering from inadequate training, shortages of spare parts and poisonous morale? Just to pose the question in those terms points strongly to the commonsense answer—of course not. This is not the 1970's and the Clinton Administration is not repeating the mistakes of the Carter Administration.

Today, the United States spends more than six times as much on defense as its closest rival, and almost as much on national security as the rest of the world combined. In 1995, Bill Clinton will actually spend \$30 billion more on defense, in constant dollars, than Richard Nixon did 20 years ago and substantially more than his own Secretary of Defense argued was necessary in 1992.

Since the collapse of the Berlin wall, the Pentagon's forces have declined by 25 percent and financing for new weapons has fallen by 50 percent while readiness spending has dropped by only 10 percent. In the last year, readiness accounts increased by \$5 billion while the overall military budget dropped by 3 percent. The Pentagon now spends more on readiness (about \$60,000 per person) than it did in the Reagan and Bush Administrations (when readiness hit all-time highs) and 50 percent more than during the Carter years.

And the quality of entering recruits is still very high (96 percent) and retention rates are so good that the Pentagon is still dismissing people.

If readiness spending is higher than in the Reagan and Bush years, and if the manpower situation is still so solid, why do so many politicians and generals warn darkly about a readiness gap? That—not the theological question of whether our forces are combat ready—is the crucial question. The answer is more nuanced than most people would imagine, and sheds a great deal of light on Pentagon politicking in the post-cold-war era.

I first encountered the politics of military readiness 30 years ago when I was a Naval flight officer in the Far East. One Sunday afternoon, in response to a call from the Seventh Fleet, I reported that only 3 of our 12 planes were ready for combat. For my honesty, I received a severe tongue-lashing from my commanding officer, who informed me that whenever headquarters called we were always ready. The military, he explained correctly, prized a "can do outfit," and the services promoted those who performed regardless of circumstances.

My next encounter was in 1980, when I was preparing a monograph on the subject for the American Enterprise Institute. When word of

my project reached the Pentagon I was drowned in data (some of which was highly classified) and anecdotes from normally tight-lipped bureaucrats. When I went to the Pentagon to conduct some interviews, I was treated like a foreign dignitary.

One of my conclusions was that readiness is a slippery and poorly understood concept. To most people it is a synonym for military capability or preparedness. To the military, however, readiness is only one of four components of preparedness, and not necessarily the most important one. To obtain a true picture, one had to look at the other three pillars—force structure (the number of ships, planes, tanks), modernization (the age of the forces) and sustainability (staying power). Thus, a very ready force could be considered militarily impotent if it was too small, too old and lacked staying power. By the same token, a force that was bigger, more sophisticated and better armed than its adversaries could be deemed unready if it was considered improperly trained and outfitted.

I also concluded that readiness is a hot-button political issue, subject to unlimited manipulation. Even the informed public can't judge such matters as the appropriate force structure, the proper time to replace a plane or tank and the level of effort necessary to win a war. But everybody wants and expects a ready force.

Military leaders were quick to grasp the political potential of readiness scares. In the late 70's, word went out that reports of readiness problems would be welcomed by headquarters. The only exception was the Marine Corps. I was told by a general that the Marines had been C-2 (ready) for 200 years!

I also came to understand that measuring readiness is hardly an exact science. Each service defined readiness differently, and I found similar units with similar problems reporting different levels of readiness. The Air Force claimed that a fighter pilot needed to fly 20 hours a month to stay battle fit. The Navy and Marine Corps said their pilots needed a minimum of 24 hours a month; Air National Guard units needed only 10 hours per month. No one could ever explain why readiness demanded that Army tanker trucks drive 800 miles a year, why ships needed to steam 55 days per quarter or why helicopter pilots needed only 14 hours a month flying time.

Finally, I discovered that a unit's readiness was determined by the lowest grade it received in any of the four categories (personnel, equipment and supplies on hand, equipment readiness and training). Thus, a fully manned unit with modern equipment in perfect working order would be classified as not ready if it trained for only a brief period of time.

Nonetheless, my report for the American Enterprise Institute concluded that the armed forces were indeed experiencing severe readiness problems, for three reasons. Given the threat posed by our principal adversary, the Soviet Union, military expenditures in the 1970's were too low. Moreover, the civilian and military leaders of the Department of Defense decided to spend the few extra dollars they received on stealth war planes, cruise missiles and other new technologies at the expense of flying hours and spare parts. Finally, the Carter Administration allowed military pay and benefits to fall 25 percent behind comparable rates in the private sector. Consequently, the quality of recruits fell below acceptable standards and retention rates dropped precipitously.

My conclusions were attacked by the Secretary of Defense but embraced by the mili-

tary and candidate Reagan. My reward, following the Reagan triumph, was to be appointed "readiness czar" in the Pentagon.

Once in office, I was introduced to another side of the politics of readiness. The military chiefs, having skillfully used the issue to help secure a large spending increase, were much less interested in fixing readiness than in modernizing and enlarging their forces. The same Army chief who had coined the term "hollow military" told the Secretary of Defense that the best way to improve a soldier's readiness was to buy him a new rifle.

Spending for readiness did increase by about 20 percent, or nearly \$10,000 per person (in total, less than one-fifth the increase in procurement). Nonetheless, according to the Joint Chiefs, by 1984 the readiness of all major units, except Navy ships, had gone down and I was being pilloried by the Democrats.

How did this happen? Without telling their civilian "superiors," the service chiefs had raised the standards for readiness right along with the Reagan buildup. After these standards were made more realistic, readiness began to grow significantly during the last half of the 1980's, reaching all-time highs. The performance of the American forces in the gulf in 1990 and 1991 showed just how capable and ready they were.

With the ascension of Bill Clinton to the Presidency, readiness once again emerged as the hot-button issue. Senator John McCain, the Arizona Republican, issued a report called "Going Hollow," in which he drew heavily on the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Last December, a weakened President Clinton pledged an additional \$25 billion for readiness. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the current readiness gap, like others since the 1970's, was designed and manufactured by the Pentagon to serve its political agenda—to maintain the cold war status quo.

Despite several reviews of force structure in recent years, the services remain configured to contain a non-existent Soviet empire. The Navy still keeps three active carrier battle groups, with thousands of battle-ready marines, while the Army and Air Force have nearly 200,000 troops stationed in Europe and Asia. Thus, when a crisis erupts in a Haiti or a Rwanda, these forces must take on these assignments as "extra tasks," for which they often lack training and equipment. The question here is not readiness but why we continue to train and deploy forces for cold war tasks.

Additionally, the services have inflated the threat against which readiness is measured. According to President Clinton, the armed forces should be prepared to fight two major regional wars simultaneously: one against Iraq and one against North Korea. According to the Pentagon and many Republicans, the services have neither the money nor the forces to accomplish this. Since defense spending is at about 85 percent of its average cold war level, this leads to the absurd conclusion that Iraq and North Korea (which together spend less than \$20 billion a year on the military) equal 85 percent of the might of the Soviet empire.

Finally, the joint chiefs are simply manipulating the system. Two of the three Army divisions that they identified as unready were in the process of being demobilized. Other units were not able to do routine training because they were involved in a real war, that is, the October deployment to the Persian Gulf to deal with Saddam's thrust toward Kuwait. The Marines, who have finally caught on, now say that their readiness is lower than in 1980!

The U.S. has the finest and best financed military in the world. It is also the most ready, prepared to go thousands of miles on short notice. But it is inadequately controlled by its civilian superiors. Because of Bill Clinton's perceived political vulnerability on defense issues, the civilian leaders do not wish to risk a confrontation with the Republicans or the military chiefs. As a result, the "nonpolitical" admirals and generals running the military are taking all of us to the cleaners, using the readiness gap to snatch up precious dollars to defend against a threat that no longer exists.

DELAURO HONORS LOCAL HERO

HON. ROSA L. DELAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in mourning the passing of a true hero. Mr. John Willsher of Woodbridge, CT, died of a heart attack last month after helping to rescue two young boys, whom he had never met, from the freezing waters of Lily Pond in New Haven.

Having stopped to buy gas, he heard the boys screaming from across the street and ran to help. As part of a brave and selfless rescue effort, he helped remove the boys from the frigid waters of the pond. After making the rescue, John Willsher suffered a fatal heart attack.

Mr. Willsher died the same way he lived for 57 years—helping others. He was known among relatives and neighbors as helpful and generous. His countless acts of selflessness cannot be listed, but will long be remembered by those who knew him.

Mr. Willsher is remembered by his friends and family for his good sense of humor, his interest in politics, and his love of cooking. He and his wife, Elizabeth (Buddy), to whom he had been married for 30 years, and his three children, Michael, Peter, and Jennifer, were very close.

Mr. Willsher moved to the United States from Colchester, England in 1963. He worked as a plumber for 18 years at the AlliedSignal Corp. in Stratford and was 2 years away from retirement.

John Willsher reminds us of the best in people. His generosity and selflessness renew our faith in ourselves.

I am confident that my colleagues in the House join me as I send my deepest condolences to the Willsher family and my gratitude for the selflessness and bravery demonstrated by John throughout his life.

STATE ROUTE 905—NAFTA'S MISSING LINK

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will be interested in testimony I gave today before the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony on a project that is critical to the economic success of the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA] and the economic development of not only southern California, but the whole Nation.

When the 103d Congress approved and the President signed NAFTA, we all knew that ensuring the success of the agreement would require that all parties provide the necessary infrastructure to facilitate the flow of trade. I am asking this committee and this Congress to honor this commitment to San Diego.

State Route 905 is the critical missing link in our United States-Mexico border trade and transportation system on the West Coast. The current road serves as the only connection between the Otay Mesa point of entry [POE] in San Diego and the Nation's interstate highway system. State Route 905 is a part of that infrastructure which is needed to accommodate international trade and deserves to be funded and completed.

I am here today to urge you to consider funding this vital link during your upcoming deliberations of transportation projects to be funded during fiscal year 1996.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

There is a critical need for continued Federal funding of "special highway demonstration projects." States undergo a constant struggle to build and maintain their own intrastate roads and bridges. They do not have sufficient funds to single-handedly complete highway projects which supplement the national highway system and which support Federal trade policy—as in our case.

This project will produce benefits far beyond the local region as only 16 percent of trade using this border crossing has a San Diego origin or destination. Every State in the continental United States, Hawaii, Canada, Asia, and the Canal Zone all profit from trade through this point of entry.

The Federal Highway Administration has proposed that this road be a part of the National Highway System—and I am confident that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will include this in its list of authorized projects.

LOCAL COMMITMENT

The city of San Diego and the State of California already have demonstrated their good faith commitment to their share of this project. They have invested \$14 million and have begun work to widen the existing road from four to six lanes of traffic. However, due to the increasingly heavy flow of trans-border commercial traffic, this road will be at—or above—capacity when completed. This is only a short-term solution, however, and a permanent answer to America's growing trade with Mexico is needed.

We have worked closely with the city and county of San Diego, the State Department of Transportation [CALTRANS], and the local regional council of governments in identifying this as our county's top transportation need.

In addition, CALTRANS, the General Services Administration and the California Highway Patrol Department all concur on the vital need for completion of this highway to meet the pressing needs created by the substantial increase in trade transportation.

TRADE FACILITATION

This is a necessary and vital road because the Otay Mesa crossing is the only commercial vehicle border crossing facility between the two largest cities on the United States-

Mexico border. With the recent opening of a new border crossing facility at Otay Mesa, this point of entry handles the third highest value of commerce along the entire United States-Mexico border.

The recent Federal Highway Administration report to Congress estimated that, because of the adoption of NAFTA, the value of commercial goods crossing the border would increase by 208 percent by the year 2000—but only if additional infrastructure improvements are made. If we achieve this 208 percent growth—the estimated value of goods crossing this border would be \$18.8 billion annually.

The Otay Mesa border crossing facility can handle this increase in business. We simply need an additional incremental investment on the part of the Federal Government to put us in a position to take full advantage of future increases in trade.

The one road that leads from the interstate highway, to this border crossing cannot accommodate the increase in traffic. This link is a four-lane city street—Otay Mesa Road—which is already over capacity and which has been the location of a number of fatal vehicular accidents due to its congestion. This road was never intended to handle heavily loaded cargo trucks traveling at high speeds to and from the international border. We need a highway to take this commercial traffic inland.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government made the decision to process all international commercial traffic at the Otay Mesa border crossing. The Federal Government also made the decision to approve NAFTA—which will soon double the volume of our cross-border traffic. These two new federal trade policies have created the urgent need for this highway. Not funding this project would be the worst kind of unfunded mandate. The Federal Government must meet this responsibility—our local communities simply cannot.

TRAFFIC AND SAFETY

As I have mentioned, an overcrowded four lane city street—Otay Mesa Road—provides the only connection between the Otay Mesa point of entry and the interstate highway system. This road, which has the appearance of a country road, was not intended to carry a high volume of automobile traffic and certainly never a high volume of heavy commercial vehicles.

With the closing of the nearby San Ysidro border crossing to commercial traffic, an additional 1,200 trucks per day carrying commercial goods to and from Mexico now travel on this city street. While the average mix of commercial trucks on any city street is 5 percent, this road experiences a 20 to 25 percent truck mix during regular business hours. Wear and tear on this road is occurring at an alarming rate due to these heavy loads.

When major traffic accidents occur on this road—as they do with increasing frequency now—all border traffic slows to a stop. It is typically 4 hours and occasionally more before accidents are cleared away and traffic returns to normal. This constitutes a major impediment to the implementation of NAFTA.

This road also does not meet requirements for the transportation of hazardous materials through communities. With the closing of the San Ysidro crossing to commercial traffic, trucks carrying hazardous materials must travel to the Calexico-Mexicali point of entry to cross the border—a 90-mile detour!

COST

We are asking that the Federal Government help San Diego accommodate this increasing international trade by approving a three-year project to build State Route 905, which would link the Otay Mesa border crossing with the interstate highway system, and to make the necessary street improvements to manage this commercial traffic that is so vital to our economic growth.

While the total cost for the 3-year project is \$96.7 million, our request for fiscal year 1996 is \$500,000. These funds would allow for the completion of necessary environmental and cultural reports on the proposed route of the new highway. These studies are important and invaluable as they will influence the highway's alignment and potentially reduce expensive mitigation costs in the future. Funding for these studies is critical for this project to move forward.

CONCLUSION

It is a Federal responsibility to connect ports of entry with the interstate highway system. The Federal Government has not met its obligations. The State of California and the city of San Diego have invested more than \$14 million in interim remedies. The private sector has invested far more than that to finance the necessary local street network. Existing State and Federal funds are being used to improve two existing highways, Interstates 5 and 15. These two highways would carry NAFTA-related traffic from the new highway to destinations throughout the county and beyond.

San Diego County's transportation and infrastructure needs are many. I hope that this committee will agree that the relatively small Federal investment required for this critical portion of border infrastructure, State Route 905, is in the national interest and that you will include funding for this road in our fiscal year 96 budget.

AMERICAN HOLOCAUST SURVIVOR
HUGO PRINZ

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring your attention and that of my colleagues to the case of Hugo Prinz. Mr. Prinz is the only known American survivor of the Nazi death camps. He has been denied Holocaust reparations by Germany for 40 years because of his U.S. citizenship while in the camps, despite numerous diplomatic entreaties on his behalf by successive administrations and Congress.

During the 103d Congress, the House and Senate unanimous resolutions supporting Mr. Prinz and took numerous other steps on his behalf, including unanimous passage last October in the House, and near passage in the Senate, of legislation I authored which would have permitted the lawsuit he filed against Germany in 1992 to proceed; the courts had found Germany immune from the suit. My colleagues and I are prepared to reintroduce that bill in this Congress should the latest diplomatic efforts to resolve the case founder.

Much has been written about the Prinz case, but a superb column by Eric Breindel, editorial page editor of the New York Post, describes the Prinz story in especially eloquent

and dramatic detail. Entitled "Germans stick to 'principle'—and the price is decency," it was published in the Post on January 19, 1995. Mr. Speaker, I ask its inclusion in the RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it.

I want to underscore one point made by Mr. Breindel. He rightly praises the key role in the Prinz matter played by William R. Marks, a D.C. attorney, and his firm, Atlanta-based Powell, Goldstein, Frazer & Murphy. Mr. Marks and Powell, Goldstein—led in this effort by partner Simon Lazarus—have been tireless champions of Mr. Prinz since they took the case on 20 months ago. They have so successfully raised its profile on the political, diplomatic and media fronts that a breakthrough may finally be possible. And that they accepted the case *pro bono* is a true testament to their commitment to resolving this unique humanitarian issue. I commend Mr. Marks, Mr. Lazarus, and Powell, Goldstein, and look forward to continued work with them and with Steven Perles, Mr. Prinz' top-notch litigation attorney, as we try and bring this case to a successful conclusion.

[From the New York Post, Jan. 19, 1995]

GERMANS STICK TO "PRINCIPLE"—AND THE
PRICE IS DECENCY

(By Eric Breindel)

Tuesday's refusal by the U.S. Supreme Court to hear the case of Hugo Prinz—a 72-year-old Holocaust survivor who wants to sue the German government in an American court—will be hailed by well-meaning lawyers as a victory for the ancient principle of "sovereign immunity."

In fact, Hugo Prinz's story represents a case study in the abandonment of ordinary decency for abstract principle.

The Prinz affair is almost a Manichean morality play. Prinz himself, who endured the ultimate in barbarism as a Jewish inmate at Maidanek, Auschwitz and Dachau, is driven by a quest to realize some semblance of justice—to make his tormentors pay, if only in a meager, monetary way, for abusing him and murdering his family.

The Germans are animated in part by parsimony and in great measure by a determination to close the book on a past they've never fully been willing to face. Meanwhile, handicapped by an addiction to absolute order and an aversion to creative problem-solving, Berlin refuses to recognize that dealing with Hugo Prinz as a special case would have spared Germany a good deal of unhappy publicity.

Notwithstanding the Supreme Court's ruling, the Prinz story isn't over—largely because the aging survivor has managed to find vocal champions. Two of them stand out: Rep. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) and William R. Marks, a young, Washington-based lawyer who's taken on Prinz as a *pro bono* client.

Marks, a graduate of Harvard and Georgetown, persuaded his law firm colleagues that Prinz's struggle against the German government deserved attention for humanitarian reasons. Schumer, a powerful House Democrat and skillful parliamentarian, means to introduce legislation that would strip Germany of its sovereign immunity for "acts of genocide" committed against American citizens. The bill, in short, would apply only to Prinz. There is no other living American who survived the Nazi Holocaust as a U.S. citizen.

Prinz and his family were American nationals living in Slovakia in 1942 when the German SS—assisted by Slovak Collabo-

rators—sent them to the Maidanek death camp in Poland because they were Jewish. Twenty years old at the time, Prinz had been born an American citizen. The Prinz family—blessed with valid U.S. citizenship papers—should have been able to join a Red Cross prisoner-exchange transport. But in the night and go of war, Prinz, his parents and five siblings were hustled onto Maidanek-bound cattle cars.

It's well to note that Prinz and his father tried many times to secure appropriate papers for passage to America during the course of 1938 and 1939; despite their desperate circumstances—as Jews under impending Nazi rule—they were rebuffed by the U.S. embassy in Prague.

Apart from the curious fact of their nationality, the Prinz family's fate was akin to that experienced by most East European Jews. Both his parents and his three sisters were shipped to Treblinka from Maidanek and gassed on arrival. Hugo and his brothers spent most of the war as slaves at Auschwitz. Both brothers perished. Prinz himself was tasked with stacking the bodies of his fellow Jews after they were murdered. Near the war's end, he was marched into the German interior and wound up as a slave laborer at Dachau—where he was liberated in 1945 by U.S. troops.

As an American, Prinz was spared interment in a Displaced Persons camp: After recuperating in a U.S. military hospital, he came to the U.S.—finally—in 1946.

This circumstance caused the German government to reject his original 1955 application for reparations: Insofar as he hadn't been either a German national or a DP, Prinz was declared ineligible, notwithstanding Germany's professed willingness to recognize its moral obligation to make restitution to Holocaust survivors.

After 37 years of humiliating application and reapplication, Prinz filed suit in federal court in 1992. The German government had broadened its eligibility criteria in 1965, but failed to notify Prinz. When he finally submitted new forms, the long-suffering survivor was told that the statute had lapsed. Prinz's lawsuit required him to advance a serious damages claim—thus, he's seeking \$17 million for "false imprisonment, assault and battery and infliction of emotional distress." (It's wrenching to see the Holocaust reduced to the language of tort law.) He also seeks payment from private German firms for the slave labor he performed.

The real debt may not be \$17 million, if it's calculated in accordance with what other survivors were awarded. (Prinz insists that his goal is retroactive parity.) Still, the debt is a good deal larger than the \$3,400 lump-sum payment, plus a \$340-per-month stipend, that Germany's lawyers offered Prinz Tuesday after the high court ruled against him.

The Germans claim they can't strike an entirely separate deal with Prinz, lest doing so invite additional litigation. ("The concern is groundless. Prinz's circumstances are entirely unique.") On a less than compelling note, the Germans contend that the settlement they're now offering is "all the German government can afford."

This sordid business has gone far enough. If Berlin can find funds to pay military pensions to ex-members of the murderous Latvian SS, it should be possible to locate money to "compensate" Hugo Prinz.

Schumer's bill—which has lots of cosponsors and supporters on both sides of the aisle and in both houses of Congress—may help concentrate Berlin's mind and promote a focus on settling the case. After all, it's hard

to imagine that Germany wants to see a genuine Holocaust trial take place in an American courtroom.

COMMENDING NATIONAL SERVICE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in light of the continuing debate about increasing Federal fiscal responsibility, it is extremely important that we recognize those programs that offer a substantial national return on the Federal investment. One such initiative, the National and Community Service Program, is a successful Federal program which provides volunteer placements for young people who choose to perform thousands of hours of work serving their country in return for educational assistance. Unfortunately, this program is also one of the many victims of misplaced Republican budgetary cuts.

As my colleagues are aware, the National and Community Service Program took a large hit in the recent House-passed rescissions bill. In response to this action, I would like to draw your attention to Mary McGrory's article in today's Washington Post which complements the program as a "model enterprise." The article describes "rampaging Republicans" in the House who would like to eliminate National Service even though the program is overwhelmingly supported by both Democratic and Republican Governors across the Nation and by the communities that are recipients of the valuable work performed.

In 1994, approximately 20,000 AmeriCorps volunteers worked to confront unmet human, educational, environmental and public health needs. Roughly 350 of these volunteers worked in eight units of the National Forest System to combat the severe backlog of maintenance, improvement, and rehabilitation needs—work which is important but far from glamorous. The task undertaken on our public lands are those which are too undesirable or too costly for Forest Service personnel or contract employees to perform. Yet, this work directly benefits all Americans. Some of the AmeriCorps' accomplishments in the national forests include:

In San Bernardino National Forest, in California, AmeriCorps volunteers have taken important steps to prevent erosion by rehabilitating 12,000 acres of land burned by fires;

In Six Rivers National Forest, also in California, National Service volunteers have rehabilitated 3.5 miles of hiking and horse trails and reforested and restored wildlife habitat on 10 acres of land which was once a gold mine waste area;

Volunteers planted 2,390 trees in several campgrounds, enhanced fish habitat, built a nature trail, and improved timber stands in the Rouge River National Forest in Oregon. AmeriCorps volunteers have also improved overall forest health on 55 acres by pruning second growth trees;

In Washington's Olympic National Forest, AmeriCorps volunteers have maintained 4 miles of trails, rehabilitated campground sites,

completed handicapped access in six recreation sites, completed restoration of two historic sites, surveyed species habitat, and pruned 120 acres of timber stands;

In the Arizona National Forests, volunteers maintained 15 miles of trails, rehabilitated 10 campground sites, improved wildlife habitat on 300 acres, and obliterated 2 miles of road, returning the land to its natural state; and

AmeriCorps volunteers improved paths and maintained roads in Bienville National Forest in Mississippi.

These accomplishments represent only some of the projects AmeriCorps participants have completed. Elsewhere across the Nation, AmeriCorps volunteers have performed emergency response work to mitigate the effects of floods, fires and earthquakes, cleaned-up our urban areas, increased disaster prevention efforts and worked with citizens to improve their quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues remember that the entire Nation reaps the benefits of the National Service Program.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 1995]

CRIB DEATH FOR NATIONAL SERVICE

(By Mary McGrory)

The House Republicans' strangling of national service in its crib has to be seen not as a criticism of the agency's performance but simply as another expression of the party leadership's notion that no government program is worth a damn.

If they were going by performance, the Republicans might have to applaud AmeriCorps as a model enterprise. It is modestly funded, locally directed and dramatic evidence that American youth is not cynical or self-serving. AmeriCorps has had rave reviews from coast to coast for its 20,000 volunteers, who are doing things nobody else tackles, everything from helping to build housing for the poor and tutoring inner-city school pupils to cleaning polluted streams in Baltimore's watershed.

A case in point is Howard Hogin, a 1994 graduate of Georgetown University. He is living in a cramped barracks at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. He spent September fighting forest fires in Idaho and much of the fall in helping build a riding ring for disabled children. Now he's trying to clean up Maryland's polluted streams. He hopes to pay off his college loans. AmeriCorps pays its workers a minimum wage and an annual \$4,725 toward college expenses.

Service is in Hogin's genes, and by his family's standards, he is a big success. His parents are both social workers and his ancestors experienced big trouble, like the Irish famine and the Holocaust. He says lots of his Georgetown classmates have the same impulse to leave the country a better place but "just can't afford to do it."

Hogin is tactful about the mugging AmeriCorps suffered when the House cut \$416 million, or 72 percent, from its \$575 million budget. He was voted outstanding teenage Republican in his high school class. "I understand that we have tremendous deficits and the taxpayers are heavily burdened, but if we give up what is best about America, what kind of a legacy do we leave?"

No such considerations figured in the thinking of House Republicans. The rap on AmeriCorps was not just that it was a government program, it is Bill Clinton's favorite program. Said Rules Committee Chairman Gerald B.H. Solomon, "It's get-even time."

It is also get-nervous time for the rampaging Republicans. They are winning victory after victory on the floor, but they are losing in public opinion. They have long since maintained that they know exactly what Nov. 8 was about, that the country wanted government to be shrunk and ordinary people, especially the poor, to pull up their socks. But a recent Washington Post-ABC poll shows that the public thinks Republicans have gone too far. And in his effort to save programs for the poor, Clinton has picked up some unexpected allies; the Roman Catholic bishops. They were reserved about him during the campaign because of his abortion rights stand. But they think now that pitiless Republicans pose a worse threat of increased abortions.

The Republicans' greatest tactical mistake was to meddle with the school lunch program, a popular and scandal-free operation that has helped many a hungry child get through the school day. In vain, the Republicans protested that they had not cut the funds but merely slowed the increase in the growth rate. Nonetheless, the ranks have begun to wince in the iron corset of the contract, and this week, 102 members rebelled against tax breaks for the rich.

The Democrats, who have been having their best week since the calamity of Nov. 8, were sporting "Save the Children" neckties on the House floor.

Eli Segal, the chief executive officer of the National Service Corps, has been summoned before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development and Veterans Affairs for a discussion of the 1996 budget, which since the House action stands at \$159 million, a sum that prohibits serious action.

He has been traveling the country inspecting the workers, deriving solace from moderate Republican governors who are keen about the corps' activities in conflict resolution, environmental cleanup, tutoring and other contributions to urban peace. They agree with him that pulling the plug after less than a year is bad practice. Segal's hope is that they will transmit their enthusiasm to their brother moderates in the Senate, which has become the haven for storm-tossed programs.

Republican Christopher Shays of Connecticut was the only member of his party to vote against the amendment that mortally wounded national service. He is a Peace Corps alumnus and believes passionately in the importance of youthful involvement.

"A colossal mistake," he calls his party's action. "I hope the president has the fortitude to veto the bill. I would support his veto."

REAL FOUNDER OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS HAPPY WITH SELECTION OF SHRIVER

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, if one were to say that President John F. Kennedy launched the Peace Corps, one would be right. But if one were to say that President John F. Kennedy thought up the Peace Corps, one would be mistaken. The author was Hubert Humphrey.

If one were to say that the nobly civil minded Eunice Kennedy Shriver brought her considerable talents to bear in order to launch the

Special Olympics nationally, one would be right. But if one were to say that Ms. Shriver thought up the idea of a Special Olympics, one would be mistaken. Judge Ann McGlone Burke is the author of the idea.

As Judge Burke has generously said, she is happy that Ms. Shriver is being honored by the 1995 Special Olympics Silver Dollar Commemorative. But it is worthwhile too for all Americans to know that Judge Burke should also be honored as the author.

REAL FOUNDER OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS HAPPY
WITH SELECTION OF SHRIVER

(By Michel E. Orzano)

The woman who founded the Special Olympics in 1968 is pleased that the games for mentally and physically handicapped children and adults will be recognized with a commemorative coin.

But her portrait won't be the one on the 1995 Special Olympics silver dollar commemorative. That's because Anne Burke of Chicago—former Chicago physical education teacher, retired lawyer and judge—not Eunice Shriver Kennedy, is the real founder of the games.

The law authorizing the coin permits the striking of 800,000 silver dollars and each will bear a \$10 per coin surcharge going to the Special Olympics. The Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee rejected the idea of a portrait of a living American but Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin approved the design choice. Shriver will become the first living American woman to have her portrait on a coin and only the fifth living American to bear that distinction.

Chicagoan Burke, who now serves as special counsel on child welfare to Illinois Gov. Jim Edgar, told *Coin World* that she's pleased the program she started will benefit from the coin. But as far as the claim of founder goes, that resides with Burke.

In 1965, Burke, then Anne McGlone, was a young physical education teacher who taught mentally retarded youngsters in a special summer program sponsored by the Chicago Park District. By 1967, she said, there were 10 locations throughout the Chicagoland area with 150 children participating in the free program.

Burke said she knew at the time there were probably more people out there who could benefit from involvement in sports and other activities because there wasn't mandatory education for mentally retarded people. But, she said, she also knew families of mentally retarded children and adults were often very protective of them and shunned involvement in public programs.

But by the end of the summer of 1967, after Burke and participants put on the play "The Sound of Music," Chicago Park officials were so pleased with the response they sanctioned her idea of sponsoring a citywide track meet for mentally retarded youngsters the following summer.

Once she was given the official green light, Burke turned her attention to planning the event that fall and winter. Burke said while refining the idea, a professor she was working with at Southern Illinois University suggested she contact the Joseph P. Kennedy Jr. Foundation to request funding for the proposed program.

Shortly thereafter, Burke wrote to Shriver, she said, who was living in Paris with her husband, Sargent Shriver, then ambassador to France. Burke said Shriver was intrigued with the idea and suggested a meeting in Washington, D.C.

After meeting with Shriver, Burke said she re-wrote the proposal including Shriver's

suggestion to involve children from other states and re-submitted her funding request. The foundation responded with \$25,000 for the program. Burke invited Shriver to attend the 1st National Chicago Special Olympics, which were held July 20, 1968. Children from 23 different states participated that year and, as Burke notes, "The rest is history."

She said she is still actively involved with the Special Olympics program in the Chicago area. Her concern for children has always seemed to touch her professional life as a teacher, mother and a lawyer. But she also acknowledges the contributions Shriver has made to Burke's original idea.

"Without the Kennedy Foundation the Games wouldn't be the Games. There is no other family with the charisma or the wherewithal to do this," Burke said. "[Shriver] deserves the recognition. What has happened has been incredible and it [who's portrait appears] really makes no difference now."

But Burke admits she is disappointed that Chicago, its park employees and the late Mayor Richard J. Daley, never have been recognized by the Kennedy Foundation nor Shriver for the innovation shown in planning and hosting those first Games.

"We took the chances," Burke said, describing the view of many at the time that such games might exploit the mentally retarded. "I think the other side [of the Special Olympics coin] should recognize Chicago, not anyone's name, just Chicago."

When asked if she planned to buy any of the commemoratives, Burke said she thought Shriver should give coins to each of the first participants and employees of the Chicago Park District who planned and hosted the first event.

THE BURKE CONNECTION

Dateline: The Chicago line . . . but it was Chicagoan Anne (McGlone) Burke, during her tenure at the Chicago Park District, who gave Shriver the idea for the Special Olympics in a written proposal, and who organized the first Special Olympics event, which was held in Chicago and attended by Mrs. Shriver. Shriver bit, and the rest is history.

Conclusion: Shriver should be honored for giving the Olympics a happy life, but it was Burke who gave it birth.

THE JOSEPH P. KENNEDY, JR.,
FOUNDATION,
Washington, DC, July 23, 1968.

Mrs. ANN BURKE,
Chicago Park District, 425 East 14th Boulevard,
Chicago, IL.

DEAR ANN: When the history of the Chicago Special Olympics is written, there will have to be a special chapter to recount the contributions of Ann Burke. You should feel very proud that your dedicated work with retarded children in Chicago has culminated in an event of such far reaching importance.

We all owe you a debt of gratitude, but I know that what means most to you is that the Olympics will continue and that children all over the country will benefit from your idea.

My warmest personal thanks.

Sincerely,

EUNICE KENNEDY SHRIVER.

THE JOSEPH P. KENNEDY, JR.,
FOUNDATION,
Washington, DC, January 29, 1968.

Miss ANNE MCGLONE BURKE,
Chicago Park District, 425 East 14th Boulevard,
Chicago, IL.

DEAR MISS MCGLONE: Thank you so much for your letter of January 23d informing me about your plans to initiate a National

Olympics for retarded children through the Chicago Park District. Both Mr. Shriver and Dr. Hayden have spoken to me about your project and I think it is a most exciting one. I sincerely hope that you are successful in launching it.

This is certainly a large undertaking and we know that you will need a great deal of assistance of many kinds. When you have been able to formalize your plans and put them into a written proposal the Kennedy Foundation will be very happy to send it out to the members of our physical education and recreation advisory boards for their review and comment. All requests to the Foundation for funds in these areas are handled in this manner and I am sure that the suggestions from these people would be very helpful to you.

Once again, let me say how delighted I am to know of your plans. I will look forward to hearing from you again as they progress.

Yours sincerely,

EUNICE KENNEDY SHRIVER.

DIRECT LOANS WORK

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the March 13, 1995, issue of U.S. News & World Report includes an excellent article entitled, "The College Aid Face-Off." The article reports on the current debate in Congress on the future of the direct loan program as well as on major cuts in the student financial aid programs. With respect to direct loans the conclusions of the article are striking—direct loans work. Direct loans are simpler, faster and more efficient for student borrowers, student financial aid administrators and schools. In addition, direct loans save the taxpayers money. Opposition to direct loans comes from banks and other student loan middlemen who fear the loss of billions of dollars of profits and whose lobbying efforts are fueled by at least \$11.3 million in campaign contributions. The full text of the article follows, and I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 13, 1995]

THE COLLEGE AID FACE-OFF

(Clinton fights the GOP and bankers over what students get and who runs the loan business)

(By James Popkin and Viva Hardigg with Susan Headden)

Believe it or not, there is a group of Americans who truly delight in one of the things Bill Clinton has accomplished as president, who think that a government-run program that handles gobs of money is preferable to one run by the private sector and think that the paperwork created by public bureaucrats is easier to navigate than the forms devised by well-run corporations. They are the thousands of college students who got their loans last fall directly from the government instead of from banks. The verdict from Anthony Gallegos, a 22-year-old journalism major at Colorado State University: "It's the best thing since microwavable brownies."

But all is not entirely happy in loan land. Even though many students at 104 schools say they got their money with fewer hassles in a fraction of the time it usually takes and

taxpayers might benefit because banks and middlemen didn't collect subsidies to make the loans, the direct-lending program is now the object of a bitter new battle in Washington. In fact, every major federal college aid program is considered a target in one form or another by the new Republican majority in Congress. The disputes have all the hallmarks of postmodern politics: None really centers on principle; almost everyone in Washington believes the government has a useful and morally defensible role to play in helping more kids get into college and pay for it. The fight so far centers on the spoils system—whether the public or private sector administers the program—and arcane federal budget accounting questions.

MILLIONS AFFECTED

Those are not inconsequential issues, because billions of dollars of profits (for banks) or potential savings (for taxpayers) are at issue. But the bigger fight will come as Congress deals with the budget. It will feature the first serious talk of major cuts in college loans and grants since the early days of the Reagan administration. "What is at stake is nothing less than access to higher education for millions of middle- and lower-income students at a time when public-college tuition is rising sharply," says Terry Hartle, a vice president of the American Council on Education. The biggest dispute could center on a plan circulating among Republicans to cut loan subsidies to needy students during their time in school—a move that might save \$9 billion over five years and could hit 6 million students with higher debt and payments.

This sets up a political showdown that Clinton is unusually pleased to face. He has called for increasing federal funds for college aid by 10 percent to \$35.8 billion as part of his middle-class "Bill of Rights," including expansion of many of the programs Republicans are eyeing for cutbacks. Clinton won major reforms in federal college aid initiatives in 1993 as part of his national service program, which he heralds as a cornerstone of his "New Covenant" to provide government help to those who help themselves. Asked if Clinton is willing to renegotiate any feature of the national service or college aid programs, one senior White House aide responded: "My guess is his answer is between 'No' and 'Hell, no.'" "A probable Clinton veto of any cuts in college aid means that these programs will survive intact for now, but there is still a good chance that his plans to expand them could be held up.

In coming weeks, the direct-lending program will grab the most attention. One of the reforms enacted in national service was the gradual phase-in of a system that would have the federal Government lend money to students directly rather than provide financial incentives and guarantees to coax banks into making the loans. Even though new workers will have to be hired by the Department of Education to run the program, it still saves considerable sums. That's why Clinton wants to accelerate its availability to all the nation's 7,000 eligible schools. But bankers and other firms that trade student loans for investors have aggressively battled the loss of this lucrative line of business and heatedly dispute Clinton's claim that the program saves money.

Their lobbying fueled by at least \$11.3 million in campaign contributions, has helped encourage Republican congressional leaders Rep. William Goodling of Pennsylvania and Sen. Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas to push legislation that would limit the expansion of the program to 10 percent of all student loans. Some moderate Democrats like Rep.

Bart Gordon of Tennessee also support the move on the theory that the new lending program should be tested before it becomes the norm for all colleges. House Speaker Newt Gingrich wants to kill the program. He argues that Clinton's reforms vest too much power in the Government, especially because the lending program is run by the Department of Education, which has allowed fraud to flourish in aid programs for decades.

However, the first reports about direct lending are very positive. Students and college-based loan officers say funds are available to students in weeks rather than months. The paperwork is simpler, and college officials have to deal with only one federal office rather than many banks. "Being in direct loans has been almost a spiritual experience," says Kay Jacks, director of financial aid at Colorado State University. "It helps us provide better service to students, period." Karen Fooks, the financial aid director at the University of Florida, says her whole office threatened to quit if it was ordered to return to the bank system from direct lending.

PAY AS YOU CAN

But bankers argue that doling out money is the easy part. Collecting it is something the government hasn't done very well. Many new loans will be on a "pay as you can" basis letting borrowers pay back a portion of their earnings over many years, rather than a fixed monthly payment. Administrators that will tax even the most efficient agency.

That is why one thoughtful critic, author Steven Waldman, has argued that this upcoming struggle misses the main point. Waldman, who wrote the recently released book, *The Bill*, about the legislative battle over national service, believes Clinton has achieved an enormously beneficial reform in the "pay as you can" scheme. It relieves some of the financial pressure on borrowers and potentially encourages them to choose socially useful—but less-high-paying—careers like teaching because their loans are pegged to their ability to pay. But Waldman argues that Clinton's achievement is jeopardized because neither banks nor the federal education bureaucracy can prevent the program from becoming another boondoggle. His solution: Call in the IRS, the only agency that "could accurately and efficiently assess a person's income and be sure to collect."

An idea like that puts tough-minded Republicans in a bind. If they want to fix a potentially flawed Clinton idea and do right by taxpayers, their best bet is to vest more power in a much-feared federal agency. Who knows, maybe the students who have newfound appreciation for the easier-to-fathom lending system run by the government might not balk too much at paying when the bills come due.

AMERICAN SAMOA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1995

HON. ENI F.H. FALOMAVEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. FALOMAVEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the American Samoa Economic Development Act of 1995.

For too many years American Samoa has been receiving assistance from the Federal Government on an annual basis. When 20

percent of a government's funding is dependent on annual appropriations of discretionary funds, it is difficult to make long-term plans.

The bill I have worked on with Congressman ELTON GALLEGLEY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs, provides a secure source of funding for the territory of American Samoa. Coupled with other efforts, I believe we can develop American Samoa's infrastructure and reduce our Nation's annual deficit at the same time.

I want to thank Chairman GALLEGLEY for his support and assistance in preparing this legislation. Our bipartisan effort on this bill continues a long history of bipartisan legislation in the subcommittees which have had jurisdiction over the insular areas. As the new ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee, I intend to make every effort to continue this tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting a copy of the bill for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Samoa Economic Development Act of 1995".

SEC. 2 FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) funding for the United States territory of American Samoa has been based on the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to provide for accepting, ratifying, and confirming cessions of certain islands of the Samoan group in the United States, and for other purposes", as amended (48 U.S.C. 1661), with commitments being made on a yearly basis;

(2) American Samoa is locally self-governing with a constitution of its own adoption and the direct election of the Governor since 1977;

(3) the territory of American Samoa has had difficulty in planning and implementing comprehensive and sustainable infrastructure based solely on annual ad hoc grants; and

(4) the territory of American Samoa and the United States would benefit from a multiyear funding commitment which promotes economic development and self-sufficiency and requires compliance with financial management accounting standards, the establishment of semiautonomous public utility authorities utilizing cost-recovery principles, and the phase-out of Federal subsidies for government operations.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the Government of American Samoa \$34,500,000, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2005. Such amounts shall, subject to the limits specified in the table in subsection (b), be used for—

(1) construction of capital assets of American Samoa;

(2) maintenance and repair of such capital assets;

(3) the operations of the Government of American Samoa; and

(4) reduction of unbudgeted debt incurred by the Government of American Samoa in fiscal years prior to 1996.

(b) TABLE OF MULTIYEAR FUNDING.—The table referred to in this subsection is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Year No.	Operations	Construction	Deficit reduction (100% match)	Maintenance and repair (100% match)	Total
1996	1	23.0	5.5	3.0	3.0	34.5
1997	2	23.0	5.5	3.0	3.0	34.5
1998	3	23.0	5.5	3.0	3.0	34.5
1999	4	21.0	7.5	3.0	3.0	34.5
2000	5	18.0	10.5	3.0	3.0	34.5
2001	6	15.0	16.5		3.0	34.5
2002	7	12.0	19.5		3.0	34.5
2003	8	9.0	22.5		3.0	34.5
2004	9	6.0	25.5		3.0	34.5
2005	10	3.0	28.5		3.0	34.5

(c) **MULTIYEAR AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Amounts not expended in the year appropriated shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUST.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Government of American Samoa shall establish a trust into which the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 3 are placed.

(b) **TRUSTEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A trustee to administer the trust established by this section shall be nominated by the Governor of American Samoa and passed by both Houses of the Legislature of American Samoa pursuant to local law and shall be a nongovernmental entity, bonded in an amount no less than 110 percent of the maximum amount of funds which will be held in trust during any given fiscal year (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "trustee"). The trustee shall not be the independent auditor required by section 7.

(2) **REPLACEMENT.**—The trustee may be terminated only by mutual agreement, or at the end of its contract for services as trustee, or for good cause. Termination of a trustee for good cause must be recommended by the Governor of American Samoa and approved by both Houses of Legislature of American Samoa.

(3) **OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The trustee shall be subject to such other conditions as the Government of American Samoa may provide under local law.

(c) **TRUST FUNDS.**—

(1) **DEPOSIT; INVESTMENT.**—The trust funds shall be deposited in an account or accounts of a financial institution insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and may be invested by the Government of American Samoa, or the trustee if so designated, in only federally insured accounts or issues of bonds, notes or other redeemable instruments of the Government of the United States.

(2) **USE OF INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS.**—Interest or dividends earned from investment of trust funds under paragraph (1) may be used for projects contained on the approved master plan of capital needs developed under section 5, or for the costs of managing the trust.

(3) **AVAILABILITY AND USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.**—Federal funds made available for the purposes described in section 3(a)(1) may be used only on projects from the approved master plan of capital needs.

(d) **REPORTS.**—Within 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, the trustee shall submit an annual report to the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate, the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives, and the Government of American Samoa. The report shall include at a minimum the financial statements of the ac-

count or accounts in which it holds trust funds pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 5. USES OF TRUST FUNDS.

(a) **CAPITAL NEEDS.**—

(1) **MASTER PLAN OF CAPITAL NEEDS.**—For fiscal year 1997 and all following years, no funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be released by the trustee for construction of capital assets without the submission by the Government of American Samoa to the trustee of a master plan of capital needs that ranks projects in order of priority for at least five years. The master plan shall be approved by the Governor and passed by both Houses of the Legislature of American Samoa pursuant to such laws as the Government of American Samoa may enact. The master plan of capital needs may be amended at any time, but all amendments must be approved by the Governor and passed by both Houses of the Legislature of American Samoa. The plan shall include the capital needs of all the islands of American Samoa.

(2) **FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CAPITAL ASSETS.**—Funds for the construction of capital assets shall be paid to the Government of American Samoa only after approval by the trustee. The trustee shall approve the release of funds only for construction projects for a public purpose in the areas of communications, electrical power, water, waste water, roads, schools, school transportation system, air, water and surface transportation, ports, harbors, storage and transportation facilities of fuels or other forms of energy, health, and construction of government-owned buildings. Funding made available pursuant to section 3(a)(1) for construction of capital assets may only be used for projects listed on the master plan of capital needs as set forth in this section. To the extent an appropriation is available, the projects contained on the master list with the highest priority are to be funded.

(3) **REQUIREMENT OF SEMIAUTONOMOUS AGENCIES.**—Beginning with fiscal year 1997, no funds for the construction of capital assets shall be released by the trustee in the areas of communications, electrical power, public health, transportation, water, and waste water until there is established by local law semiautonomous government agencies of the Government of American Samoa.

(4) **MAINTENANCE PLAN AND FUNDING.**—For fiscal year 1997 and all following years, no funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be released by the trustee for the construction of capital assets until the Government of American Samoa, or the appropriate semiautonomous government agency if required, submits to the trustee a maintenance plan covering the anticipated life of the project and the project is initially funded. The maintenance plan shall include the estimated cost of maintaining and repairing the project and identify a source to fund the estimated maintenance and repairs for the anticipated life of the project. The initial funding for this maintenance plan shall be in the

amount of 10 percent of the cost of the project. Federal funds made available for the purposes described in section 3(a)(2) may be used for one-half of the initial funding. Other Federal funds made available pursuant to this Act may not be used for this purpose. Funds set aside pursuant to this paragraph may be used for the maintenance and repair of any capital asset within the purview of the government or the appropriate semi-autonomous agency.

(b) **DEBT REDUCTION.**—Any funding made available pursuant to section 3(a)(4) used to reduce the unbudgeted debt of the Government of American Samoa must be matched, on a dollar for dollar basis, by funds provided by the Government of American Samoa from revenue raised from non-Federal sources.

(c) **MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR.**—Any funding made available pursuant to section 3(a)(2) used for the maintenance or repair of the capital assets of the Government of American Samoa must be matched, on a dollar for dollar basis, for funds provided by the Government of American Samoa from revenue raised from non-Federal sources.

(d) **PROHIBITED USES OF FUNDS.**—Neither the funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, nor any interest or dividends earned on those funds may be transferred to other accounts, or loaned to other accounts or agencies, nor may these funds, interest or dividends be used as collateral for loans made by the local governments.

SEC. 6. DISBURSEMENT OF TRUST FUNDS.

(a) **OPERATIONS.**—Trust funds to be used for the operations of the Government of American Samoa shall be disbursed in equal amounts on a monthly basis, on the first business day of each month of the fiscal year. An extra drawdown may be made once each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed ten percent of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year for the purposes of section 3(a)(3), and only for purposes caused by extreme or national emergencies deemed unforeseeable by the trustee.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Trust funds to be used for the construction of capital assets shall be released by the trustee—

(1) to the Government of American Samoa, only upon completion of identifiable portions of the construction work if the work is performed by employees of the Government of American Samoa, or

(2) a bona fide contractor of the Government of American Samoa pursuant to the terms of a construction contract, on an invoice presented to the Government of American Samoa and approved by an appropriate official of the Government of American Samoa.

(c) **DEBT REDUCTION; MAINTENANCE REPAIR.**—Trust funds to be used for unbudgeted debt reduction or maintenance and repair made available under sections 3(a)(2) and 3(a)(4) shall be released by the trustee on submission by the Government of American Samoa of proof of payment from non-Federal

sources for either debt reduction, maintenance, or repair, and proof acceptable to the trustee of an obligation due and owing for the appropriate category.

SEC. 7. AUDITS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning with fiscal year 1996, the Government of American Samoa must obtain, at its own expense, a comprehensive financial audit meeting the requirements of chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code, and subtitle A of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, and upon which an independent auditor expresses an opinion that the financial statements of the Government of American Samoa present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Government of American Samoa, and were prepared in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. The audit shall include the funds held in trust pursuant to the Act.

(b) **SUBMISSION OF AUDIT REPORT TO UNITED STATES.**—Reports of audits required in this section shall be transmitted by the Governor of American Samoa to the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate, and the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives within 180 days of the end of each fiscal year for which the United States provides funding under this Act.

(c) **FAILURE TO OBTAIN AUDIT.**—In the event the Government of American Samoa does not obtain the audit within the time required by this section, the trustee shall not disburse additional funds pursuant to a section 3(a)(3) for the operations of the Government of American Samoa until such time as a qualifying audit is received and the report of that audit is forwarded as required by this section. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, one emergency disbursement may be made per year under the provisions of section 6 of this Act, even if a qualifying audit report is not obtained.

SEC. 8. AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES TO AUDIT.

The Comptroller General of the United States and the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior shall have the authority to conduct audits of all funds of all branches and semiautonomous authorities of the Government of American Samoa. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to restrict the authority of these or other Federal agencies to audit government funds as authorized by Federal law.

SEC. 9. SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES.

The High Court of American Samoa is authorized to resolve disputes which arise under this Act pursuant to its rules of procedure.

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY P. MANGINELLI

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity as a member of Moose International will be coming to my hometown of Clifton tomorrow night to welcome a new class of members into the fraternity. A resident of Syracuse, NY, Mr. Manginelli has been a member of the fraternity since 1946, and just last year attained our organization's highest rank, that of supreme governor. In this role, he has led our 1.2 million-member organization with pride and dignity, advancing the high goals of the Moose on an international level.

As a relative newcomer to the Moose myself, I can say that I am nothing but proud to be associated with my fellow members both in my local chapter, and in the much larger international organization. But Moose International is so much more than a medium through which outstanding men and women can socialize. It is a perfect way to get involved in challenges faced by our local towns and cities, and through its Mooseheart and Moosehaven communities, to make an impact on a much larger scale. Every day, Mooseheart and Moosehaven provide support for the neediest associated with our organization in a loving and nurturing way.

Congratulations to my newly inducted brothers in the Moose, and to Supreme Governor Anthony Manginelli. Please continue your fine work in spreading the compassionate message of Moose International around the country, and around the world.

IN MEMORY OF BILL BAILEY

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a legendary figure of San Francisco's waterfront, William "Bill" Bailey, who passed away on Monday, February 27, 1995.

Bill Bailey was born in Jersey City, NJ, and brought up in Hoboken and the tough Hell's Kitchen section of Manhattan. Shipping out to sea at the age of 14, he joined the Industrial Workers of the World—the Wobblies—and began his career as a labor activist from the day forward.

Active in the maritime unions, Bill was a member of the generation of young radicals who transformed the labor movement of our country. He participated in the walkout on the waterfront which became San Francisco's famed general strike of 1934. In 1935, Bill and a group of seamen boarded a German liner tied up in New York Harbor, the *Bremen*, and tore its Nazi flag from the bow mast. Accounts from that incident recollect that a security force of nearly 300 were unable to stop Bill and his group.

In 1937, Bill went to Spain as a member of the Abraham Lincoln and George Washington battalions. Wounded several times, he participated in almost all the major engagements of the war.

In 1939, after returning to the United States, he resumed his leadership role in the maritime industry, and was elected vice president of the West Coast Maritime Firemen's Union. In the early 1950's, during the height of the McCarthy era, Bill was kicked out of the union under a screening program imposed by the U.S. Coast Guard. He then joined the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, rising to the vice presidency of San Francisco Local 10.

After retiring from the waterfront in 1975, Bill began a second career as an writer and actor, working in a major TV series on the Spanish civil war and appearing in several feature films and documentaries. He published his memoir, "The Kid from Hoboken," in 1993. But he never retired from his lifelong commitment to social and economic justice, continuing his activism until his dying day.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Bailey was part of the proud waterfront history and tradition of San Francisco. On Sunday, March 20, Bill was remembered at a memorial service convened by the waterfront unions which he loved. On behalf of the Congress, allow me to express our condolences to his son, Michael, and pay tribute to his work as a labor and civic leader for San Francisco.