

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 17, 1997, I appreciated being granted an excused absence due to a serious illness in my family. Due to that absence, I missed several rollcall votes.

Had I not been unavoidably absent on June 11, I would have voted in the following manner pertaining to H.R. 2160, the Agriculture Appropriations Act: "Aye" on rollcall vote No. 285, a motion for the Committee to rise; "no" on rollcall vote No. 284, a motion for the Committee to rise; "no" on rollcall vote No. 283, a motion for the Committee to rise; "aye" on rollcall vote No. 282, a motion to table the motion to reconsider the vote; "aye" on rollcall vote No. 281, a motion to resolve into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention my monthly newsletter on foreign affairs from July 1997 entitled "NATO Enlargement."

I ask that this newsletter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

NATO ENLARGEMENT

At an early July summit in Madrid, President Clinton and leaders from the 16 member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) invited the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland to enter talks to join the Alliance. The goal is to complete negotiations in 1997 and treaty ratification by 1999, so that these three countries can join in time for NATO's 50th anniversary.

A decision to forge a new system of international security by enlarging NATO has been long in coming—but came as no surprise. NATO established a program of cooperation with former Warsaw Pact countries in 1994, the Partnership for Peace, and President Clinton made clear at that time that the question was when—not if—NATO would expand. NATO outlined a strategy for enlargement in a 1995 report, and announced in 1996 that invitations would be extended to new members in 1997. Two months ago, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin signed the NATO-Russia Founding Act. This document spells out future relations between NATO and Russia, sets up a Joint Council for regular consultation, and seeks to ally Russia's concerns about enlargement. The Founding Act paved the way for Madrid, where there

were some differences between the U.S. and its allies about those not invited to join NATO (Romania and Slovenia)—but no suspense about the three invited.

The spotlight on enlargement now shifts to parliaments and public opinion. So far, the U.S. debate on NATO enlargement has been a narrow one, attracting little interest outside of ethnic communities. The President's task now is to persuade the American people that it is in our national interest to defend the countries of Central Europe.

From my perspective, there are five major questions about NATO enlargement—commitments, costs, relations with Russia, what happens to countries not invited to join, and the impact of enlargement on the Alliance itself.

Commitments.—Twice in this century Europe exploded into world wars because of events in Central Europe. The United States intervened in 1917 and 1941 to protect its vital interests on the European continent, and formed NATO in 1949 to protect western Europe against the Soviet threat. The question now is whether countries in Central Europe should have the same security guarantee as current NATO members. This guarantee, which requires NATO allies to treat an armed attack against one as an attack against all, would come at a time when U.S. troop levels in Europe have been cut from 300,000 to 100,000 in the past six years. The threat to peace in Europe today is remote, but NATO enlargement means a pledge to intervene in tomorrow's unforeseen crises. The bet is that the promise of sending NATO troops to defend countries in Central Europe will make it unnecessary to do so.

Cost estimates of NATO enlargement vary widely, from \$5 billion to \$125 billion. The Pentagon's own estimate is \$27 to \$35 billion spread over 13 years, with a U.S. share of up to \$2 billion. There is reason for skepticism about all cost estimates, because military budgets across Europe have been declining. The three countries invited to join NATO spend a total of \$4 billion annually on defense, or less than Belgium spends. Current NATO members see little threat, and most are under pressure to cut spending to meet budget targets for European Monetary Union. If Europe won't pay, the U.S. Congress also will be reluctant to pay. More burdensome disputes with Europe are likely.

Relations with Russia.—Opponents of a larger NATO stress that expansion will provide hostile reaction from Russia, creating a new line of division across Europe. Russia opposes enlargement, but has acquiesced in its initial stages. It remains to be seen how enlargement will impact on key U.S. interests in Russia's ratification of the START II nuclear arms reduction treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention, or the future of reform in Russia. Much of the success of NATO enlargement will depend on how the U.S. manages relations with Russia.

Those Not Invited To Join.—Twelve countries emerging from communism applied to join NATO, and only three got what they wanted in Madrid. The challenge ahead for NATO is to enhance military and political cooperation with non-members. The Alliance

has also made clear that the door is open to future members. No one knows how far NATO enlargement will go, but the first wave will not be the last. The toughest question here will be the Baltic States.

Impact of Enlargement on the Alliance.—There is a tension between keeping NATO's door open, and keeping the Alliance functional. NATO decisions require unanimity, and so far the Alliance has been able to function well on the basis of consensus. It is an open question whether this round, or future rounds of enlargement, will affect the cohesion and integrity of the Alliance and its decision-making process.

CONCLUSIONS

NATO enlargement is going to happen. I still have many questions about it, and we have not had sufficient debate or consideration of its impact. Yet the risks of proceeding with NATO enlargement are less than the risk of not going forward. Sixteen governments cannot take a decision of this magnitude and then reverse course. The alternative to expansion—freezing NATO in its cold war membership—also carries risks of irrelevance or even dissolution.

NATO enlargement can increase the security of all of Europe, and decrease the chances of future wars. NATO enlargement certainly will assure new democracies in Central Europe and reinforce their democratic reforms. If done right, it can bring Russia into a cooperative relationship with Europe. The President needs to answer questions and address lingering doubts. If he articulates the case forcefully, the President can win the support of the American public—and the advice and consent of the Senate—for NATO enlargement.

A RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE THE VIRTUES OF OUR NATION'S YOUTH

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join Representatives DUNCAN, ETHERIDGE, HALL of Ohio, and WOLF in introducing House Concurrent Resolution 127.

Traditionally, colleges and universities were founded on the premise of developing intellectual minds and moral character. Today, colleges and universities continue to play a vital role in these areas. Some of these institutions have been applauded for their success in fostering high moral values. However, we must not rest until all schools place proper focus on character.

Parents should be the primary developers of character in our Nation's children, but the role of education in character-building becomes increasingly important with every divorce, drug deal, juvenile crime, and teen-age pregnancy, which continue to undermine our Nation's moral code. The fact is, most Americans support the teaching of core values and basic

● 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.

morals such as trustworthiness, respect for self and others, responsibility, fairness, compassion, and citizenship. It is time for Congress to encourage these activities in our Nation's schools.

I would like to thank the John Templeton Foundation for its leadership and efforts on the subject of character-building in education across our Nation. The foundation has been a leading proponent of this issue since 1989, when it began sponsoring the "Honor Roll for Character-Building Colleges" guide book. This annual publication recognizes superior character-development in post-secondary institutions. I am grateful for the foundation's voice on this pressing issue.

Our children will shape our future. Society must work to ensure that their moral foundation does not crumble. I call on all people who care about our future to promote the virtues of our Nation's youth and support this resolution.

COMMENDING SHERWOOD KERKER
ON HIS UNIQUE CONTRIBUTIONS
TO LABOR JOURNALISM

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Sherwood Kerker's retirement from the St. Louis/Southern Illinois Labor Tribune.

The editor of the *Labor Tribune* has received several awards from the International Labor Communications Association for journalistic excellence, and is acknowledged for 40 years of loyalty in serving the members and families of the trade union movement throughout the Greater St. Louis/Southern Illinois Region.

Publisher Edward M. Finkelstein and the staff of the *Labor Tribune* will honor Sherwood Kerker at a "We Love You Sherwood" retirement luncheon to be held in St. Louis, MO, on August 28, 1997. I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Sherwood Kerker's unique contributions to labor journalism.

THE NEW MEXICO STATEHOOD
AND ENABLING ACT OF 1997

HON. STEVEN SCHIFF

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as well as in the other body, for passage of S. 430 the New Mexico Statehood and Enabling Act of 1997.

This bill, introduced and supported by the entire New Mexico delegation, approves the changes made to the State constitution by the voters of New Mexico on November 6, 1996, which are specific to the New Mexico Land Grant Permanent Fund—established by the enabling act of 1910.

With these changes in place, New Mexico will be able to safeguard against the eroding

effects of inflation to ensure that the fund will be able to help us meet tomorrow's educational needs.

This fund, which has grown to be the third largest educational endowment in the world, now comprises almost 14 percent of our State budget, and is a critical part of a better future for our children. So again, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for their support.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES M.
SPRAFKA

HON. JIM RAMSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a stellar public servant who passed away recently.

Charles M. Sprafka, a native of Detroit Lakes, MN, and the associate Hennepin County administrator for human resources, died on June 24 following a long and courageous battle with pancreatic cancer.

Mr. Speaker, Chuck's career in public service was varied and characterized by the pursuit of excellence in every way. The people of my home county in Minnesota were well served by his stewardship and great desire to help people in their time of need.

President John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address on January 20, 1961, just outside this Chamber, declared: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." Chuck Sprafka did a great deal for his country, Mr. Speaker, and today I want to celebrate a dedicated public servant's inspiring commitment to his country and the people of Hennepin County he served so well.

Chuck Sprafka was named Hennepin County personnel director in 1984. In 1994, he was named associate county administrator for human resources, which made him a member of the Hennepin County administration's executive team.

Mr. Speaker, Chuck's record in public service was exemplary. In 1995, he was named recipient of the Twin Cities Personnel Association's "Award of Excellence." In May of this year, Hennepin County created an employee recognition award in his name.

His fellow workers in Hennepin County called Chuck The Rock. That's because, whenever there was a great challenge to be overcome, everyone turned to Chuck. His pioneering efforts produced a program called Quality Partnership Initiatives, a new county approach to improving the quality of service.

Quality is the theme that comes first to mind when you summarize the career of Chuck Sprafka for he truly represented the best in public service.

Mr. Speaker, Chuck was also very active in a numerous community and professional organizations, including the Industrial Relations Center Advisory Council, Minnesota Chapter of the International Personnel Management Association, and the national and Minnesota Public Employer Labor Relations Associations. He was also a member of the Human Resources Executive Council.

Chuck was a great high school athlete at Detroit Lakes High School, one of the best skaters in that school's history. He loved the outdoors, and was an avid sportsman. After receiving a bachelor's degree in mathematics and chemistry from Bemidji State University in 1968, he had a successful career in the business world. He then returned to school and earned a master's degree in industrial relations from the University of Minnesota in 1972, after which he went to work for Hennepin County, Minnesota's most populous county and one of the largest employers in the state. During his tenure at the county, he did graduate work in public administration at Harvard University.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, Chuck Sprafka was a dedicated and loving husband and father. As his lifelong friend Jon Boisclair put it, "Chuck's family meant the world to him, and he loved them dearly." Chuck will forever be missed by his loving wife, Jeannie, and his children, Collette, Rachelle, and Nicholas.

Mr. Speaker, Chuck Sprafka stood for all that's right with America, and his legacy will live on in the hearts and minds of all who were fortunate enough to know him.

ENVIRONMENTAL SLEIGHT OF
HAND IN REPUBLICANS' BUDGET
DEAL

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, once again the Republican leadership of the Congress has demonstrated its very strong hostility to policies to promote a strong environmental policy for this country.

I am sure that every Member of this House remembers that when the budget agreement was signed by the congressional leadership and President Clinton, it included at the President's insistence sufficient funding to acquire lands threatened with ruinous development that would present severe dangers to California's ancient redwood forest and to our first national park, Yellowstone. These development plans could result in the cutting of some of the most significant trees in North America—one of the very last ancient stands—and in the locating of a massive mine just upstream of Yellowstone Park.

Now, we included in the budget agreement sufficient moneys to acquire these lands, and then to provide additional acquisitions from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. As you know, some \$900 million each year comes into that fund from offshore oil and gas development on Federal lands, and that money by law is to be used for land acquisition. Instead, the Congress has refused to appropriate sufficient funding to keep up with the need to protect our national resources, and a \$12 billion surplus has developed in the fund.

The President thought he had struck a deal with the Republican leadership to provide \$65 million for the New World Mine lands, and another \$250 million for the Headwaters redwood grove, and then an additional \$295 million for other long-awaited acquisitions. That

was an important part of the budget deal. And, frankly, I would have thought that a party whose environmental reputation is as justifiably low as the Republican Party's would have honored its commitment and its promise.

But instead, the Republicans have reneged on their agreement and, in the midst of the summer when tens of millions of Americans are enjoying our parks and other public lands, the Republicans in Congress have repudiated their commitment. The House bill provides no funding for these high priority park purchases, and the Senate bill is hardly better, adding additional, unnecessary bureaucratic steps that everyone knows will doom the funding.

I hope the public understands this Republican sleight of hand that clarifies once again that leadership's utter indifference to our national parks and other public lands. And I would like to enter into the RECORD an editorial from today's New York Times that correctly challenges the Republicans in Congress for their failure to keep their promises on environmental protection.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROMISES TO KEEP

As part of their budget agreement with President Clinton last May, Republican leaders in Congress pledged to provide funds to protect several particularly vulnerable pieces of the American landscape from further degradation. They would give Mr. Clinton enough money to carry forward the largest environmental rescue operation ever undertaken—the restoration of Florida's Everglades. They would also approve generous funds for Federal land acquisition that would allow Mr. Clinton to purchase a potentially ruinous gold mining operation near Yellowstone National Park and to acquire California's Headwaters Redwood Grove from a private lumber company.

So far, Congress has not lived up to its end of the bargain. This puts a special obligation on senior Republicans like the Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, and Senator Pete Domenici, who helped negotiate the budget deal, to remind their colleagues that their party may suffer if they break good-faith commitments. It also means that the Administration cannot relax its vigil. Indeed, Mr. Clinton might think about threatening to veto any spending bills that do not contain the promised funds—a weapon he used to good effect in the last Congress when Republican conservatives tried to dynamite the country's basic environmental laws.

The Yellowstone and Headwaters projects are especially at risk. The House has refused to provide a penny of the \$700 million in extra money promised for land acquisitions, including \$65 million for the mine and \$250 million for the redwoods. The Senate appropriations committee approved the \$700 million but then added a caveat that could doom the Yellowstone and Headwaters purchases. The purchases cannot be consummated, it said, until Congress passes separate legislation specifically authorizing them. That would throw the matter back to the Senate's Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which is full of people eager to deny the President an environmental triumph.

The truth is that no separate authorizing legislation is required. The Interior Department and the Forest Service, which would carry out the deals, have pre-existing authority to make the acquisitions as long as the money is there. Mr. Lott and Mr. Domenici must see this mischievous and unnecessary language for what it is—an opening for anticonservationist Republicans to torpedo

Mr. Clinton—and make sure it is removed when the bill comes to a floor vote.

The news about the Everglades is much better, at least so far. The appropriations committees in both houses have provided full funding for the Interior Department's Everglades Restoration Fund—a \$100 million program aimed primarily at creating buffer zones between the Everglades and two of its greatest threats, the agricultural regions to the north and the exploding urban populations to the east. This is only a small down payment on the Federal share of a restoration effort that may eventually cost \$3 billion to \$5 billion. But it is an important start.

At the same time, however, both the Senate and House have denied the Administration more than half the \$120 million it requested for restoration projects to be undertaken by the Army Corps of Engineers in South Florida. The corps plans a massive re-plumbing project aimed at replicating the historic flow of clean water from Lake Okechobee southward to the Everglades and Florida Bay. This is a vital part of the overall scheme and for that reason was specifically promised in the budget agreement. To honor their word, Mr. Lott, Mr. Domenici and their counterparts on the House side, should make sure that these funds are restored.

The Republicans keep saying that they want to spruce up their environmental credentials. Breaking pledges on matters of transcendent interest to environmentalists is not the way to go about it.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF HIGHLAND

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to your attention "Ten Years of Success", an anniversary celebration for the proud city of Highland, CA. On November 24, 1997, many people will be preparing to give thanks and commemorate our Nation's history of the day of Thanksgiving. The cold autumn air will bring in another different reason for the people of Highland to celebrate, as they will reach a great milestone in their own history, and ring in 10 years of existence as a city.

Do you believe in miracles?

The community and citizens of Highland certainly do. Many people, especially the so-called experts, warned in 1987 against incorporation of the community because they believed the proposed city was financially infeasible and would be bankrupt within the first 2 years of existence. I am more than pleased to report that the experts were wrong and the city of Highland is flourishing and growing with intensity. More importantly, the city is in relatively sound fiscal condition.

The future of the city of Highland, along with the successful maintenance of its fiscal approach, looks bright. If the past is any indication of the future, those who believe in the miracle and call the city of Highland home will be able to do so for many more years to come. May the next 10 years be even better than the past for the citizens of this great community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and the many proud people who call

the city of Highland their home, in recognizing a decade of success. This November all of us will recognize that miracles never cease to flourish in the city of Highland.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall votes 298 and 299 on July 22, I would have voted "yea." In addition, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 319 and "yea" on rollcall vote 320 which occurred on July 24.

HONORING JEAN WILLIAMSON'S DEDICATION TO VOLUNTEER NURSING

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable woman. Jean Williamson has been a nurse at the Clearwater Free Clinic in Clearwater, FL, for 5 years. The clinic provides critical health services to many of my constituents in the ninth congressional district who otherwise would be unable to afford them. In fact, the clinic was able to treat over 7,000 patients last year alone—and that number is expected to rise this year.

In 1996, Jean earned the title "Volunteer of the Year," for her tireless efforts on behalf of the patients she serves. Perhaps not surprisingly, she is again likely to receive this accolade.

This year, Jean gave up her summer to serve as the interim executive director of the clinic. She was compelled to do so after the previous director resigned to take a national office. This selfless act has permitted the clinic's board to carefully search for the right replacement and has made the transition period far smoother than it otherwise would have been.

However, I believe the greatest tributes come not from the words of outsiders, but from those who work closely with Jean. One of her colleagues described her as, "one of the most dedicated and conscientious volunteers anywhere . . . she has set an example few can follow." It was because of people like Jean that Congress recently passed H.R. 911, legislation to protect volunteers from frivolous lawsuits which arise out of their service. I am pleased to have been a cosponsor of this important bill to protect people like the volunteers of the Clearwater Free Clinic.

Mr. Speaker, in an age when volunteerism has declined, I would like very much to congratulate Jean for her unselfish and outstanding work at the Clearwater Free Clinic. She serves as a shining example for other volunteers around the country. I would ask that our colleagues join me in wishing her continued success with her work at the clinic and, indeed, with all of her future endeavors.

IN MEMORY OF U.S. DISTRICT
JUDGE NORMAN BLACK OF
HOUSTON

HON. KEN BENTSEN
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my Houston colleague Mr. GENE GREEN and myself, I rise to honor the memory of a valued and respected member of the Federal judiciary and a constituent, Senior U.S. District Judge Norman W. Black, and chief judge emeritus of the southern district of Texas, who passed away on July 23, 1997. As much as the community of Houston loved and respected Judge Black, his family has suffered an even greater loss.

Judge Black was an institution in Houston, a city he truly loved. He was born and raised in Houston, attending the city's public schools before attending the University of Texas for his bachelor and law degrees. He was an active citizen of the Houston community, a member of several civic and professional organizations including the Houston Philosophical Society, Congregation Beth Israel, and many, many more. His legacy of good work will be missed.

Judge Black was recommended to the bench by my uncle, Senator Lloyd Bentsen, and appointed by President Carter in 1979. He had previously served as a Federal magistrate in Houston for 3 years and had practiced law before that. He stepped down from his post of chief judge of the southern district last December, as required, upon turning 65. But he remained active, maintaining senior status in order to remain on the bench to handle his own cases and fill in as needed for other judges around the district.

Judge Black will be remembered not only for his position, but for the manner in which he served. He was a Texas gentleman, presiding on the bench as an even-tempered and courteous man of justice. He was one of the best-liked jurists on the Federal bench. He consistently received the highest ratings in the Houston Bar Association's annual poll. He will be remembered for his legal mind as well as his duty to the people he served. He had the compassion and understanding to recognize how his decisions impacted the lives of real people. He was, indeed, one of our very best.

Judge Black revered the law and recognized its importance. As an instructor at the University of Houston Law School and an adjunct professor at South Texas School of Law, he taught students to show respect and dignity for the law. He criticized "Rambo-type" attorneys who fought endlessly over minor points and impugned the integrity of their colleagues, calling them bad role models for young lawyers. He always recalled that when he began practicing law in the 1950's, young lawyers strove to be more like "Perry Mason"—polite, dignified and dedicated to serving their client.

Judge Black was more than just a great judge; he was also a great Texan, a loyal friend, a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. We offer our sincere condolences to his wife, Berne, his two daughters, Elizabeth Berry of Houston and Diane Smith of Austin,

and his entire family. We feel their loss as we mourn the passing of Judge Norman Black.

**JOHN BRADEMAs ADDRESSES
CYPRUS ISSUE**

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in a long while there is reason for guarded optimism in Cyprus.

A few weeks ago Cyprus President Clerides and Turkish Cypriot Leader Ruff Denktash met in New York under the auspices of the United Nations. Another round of face-to-face talks, the first in over 2 years, is planned for later this summer.

The Clinton administration's appointment of Richard Holbrooke as U.S. Special Envoy for Cyprus is the best signal yet that the administration intends to give high priority this year to a settlement in Cyprus and moving Greek-Turkish relations forward.

It has always been my firm belief that only high-level and sustained United States attention will convince all parties to try to resolve the Cyprus issue.

In this context, I believe that Members will read with interest an excellent speech on "The Cyprus Problem: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Role of Congress" by our distinguished former colleague in the House of Representatives, Dr. John Brademas.

I ask that a portion Dr. Brademas' cogent remarks, delivered in London, England, on July 10, 1997, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address follows:

**"THE CYPRUS PROBLEM: US FOREIGN POLICY
& THE ROLE OF CONGRESS"**

(By Dr. John Brademas)
THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

Before I address myself to the issue of Cyprus, I must say a word about certain fundamental factors that characterize the American form of government. You may all be familiar with them but I assure you that many Americans are not.

First, we have a separation of powers constitution; second, our parties are decentralized, that is to say, by comparison with parties in a parliamentary system, undisciplined.

People know the phrase, "separation of powers," but too few understand its meaning. Some think that in the American system, Congress exists to do whatever a president wants it to do. But this is not the way the Founding Fathers intended the government of the United States to work and, you must all be aware, that in both domestic and foreign policy, Congress has in recent decades reasserted the separation of powers principle.

Another factor complicates matters: Presidents and Congresses are elected separately, by different constituencies and for different periods of service. The President, each Senator—there are 100—and each member of the House of Representatives—there are 435—has his own mandate and sense of responsibility to the people.

In our system, as distinguished from yours, the chief executive is not chosen from the legislative majority and, indeed, often does

not even belong to the party controlling Congress. This is, of course, precisely the situation today with a Democrat in the White House and Republicans in control of both the Senate and House of Representatives.

THE AMERICAN WAY OF GOVERNING

So the American way of governing was not designed for peaceful coexistence between the executive and legislative branches. The result has been a process, over two centuries long, of conflict and accommodation, dispute and detente—and this is the case even when, as I shall illustrate with Cyprus, the president and both bodies of Congress are controlled by the same party.

Although service on the Education and Labor Committee meant that most of my legislative energies were directed to domestic concerns, I continued my interest of student days in foreign policy. As Majority Whip of the House of Representatives, I joined Speaker Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill, Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd and other Congressional leaders for breakfast at the White House every other week with President Carter, Vice President Mondale and the president's top aides to discuss the entire range of issues facing the president and Congress, including foreign affairs.

Yet it was during the administration of President Lyndon Johnson that I became personally engaged in a foreign policy question: I made clear my strong objection to the military junta in Greece that came to power in 1967. Although then the only Member of Congress of Greek origin (and a Democrat), I testified against the Administration's request for United States military aid to Greece which, I reminded the House Foreign Affairs Committee, was a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The NATO Charter was created to defend nations that adhere to democracy, freedom and the rule of law; the military dictatorship ruling Greece, I asserted, supports none of these principles. The United States should, therefore, not provide Greece military assistance. During the years of the junta, I refused to visit Greece or to set foot in the Greek Embassy in Washington.

INVASION OF CYPRUS

In 1974, however, I found myself deeply involved in American policy toward Greece. In July of that year, the colonels engineered an unsuccessful coup against the President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios. Although the coup precipitated the fall of the military regime and triggered the restoration of democracy in Greece, it was also the pretext for an invasion by Turkish military forces of Cyprus. The initial invasion, in July, was followed, in August, by Attila II, a massive intervention of 40,000 Turkish troops.

Because the Turkish forces were equipped with weapons supplied by the United States, Turkey's government was in direct violation of US legal prohibitions on the use of American arms for other than defensive purposes. And because American law mandated an immediate termination of arms transfers to any country using them for aggressive purposes, I led a small delegation of Congressmen to call on Secretary of State Kissinger to protest the Turkish action and insist that he enforce the law, i.e., order an immediate end to further shipments of American arms to Turkey. Kissinger apparently did not take us seriously and neither he nor President Gerald R. Ford took any action in response to our admonition.

TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO

Consequently, several of us in Congress, notably the late Congressman Benjamin S.

Rosenthal of New York, then Congressman Paul S. Sarbanes of Maryland and I in the House of Representatives and Senator Thomas Eagleton of Missouri led a successful effort in late 1974 to impose, by Congressional action, an arms embargo on Turkey. We were strongly supported not only by other Democrats but by a number of leading Republicans.

In this unusual episode, my colleagues and I had active allies outside Congress. Not only did we, understandably, have the help of Greek American and Armenian American persons and groups across the country but also of many others who shared our commitment to the rule of law. The reasons my colleagues and I prevailed were straightforward: We were better organized politically both within Congress and in the country at large and we had a superior case, both legally and morally. It was this combination of factors that brought what was a remarkable victory.

THE CURRENT SITUATION

President Clinton's appointment last month as his Special Envoy for Cyprus of Richard Holbrooke, architect of the Dayton Accords and a diplomat of wide experience, is, I believe, a significant indication of the priority the President and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright have assigned to Cyprus.

Indeed, last month, before talks in Washington with Cypriot Foreign Minister Ioannis Kasoulides, Secretary Albright said, "In our meeting today . . . I will assure the Minister of America's interest in seeing the people of Cyprus achieve a lasting settlement to the intercommunal dispute on their island. There could be no more dramatic a demonstration of that commitment than the President's decision to name Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as our special emissary to promote the Cyprus settlement. . . ." She continued: ". . . What we see is the unification of Cyprus. We believe that the division of the island is unacceptable. . . . [We] continue to support the establishment of a bizonal, bi-communal federation. We will do everything we can to bring the process forward."

POTENTIAL FOR A CYPRUS SETTLEMENT

Now, given the impasse of a near quarter century and in light of the current instability of the Turkish political scene, I think it would be a mistake to expect a breakthrough in the short term. Holbrooke himself has said, "This is going to be a long haul. It's not going to be a short, intense negotiation like Dayton was."

As you know, Ambassador Holbrooke has said he would not "do anything specific" until after this week's UN-sponsored talks between President Clerides and Mr. Denktash.

I add that the distinguished British diplomat who has been working on the issue, Sir David Hannay, welcomes Ambassador Holbrooke's intervention as does the US Congress, which has been concerned with the lack of progress on Cyprus.

And if there is agreement between the Executive Branch and Congress on the need to intensify efforts for a settlement on Cyprus, there is also, especially in the House of Representatives, bipartisan agreement. The International Relations Committee of the House, chaired by Ben Gilman, Republican of New York, joined by the senior Democrat on the Committee, Lee Hamilton of Indiana, on June 25 favorably reported their resolution urging "a United States initiative seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation on Cyprus." The measure includes a call for "the demilitarization of Cyprus and the es-

establishment of a multinational force to ensure the security of both communities."

ELEMENTS OF A SETTLEMENT

As we meet tonight during the week of the Clerides-Denktaş talks, I believe I can best contribute to a discussion of the Cyprus issue by telling you what, on the basis of my conversations in recent weeks with a number of persons, some in government and some not but all at senior levels and from the various countries concerned, seem to be factors fundamental, 23 years after the events of the summer of 1974, both to understanding the Cyprus problem and to forging a viable, realistic and just settlement of it.

Many in this room are far more knowledgeable than I about Cyprus and, of course, are free to disagree with me on any or all of these points, some matters of fact, others normative.

1. Greek-Turkish Relations

First, I would assert that a normalization of relations between Greece and Turkey depends upon a resolution of the issue of Cyprus. Indeed, a senior Turkish diplomat made this same point to me a few months ago even as I heard this view echoed in Istanbul in May during a Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Forum. The Forum, composed of seven Greeks, seven Turks and seven Americans, of whom I am one, involves academic, business and political leaders from all three countries, including two former Greek and two former Turkish foreign ministers and senior retired military officers from the two countries.

At a dinner one night in Istanbul, a leading Turkish business figure asked me what I thought was the most important action to improve Greek-Turkish relations. I replied, "Cyprus." He said, "I agree. And what you [Americans] must do is help us [Turks] get out gracefully and without humiliation."

I must tell you that it is my impression—reinforced by the comments of others—that the forces in Turkey pressing most vigorously for moderation, modernization and democracy there and for better relations with Greece are these top Turkish businessmen. We must encourage them.

2. Turkey's National Interest

Second, Turkish political and military leaders must be persuaded that resolving the Cyprus question is in the national interest of Turkey. I certainly think that is true.

In economic terms, for example, Ankara's officially acknowledged aid to Turkish-occupied Cyprus this year totals \$250 million, not including the cost of keeping 35,000 Turkish troops there.

Here I would offer another argument for this proposition: Turkish armed forces on the island are now considerable, of such size and nature that to protect them adds further to the security commitments of Turkish military commanders. It is a burden that Turkish leaders have taken on themselves, and one must ask, from a Turkish point of view, is it a wise one?

But much more important than economic reasons, there is a powerful political rationale for Turkey to move, at long last, toward a Cyprus settlement. Consider the present situation in Turkey. Beleaguered by economic troubles, pressures from the military, hostility between Islamists and secularists, widespread criticism on human rights and dealing with the Kurds, thoughtful Turkish leaders know that the occupation of Cyprus is not only a continuing financial burden but a huge obstacle to Turkish ambitions for stronger ties with Europe.

Even this week the new government led by Melsut Yilmaz declared, in a statement of its

hope for eventual membership in the European Union, "Turkey will ensure its rightful place in the new Europe that is being drawn up." Yet it must be clear that even putting aside demands from the European Parliament concerning democracy and human rights, so long as the Cyprus question goes unresolved, Turkish membership in the EU is not possible.

Here I note the recent statements of Greek Foreign Minister Pangalos and Undersecretary Kranidiotis that if political objections can be overcome, Greece has no philosophical or dogmatic objection to Turkish accession to the European Union. This posture, coupled with Greek removal of a veto on Turkish participation in the Customs Union with the EU, means that the Greeks are saying, "We're not the obstacle to Turkish entry into Europe." Yet if membership in the European Union is not on the immediate horizon, enhancement of the relationship with the EU can be a significant incentive for a Turkey that seeks to be in Europe.

3. Cyprus and the European Union

Third, another basic ingredient in the search for a solution, the prospect of membership by Cyprus in the EU, was described by Holbrooke as the "the biggest new factor in the 30-year stalemate."

With the commitment of the Council of Ministers of the EU in 1995, following approval of the Customs Union with Turkey, to start negotiations with the Republic of Cyprus on its accession to the EU within six months of the end of the Intergovernmental Conference (just concluded in Amsterdam), no longer is Cyprus to be held hostage for membership to Ankara. Certainly neither the Turkish government nor Mr. Denktaş should be allowed to block accession by Cyprus, and the United States should continue to support Cyprus membership.

In light of Turkish objections to accession by Cyprus to the EU, incentives to both Turks and Turkish Cypriots to greater involvement in Europe should vigorously be explored.

4. Security on Cyprus

Fourth, the matter of security—for both Greek and Turkish Cypriots—is obviously among the factors indispensable to a solution. For it seems to me that in any settlement acceptable to both sides and to Greece and Turkey, there must be, following departure of foreign troops, provisions for a multinational peacekeeping force to assure such security for all Cypriots.

Such a force might well be a NATO operation for NATO is, aside from the UN, of course, the one organization where Greece and Turkey are on the same level. From my perspective, it would be wise for such a force to include troops from the United States as well as other members of NATO. Even a modest commitment of US forces would represent a powerful demonstration of the seriousness with which American leaders of both parties in both the Administration and Congress regard the importance of defusing what Dick Holbrooke has rightly described as "a time bomb."

5. A United Cyprus

Fifth, I turn to the matter of the constitutional arrangements for a united Cyprus.

The United Nations, the European Union, the United States and the Republic of Cyprus are all agreed that there must be on the island a bizonal, bicommunal federation, with a single sovereignty.

I remind you here of successive Security Council resolutions, including Resolution 1092, adopted on December 23, 1996, which declares that any settlement, "must be based

on a state of Cyprus with a single sovereignty and international personality and a single citizenship, with its independence and territorial integrity safeguarded, and comprising two politically equal communities . . . in a bicommunal and bizonal federation, and that such a settlement must exclude union in whole or in part with any other country or any form of partition or secession. . . ."

The goal now will be to negotiate an agreement that provides for such a single sovereign state within which Greek Cypriots will accord a significant degree of self-government to Turkish Cypriots who, in turn, must agree to territorial compromises that will enable them to share in the economic growth that both reunification and membership in the EU would entail. After all, everyone is aware that there is a huge gap in per capita annual income between Greek Cypriots—\$12,000—and the North—\$4,000.

The challenge here must be to take into account the fears and apprehensions of both Greek and Turkish Cypriots so that both communities will feel they are dealt with fairly.

I observe, by way of suggesting an example of the tone or attitude that one hopes would characterize a federation that can command the support of both communities on the island and both Greece and Turkey, that the proposal of my friend Costa Carras for cross-voting should be given serious consideration. Rather than voting only for candidates of their own community as before, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots would vote twice, all citizens casting ballots in the elections of both communities. In this way, candidates and legislators from each community would for the first time acquire a stake in appealing to the other.

Let me add that a significant result of accession to the EU by a united Cyprus would be that Turkish Cypriots would then be part of a Cypriot delegation to Brussels, one way of ensuring that Cyprus would not be hostile to Turkey.

Now, I believe most of us would agree that it is unlikely—one never says "never"—that there will be a sudden accord on an issue that for so long has eluded resolution by so many. Moreover, a breakthrough is probably not possible until after the elections in Cyprus in February. Nonetheless, it is important to begin laying the groundwork now, and UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's talks with Clerides and Denktash are part of this process as Sir David Hannay observed in a thoughtful essay in yesterday's International Herald Tribune ("At Long Last, Cyprus Should Seize the Chance to Heal Itself"). For we must build bridges today for action next spring.

NORMALIZING GREEK-TURKISH RELATIONS

With the end of the Cold War has come the possibility of resolution of many long-simmering conflicts. As we observe in the Middle East and Northern Ireland, however, not to speak of the on-going drama in the former Yugoslavia, it is not easy. Nonetheless, the rest of the world is moving toward solving difficult problems. The North Koreans have agreed to four-power talks aimed at formally ending the Korean War. The Indians and Pakistanis are discussing Kashmir. Formerly Communist states are being brought into NATO. China may be beginning to communicate with the United States in more rational terms.

Surely it is time for Greece and Turkey to normalize their relationship even as did France and Germany under de Gaulle and Adenauer, thereby paving the way to progress for both.

The report that this past Tuesday (July 8), Greece and Turkey, in what the Financial Times described as "the biggest breakthrough in their strained relations for a decade . . . pledged to respect one another's sovereign rights and renounce the use of force in dealing with each other" is solid evidence of what the FT also called "strong pressure from the US." The statement by Greek Prime Minister Constantine Simitis and Turkish President Suleyman Demirel, the consequence of Secretary Albright's determined efforts, concluded the FT, "set a favourable tone for the high-level talks over the future of Cyprus which start near New York today."

And surely, I reiterate, key to the relationship between Greece and Turkey is Cyprus. Settlement, during the year ahead, of an issue over two decades old would obviously be a major triumph for US foreign policy, for Europe, for Greece, and, most important, for all the people of Cyprus.

A CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY AND RECONCILIATION IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

Now, if I have not exhausted you, I must tell you briefly of one other development that I believe relates directly to what I have been saying but goes still farther.

My own involvement in this effort is spurred in large part by my chairing the National Endowment for Democracy.

The National Endowment for Democracy, or NED, as we call it, is one of the principal vehicles through which American Presidents, Senators and Representatives of both political parties seek to promote free, open and democratic societies. Founded in 1983 by a Republican president, Ronald Reagan, and a Democratic Congress, the National Endowment for Democracy is a nonpartisan, nongovernmental organization that, through grants to private entities in other countries, champions, like your Westminster Foundation, the institutions of democracy. NED grants are made to organizations dedicated to promoting the rule of law, free and fair elections, a free press, human rights and the other components of a genuinely democratic culture.

A planning group for the center

The project of which I want to say a particular word is the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeastern Europe, which my colleagues and I hope to establish beginning in early 1998.

In cooperation with my friend known to many of you, Costa Carras, a businessman and historian of much wisdom and a deep sense of public responsibility, and Matthew Nimetz, a distinguished lawyer who served as Counselor and Under Secretary of State during the Carter Administration and as President Clinton's Special Envoy in the 1994-1995 mediation between Greece and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), I convened last year a group to draw up plans to create what we called a Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeastern Europe.

Following earlier discussions of the idea of such a center at conferences in Thessaloniki; Washington, D.C.; New York City; and at Ditchley Park, our group met last November in Lyon. The Planning Group, chaired by Ambassador Nimetz, is composed of persons from Southeastern Europe, Western Europe and the United States, nearly all of whom have expert knowledge of the region as well as experience in business and government. Unlike other organizations active in the Balkans, the Center will be directed by a board a majority of whose members are from the

region itself. That people from Greece, Turkey, Romania, FYROM, Serbia and elsewhere are joining to establish the Center will give it credibility and relevance that US or West European based organizations cannot attain.

Mission of the center

The Center will devote attention to the fields of education and market institutions as well as to the practices of a pluralist democratic society, such as a strong and independent judiciary, free and responsible media, vigorous nongovernmental organizations, and effective and accountable central administrations—with active parliamentary institutions—and local governments.

We anticipate that the Center will have its administrative headquarters in Thessaloniki, Greece, which has excellent transportation and communication facilities, making it easily accessible throughout the region. The Center will eventually sponsor programs in all the countries of South-eastern Europe, including Cyprus, where a program on governance is planned, and Turkey, where a program on environmental issues will be established. The Center's programs are intended to be multinational in scope, bringing together participants from the several countries of the region.

The purpose of the Center's multinational approach is to foster greater interchange and understanding among the peoples of the area and to develop networks among individuals and groups committed to the democratic and peaceful development of Southeastern Europe.

Programs of the center

First, we intend to forge links with other nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in the region to cooperate on specific projects and in some cases will establish offices in other countries to focus on a particular issue or theme. More broadly, the Center can be a forum to champion NGOs as essential components of a civil society, particularly important, of course, in Southeastern Europe where such organizations are relatively new phenomena, especially in former state-controlled societies.

We want also to support development of a lively, responsible and independent press, again free of state control.

The Center plans to support projects on the writing of school textbooks and improving pedagogy at all levels in the countries of Southeastern Europe.

The Center will also address concerns of parliamentary and local governments and we hope to sponsor exchanges of parliamentarians.

Economic development clearly offers opportunities for regional cooperation and interchange. Independent business associations can be an integral part of a vibrant civil society.

Environmental challenges also open doors for cooperative endeavors throughout the region. Indeed, while in Istanbul last month, Matthew Nimetz and I called on His Holiness, Bartholomew, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, who told us that he will shortly be leading an effort to deal with environmental problems in the Black Sea, an initiative that will involve Turkish government officials and business leaders as well.

CONCLUSION

I have told you of my own involvement in Cyprus as a Member of the United States Congress and of my continuing interest in improving relations between Greece and Turkey.

I have offered a list of what seems to me to be some of the factors essential to success in

the on-going search for a just and enduring settlement of a problem—the tragedy of a divided Cyprus—that should affront the consciences of all who live in civilized, democratic societies.

I have expressed gratification that the United States is now moving toward much more intensive involvement in the issue.

And I have told you of an effort, in the form of the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeastern Europe, that although modest at the outset, can, in time, in a troubled part of the world, sow seeds of hope rather than despair.

How splendid it would be if, even before the start of the next millennium, we can see a united Republic of Cyprus, in which all its citizens enjoy the fruits of freedom, democracy and the rule of law!

THE 39TH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal conviction and pride that I submit for the RECORD an authoritative proclamation on Captive Nations Week, the 39th Observance, based on Public Law 86-90 and reflected in proclamations and observances of States and cities across our Nation this past third full week of July, 20-26.

In personal conviction, I am fully convinced that P.L. 86-90—which is uniquely vindicated by the historic changes these past 8 years in Central/East Europe, Central Asia, Africa, and Central America—will be completely vindicated as freedom forces in the world's democracies concentrate on the remaining captive nations under Communist party dictatorships in the People's Republic of China, Vietnam, Laos, North Korea, and Cuba. Unresolved issues also remain in the Russian Federation, to mention Chechnia as only one example.

In humble pride, it is a source of satisfaction that I have been playing a role in this nearly 40-year tradition begun by the 86th Congress and President Eisenhower and indelibly imprinted in our history by President Reagan and the "evil empire" concept. In short, for our own well-being and peace, a tradition of America's dedication to expressive freedom, democracy, free market economy, human rights, national independence, and the surcease of empires and imperial "spheres of influence".

Definitely certain that all who commemorated this 39th observance share these convictions and civic pride, I deem it an honor to submit the proclamation and the list of its distinguished supporters:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the Captive Nations Week Resolution, which Congress passed in 1959 and President Eisenhower signed into Public Law 86-90, has been proclaimed by every president since, with identical support by Governors and Mayors across our Nation; and

Whereas, reflecting the foresight of that Congress and supports, Public Law 86-90 has been uniquely vindicated by the demise of the Soviet Union and the liberation of the most captive nations in Central and East Europe, Central Asia, Africa, and Central America; and

Whereas, in the total picture and for our national interest, it is imperative to recognize the reality of numerous other captive nations still remaining under totalitarian, communist party dictatorship and the residual Russian Federation structure of imperial control: among others, Mainland China, North Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, Idel-Ural (Tatarstan), Chechnia, the Far Eastern Republic; and

Whereas, like the former USSR and with a long record of massive human rights violations, the People's Republic of China is in essence an empire under communist party rule, consisting of the Chinese, Tibetan, divided Turkestan, and Inner Mongolian captive nations; and

Whereas, with its own unresolved cases of non-Russian and Siberyak self determination drivers, the Russian Federation, centered in Moscow, continues to strive imperially for a "sphere of influence" in eastern Europe, causing former captive nations like Poland, Lithuania, geopolitical strategic Ukraine, and others to seek their preserved independence and full integration in a free Europe through our assistance in the forms of NATO, aid, and investment; and

Whereas, in the true spirit that crucial foreign issues are not foreign to our world leadership, economic well-being, and even American lives, Congress by unanimous vote passed P.L. 86-90, establishing the third full week in July each year as "Captive Nations Week," and inviting our people to observe in that true spirit the week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities in support of the just aspirations of the still remaining captive nations and the preservation of the freedom of the former captive nations.

Received as of today, July 25, 1997 the following Governors and Mayors have issued proclamations of the week: The Hon. Paris N. Glendening of Maryland; The Hon. Flife Symington of Arizona; The Hon. Christine Todd Whitman of New Jersey; The Hon. John Engler of Michigan; The Hon. George Allen of Virginia; The Hon. Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin; The Hon. Frank O'Bannon of Indiana; The Hon. Frank Keating of Oklahoma; The Hon. Lawton Chiles of Florida; The Hon. Terry E. Brandstad of Iowa; The Hon. Bob Miller of Nevada; The Hon. Lincoln Almond of Rhode Island; The Hon. Mel Carnahan of Missouri; The Hon. Gary E. Johnson of New Mexico; the Hon. Pete Wilson of California; The Hon. Zell Miller of Georgia; The Hon. William Weld of Massachusetts; The Hon. Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania and the Mayors: Rudolph Giuliani of New York; Richard Reardon of Los Angeles; and Edward Rendell of Philadelphia.

CUTS IN MEDICARE

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of my constituents have contacted me about the severe cuts in Medicare reimbursement for home oxygen therapy. As the House and Senate conferees deliberate over the extent of these cuts, I would like them to consider the lives of seniors receiving home oxygen services. The following letter was given to me by Laurie Keiper of Springfield, OR.

TO CONGRESS AND THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES: I am an oxygen home ther-

apy patient on 3-4 liters, 24 hours each day. I am a wife of a research vessel boatswain mate who is not home every night. He is gone most of the summer and fall.

I am a care giver also, taking care of my grandson, most of his 14 years. He will be starting 9th grade in the fall.

Without oxygen, I can not take care of my grandson, do for my family, or take care of myself. Instead you will pay more for child care, hospital and for nursing facility care. Most likely my 5 years of life expectancy will be shortened to 2 to 3 years or less. Oxygen is 1 percent of the total medicare budget. If you cut it by 40 percent what will it cost you?

40 percent increase in hospital stays.

40 percent increase in dependent payments, especially without parental guidance look at all the options—drugs, alcohol, runaways etc.

40 percent increase in home health and/or nursing facility payments.

40 percent increase in death benefit burial payments.

It does not seem fiscally prudent to make this cut. Look for fake bills, bad doctors, people who aren't supposed to be on Medicare. When someone says they question a bill—follow up on it. Cut cost that way!

Laurie Keiper.

TRIBUTE TO THE U.S.S. "INDIANAPOLIS"

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a brief moment to personally pay tribute to those who served so selflessly aboard the U.S.S. *Indianapolis*. A reunion was held in Indianapolis this weekend for those veterans who served on the U.S.S. *Indianapolis*, a heavy cruiser sunk by enemy torpedo on July 30, 1945.

My pride and admiration, for the service of these men know no bounds.

I am proud to report that I have been honored with appointment to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of Congress, an opportunity to be of special service to those who sacrificed so much for our Nation. In that work I find regular occasion to remember and to admire our citizen veterans and to help secure to them full measure of our Nation's respect for their contributions in time of peace and in the horror that is war.

I am prouder still to join my voice with those who spoke to honor the men who served with such valor aboard the U.S.S. *Indianapolis*—those with us still and those lost in the Pacific vastness somewhere west of Guam. For their service and sacrifice in the highest tradition of our country, our respect must be eternal.

MEDICARE REFORM PROPOSAL

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, this year Congress is faced with one of its toughest challenges yet. A program that for three decades

has helped pay the medical bills for America's senior citizens is in drastic need of reform. Credited with alleviating the problem of the uninsured senior citizens and reducing the health problems of the disabled, Medicare is now in need of a major overhaul if it is to continue providing for seniors.

We are working hard to ensure that Medicare remains viable for present and future beneficiaries. By addressing the impending bankruptcy of this program now, we will be able to strengthen and improve it while expanding benefits for all participants. Through a combination of savings and structural reforms, the Republican plan to reform our health care program will extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund for at least 10 years.

The House Medicare proposal increases the choices available to Medicare beneficiaries, so that they can select from among the same kinds of health plan options that are available to the rest of the population. The plan calls for new systems of payment to address the problems in areas where the growth in costs is unsustainable. Finally, our proposal achieves savings by restraining future increases in costs, while also providing important new preventive care benefits.

I am proud of the progress we have made toward reforming Medicare. I firmly believe that Medicare can be preserved, protected, and improved without jeopardizing health care for the most vulnerable populations, and I am confident that together we can make this goal a reality.

IN MEMORY OF WILLIAM N. KEMP

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of William N. Kemp, who passed away on July 15, 1997, in Houston, TX. Dr. Kemp was a self-employed optometrist for 41 years in the North Shore area of Houston and was the founder of the firm Drs. Kemp and Peterson, Optometrist. He was past president of both the Harris County Optometric Society and the Texas Optometric Association.

Dr. William Kemp was born August 21, 1925, in Wharton, TX, where he lived until entering the Navy for 3 years of service during World War II. He attended Texas A&I University in Kingsville for 3 years and was graduated from the Illinois College of Optometry in Chicago. Upon graduation, he moved to the North Shore area of Houston and was active in the community for many years, especially in the Lions International.

Dr. Kemp was active in politics where he served as president of the North Shore Democrats and skillfully represented Houston alongside with Congresswoman Barbara Jordan at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1968. In 1972, Dr. Kemp was elected to the Texas State Board of Education, district 8, where he served for 11 years.

Dr. Kemp is survived by his wife of 41 years, Kathryn Lourene Kemp; three sons, Paul Davis Kemp, George William Kemp, and Robert Harris Kemp; two granddaughters,

Kimberley Shae Kemp and Toni Louise Kemp; and one grandson, Matthew W. Kemp.

William Kemp will be remembered as a leader in his community whose ideas reached far and wide. His genuine enthusiasm for his community prompted people of all ages to become interested and involved in improving their community. Because I experienced Dr. Kemp's vitality and wisdom firsthand, I have no doubt that this tireless role model made Houston, TX, a richer place to live.

As friends and family reflect on his lifetime of contribution, it is only fitting that we also pay tribute to this great man and good friend.

THE PASSING OF A HERO

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 24 a great constitutional scholar and advocate of social justice passed away. Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan, Jr. served the highest branch of our judicial system from 1956 until 1990. His scholarship was at the forefront of an intellectual and moral frontier that began in the pre-civil-rights era.

Justice Brennan shaped our law and touched our lives in countless ways. In the area of voting rights he authored *Baker versus Carr*, 1962, which was one of the cornerstone of voting rights case law. It led to one-person one-vote reapportionment cases. On the issue of affirmative action he authored *Metro Broadcasting versus the Federal Communications Commission*, 1990, which upheld two affirmative action programs aimed at increasing African-American ownership of radio and television stations. In *Texas versus Johnson*, 1989, Brennan declared, "If there is a bedrock principle underlying the first amendment, it is that the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable." And continuing in his tradition of protecting the most vulnerable, in *Goldberg versus Kelly*, 1970, he established that it was a violation of the 14th amendment's guarantee of due process under law for a State to cut off a welfare recipient's benefit without a hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor this great drum major for justice of the 20th century. I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles from the *Washington Post* which I believe capture some of the spirit and letter of his contributions to our great system of justice.

[From the *Washington Post*, July 25, 1997]

THE BIGGEST HEART IN THE BUILDING

(By Joan Biskupic)

Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan Jr. was remembered yesterday as a bulwark of liberal activism whose effects on America is so great—and his personality so compelling—that even those who disagreed with his views said much of his legacy will endure.

Brennan "played a major role in shaping American constitutional law," said conservative Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist. "He was also a warm-hearted colleague to those of us who served with him."

"He had the biggest heart of anyone in the building" said Thurgood Marshall Jr., son of

the late justice. "Justice Brennan was not just my father's closest and dearest partner, but his hero in the pursuit of equality and justice."

Marshall, President Clinton's Cabinet secretary, said his father and Brennan could not have been more different as people, given the backgrounds from which they emerged. "But they both believed fervently in the very same ideals."

News of Brennan's death, coming shortly after noon yesterday, spread quickly among former colleagues and friends. He was known for the force of his opinions—more than 1,000—that embodied the notion that the federal courts should actively seek to right society's wrongs. He was venerated yesterday for his persuasive approach and good humor, and for a charisma that will help him be remembered for generations.

"There are few people who are truly extraordinary and we don't always know the reasons why they rise above the rest of us. But he did," U.S. appeals court judge Richard S. Arnold of Little Rock, who was a law clerk to Brennan in 1960, said yesterday. "His chief characteristics were kindness and love—to everybody."

Brennan, who retired from the court in 1990 and initially kept up professional and personal contacts, had been in poor health in recent months. He died at a nursing home in Arlington, where he had been rehabilitating after he broke his hip in November.

A court spokeswoman said Brennan's body would lie in state from 10:30 a.m. until 10 p.m. Monday at the Supreme Court Building. His funeral is set for 10 a.m. Tuesday at St. Mathews Catholic Church in the District.

All quarters of government reacted to word of Brennan's death. Clinton, who said Brennan's devotion to the Bill of Rights inspired millions of Americans and countless young law students, including myself, ordered flags flown at half-staff at government buildings, military facilities and U.S. embassies worldwide.

In addition to Rehnquist, three other of Brennan's former court colleagues issued statements of admiration yesterday.

Justice John Paul Stevens, who sat with Brennan for 15 years and shared some of his liberal views, said, "The blend of wisdom, humor, love and learning that Justice Brennan shared with his colleagues—indeed with all those privileged to know him—was truly unique. He was a great man and a warm friend."

"Justice Brennan's death means the passing of an era in the history of the Supreme Court," Justice Sandra Day O'Connor said. "In addition to the remarkable legal legacy he left behind, he left a legacy of friendship and good will wherever he went."

Justice Anthony M. Kennedy said, "Justice Brennan was one of the great friends of freedom, freedom for those who have it and freedom for those who yet must seek it."

Justice Antonin Scalia, who strongly disagreed with Brennan's liberal approach, nonetheless once called Brennan "probably the most influential justice of the century" and "the intellectual leader of the movement that really changed, fundamentally, the court's approach toward the Constitution."

Joshua E. Rosenkranz, a 1987-88 clerk who is now executive director of the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University, said, "I would be willing to bet that there is not a single person in our nation who hasn't been touched by Justice Brennan's legacy, whether they know it or not."

Attorney General Janet Reno said she was sad to hear Brennan had died and added:

"Justice Brennan stood up for people who had no choice. He devoted his long, rich life to helping the American justice system live up to its ideals. He made a difference, and he will be remembered always by all Americans who prize the rule of law."

JUSTICE BRENNAN, VOICE OF COURT'S SOCIAL REVOLUTION, DIES

Former Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan Jr., the progressive voice of the modern court and a justice unequaled for his influence on American life, died yesterday. He was 91.

During his 34 years on the court, Brennan pushed his colleagues to take on a variety of social issues and was widely recognized as the chief strategist behind the court's civil rights revolution.

He was the architect of rulings that expanded rights of racial minorities and women; led to reapportionment of voting districts guaranteeing the ideal of "one person, one vote," and enhanced First Amendment freedom for newspapers and other media.

A slight man with a ready Irish grin, Brennan was recognized across the political spectrum not only for his legal mastery but as a defender of individual liberty and a voice of civility. Poor health forced his retirement from the court in 1990.

"He was a remarkable human being, one of the finest and most influential jurists in our nation's history," President Clinton said yesterday upon learning of Brennan's death. "The force of his ideas, the strength of his leadership and his character have safeguarded freedom and widened the circle of equality for every single one of us."

Justice David H. Souter has said of the man he succeeded on the court: "One can agree with the Brennan opinions and one may disagree with them, but their collective influence is an enormously powerful defining force in the contemporary life of this republic."

What distinguished Brennan was his ability to forcefully articulate a liberal vision of judging. It was a vision that found the essential meaning of the Constitution not in the past but in contemporary life, prized individual rights beyond what was explicitly written in the text, and compelled him to reach out to right perceived wrongs. He called the Constitution "a sparkling vision of the supreme dignity of every individual," and employed it as a tool of racial equality and social justice.

"The genius of the Constitution rests not in any static meaning it may have had in a world that is dead and gone," he wrote in an essay published in 1997, "but in the adaptability of its great principles to cope with current problems and present needs."

In the confines of the court's conference room and chambers, Brennan was renowned for his cunning and persistence, and relentlessness in winning votes for his side. If a justice initially turned him down, Brennan would begin with gentle persuasion, then offer grounds for compromise, then pull out all the stops to try to win another vote. If he lost, he would pursue the justice in the hope he would win on an issue the next time around.

In a May 1995 tribute to Brennan to inaugurate the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law, former appeals judge Abner J. Mikva defined "a Brennanist" as "one who influences his colleagues beyond measure." Retired Justice Harry A. Blackmun said Brennan operated in "quiet but firm tones."

Brennan was appointed to the court by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1956,

three years after Earl Warren became chief justice. And Brennan's unmatched ability to build consensus made him a central figure in the Warren Court and a key participant in its most celebrated decisions.

He is considered the primary writer of the 1958 Cooper v. Aaron decision that forced school officials to accelerate classroom integration in the face of mass resistance.

Brennan also was the author of a 1962 decision that permitted federal courts for the first time to hear constitutional challenges to a state's distribution of voters, a ruling that brought new fairness to the sharing of political power between rural and urban America. He broadly interpreted the Constitution's guarantee of due process for criminal defendants, in cases, for example, that protected state defendants against self-incrimination and gave prisoners greater access to federal courts to challenge convictions. "In a civilized society," he wrote in the latter, "government must always be accountable to the judiciary for a man's imprisonment."

He led the majority to bolster the right of free speech, including a 1964 opinion that requires public figures who sue for libel to prove "actual malice" on the part of the media.

To the consternation of his conservative critics, Brennan was not afraid to cross boundaries into areas previously considered off-limits for federal courts. "Our task," Brennan once said, "is to interpret and apply the Constitution faithfully to the wisdom and understanding of the Founding Fathers. But often it is impossible to make a constitutional decision without basing certain findings on data drawn from the social sciences, from history, geography, economics and the like."

When Warren was succeeded as chief justice by Warren E. Burger and then William H. Rehnquist, the court began to move gradually to the right, and many of the rulings from the Warren era were reversed. But several Brennan decisions endured. Among the most important is Baker v. Carr, a 1962 opinion that gave federal courts the power to ensure the fairness of voting districts, reshaped politics and broadened participation in democracy.

Even as he found himself increasingly on the losing side in the 1980s, Brennan remained on good terms with his fellow justices. "Brennan brought to the work of the court a personal warmth and friendliness which prevented disagreements about the law from marring the good personal relations among the justices," Rehnquist once wrote.

The chief justice also remarked after Brennan had retired that "the enduring legacy of Justice Brennan—the high value which he placed on claims of individual constitutional rights asserted against the authority of majoritarian self-government—is in no danger of being forgotten or disregarded simply because he has left the bench."

Georgetown University law professor Mark V. Tushnet, who has read through the private papers of several former justices, said Brennan's winning personal style added tremendously to his effectiveness. "If you look at the tone with which people responded to his suggestions for changing an opinion, Brennan made it easy. He was friendly and had a tone of accommodation."

A minor stroke and related poor health forced Brennan to retire suddenly in 1990, but he remained active in liberal causes. In 1994, a national anti-death penalty project was begun in his name. A year later, he was

the inspiration for a free speech award given periodically by the Thomas Jefferson Center for the Protection of Free Expression in Charlottesville, Va.

Brennan said he hoped to continue effecting change and affecting lives.

"Justice Brennan has an abiding belief in the power of thoughts, thoughtful words and good will to reach understanding and solutions that more contentious methods cannot," Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., the civil rights leader and Washington lawyer, said in 1995 when a group of Brennan's admirers dedicated the Brennan Center.

Brennan was born in Newark on April 25, 1906, the second-oldest of eight children of Irish immigrant parents. His father worked as a laborer in a brewery and became a union leader and local politician.

Brennan was an honors student at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Finance and received a scholarship to Harvard Law School. Upon graduation in 1931, he joined a Newark law firm, Pitney, Hardin & Skinner, practicing there until he entered the Army in 1942. While in the military, he handled labor disputes on the staff of the undersecretary of war.

He returned to his law firm and began specializing in labor law, representing several large manufacturing enterprises, before being appointed to the New Jersey bench. In 1949 Republican Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll named him to the state superior court. Three years later, Driscoll elevated him to the New Jersey Supreme Court, and Brennan became a reliable lieutenant to Chief Justice Arthur Vanderbilt.

Brennan's nomination to the high court apparently came as a surprise. Then U.S. Attorney General Herbert Brownell Jr. telephoned him late one afternoon in his New Jersey chambers and asked that he meet Eisenhower at the White House the next day.

Brennan thought nothing of the request and even stopped at Union Station for a hot dog to bide his time, according to Robert M. O'Neil, who would become one of Brennan's first law clerks. "He didn't expect to get dinner at the White House," O'Neil said.

University of Virginia law professor John C. Jeffries Jr. wrote in his biography of Brennan's colleague, Lewis F. Powell Jr. that Brennan's shot at the high court was owed to chance.

"In 1956 the chief justice of New Jersey, Arthur Vanderbilt, was scheduled to give the keynote address at a large Washington conference on the problem of overburdened courts. Two days before the meeting, Vanderbilt fell ill, and Brennan went in his place. His speech impressed U.S. Attorney General Herbert Brownell, who, when a Supreme Court vacancy opened four months later, contemplated the electoral advantages to President Eisenhower of appointing Irish Catholic Democrat from the Northeast and recommended Brennan."

Brennan later said no one in the Eisenhower administration asked him a single question about his politics or judicial philosophy. And indeed, Eisenhower's choice for the high court marked the third time Brennan had been appointed or elevated to a court by a Republican official. The ability to bridge differences would distinguish his early career on the high court.

Brennan succeeded Justice Sherman Minton, who was retiring because of failing health, and initially received a recess appointment on Oct. 16, 1956. He was confirmed by the Senate March 19, 1957 on a voice vote. The only audible dissent came from Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy (R-Wis.), who said he was

convinced that Brennan was "hostile" to congressional investigations of communism.

Brennan had given a speech in 1954 in which he said "there are some practices in the contemporary American scene which are reminiscent of Salem witch hunts."

Brennan was 50 at the time of his appointment, the youngest member of a court that included William D. Douglas, Hugo L. Black and Felix Frankfurter. In 1962 Frankfurter who taught Brennan at Harvard and was a strong advocate of limiting judicial power, told *Look* magazine: "I taught my students to think for themselves, but sometimes I think that Bill Brennan carries it too far."

Brennan formed an immediate relationship with Warren, becoming a close ally and developing the legal justifications for the decisions that would result in a social revolution.

The Warren Court broadly interpreted the Constitution to provide greater protections for individual rights. It demanded, for example, that states abide by most of the provisions of the Bill of Rights, a document originally interpreted to safeguard individuals only from the hand of the federal government. Essentially a political actor of the era, the court actively addressed society's problems, accelerating the civil rights movement, bringing fairness to reapportionment and reforming police practices.

When he saw a litigant in need, Brennan's litmus test for offering legal protection was whether anything in the Bill of Rights explicitly prevented him from doing so. He favored the individual and put the burden on the government to show that something in the Constitution disallowed protection. (The opposite, "judicial restraint" approach asks whether anything in the Constitution or in the court's precedents explicitly permits it to extend protection to an individual.)

Brennan and the other Warren-era judges crossed boundaries into areas previously considered off-limits for the federal courts. Before 1962, for example, the question of whether legislative voting districts were drawn fairly was considered a "political question," that is, the business of elected officials, not judges. But Brennan said the fairness question was constitutional, not political. Warren would later call the ruling in *Baker v. Carr* the "most important" of his time on the court. The decision broke rural America's lock on political power and gave urban voters equal representation to fulfill the principle of one person, one vote, as articulated in later voting rights cases.

Brennan also led the court in increasing protections against sex discrimination, writing in 1972, "distinctions between the sexes often have the effect of invidiously relegating the entire class of females to inferior legal status without regard to the actual capabilities of its individual members."

SPEECH RULINGS OFTEN ENGENDERED POLITICAL OUTRAGE

He had argued that laws treating men differently from women could be justified only by a compelling governmental interest—the strictest constitutional test for a law. He failed to win a majority of his colleagues to that standard but eventually succeeded in getting them to agree to an "intermediate" standard of scrutiny still in place. Until these rulings, states could, and did, treat women differently from men in a variety of ways, imposing different requirements for everything from beer drinking to alimony.

In another area of equal rights, Brennan was a strong advocate of affirmative action. In the 1979 *United Steelworkers of America v. Weber*, he wrote for the court that federal

anti-discrimination law does not bar employers from adopting race-based affirmative action programs to boost the number of blacks in the work force and management.

In 1990, his last term, Brennan was the author of a decision upholding Congress's preferential treatment of blacks and other racial minorities in awarding broadcast licenses.

The court said the affirmative action program was justified by Congress's interest in broadcast diversity. The case, *Metro Broadcasting Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission*, was overturned in 1995 as the court increased its scrutiny of federal affirmative action programs.

When the court invalidated state death penalty laws in 1972 in *Furman v. Georgia*, Brennan wrote, "Death is an unusually severe and degrading punishment; there is a strong probability that it is inflicted arbitrarily." A court should determine "whether a punishment comports with human dignity. Death, quite simply, does not."

Four years later, when a majority reinstated the death penalty with a requirement for safeguards on its imposition. Brennan and his colleague and judicial soul mate, Justice Thurgood Marshall, dissented. Toward the end of their tenures on the court (Marshall retired in 1991 and died in 1993), they were alone in opposition to capital punishment as cruel and unusual punishment.

One of Brennan's best-known opinions is his 1964 *New York Times v. Sullivan*, which made it harder for public officials to sue the media.

In it, he referred to "a profound national commitment to the principle that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open, and that it may well include vehement, caustic, and sometimes unpleasantly sharp attacks on government and public officials."

Like many of his path-breaking opinions, Brennan's free speech decisions often engendered political outrage. Such was the case for his majority opinions in 1989 and 1990 decisions striking down bans on flag burning. Said Brennan, "the government may not prohibit expression simply because it disagrees with the message."

In the area of religion, Brennan favored a high wall of separation between church and state. Appeals Judge Richard Arnold of Little Rock, Ark., who as a young lawyer clerked for Brennan, once summed up Brennan's view: "In short, religion is too important to be co-opted by the state for political or governmental ends. . . . As Justice Brennan understands, public and ostentatious piety can be the enemy of true religion."

Brennan was the author of a 1987 decision, *Edward v. Aguillard*, that invalidated a Louisiana requirement that any public school teacher who taught evolution also teach "creation science." In the related area concerning the free exercise of religion, Brennan penned a majority opinion in 1963 that only a compelling state interest could justify limitations on religious liberty. Rehnquist, who was often on the opposite side of Brennan, wrote after he retired that "Brennan's abilities as a judicial craftsman, and his willingness to accept 'half a loaf' if that were necessary to obtain a court opinion, played a large part in translating what had at first been dissenting views into established jurisprudence."

Brennan first married in 1928 to Marjorie Leonard. They had two sons and a daughter. Marjorie Brennan died of cancer in 1982 after a lengthy illness. The following year, Brennan married Mary Fowler, his secretary of more than 20 years. They announced the

news of their wedding to the rest of the court with a memorandum that said: "Mary Fowler and I were married yesterday and we have gone to Bermuda."

In addition to his wife, he is survived by his three children, William J. III, Hugh Leonard, and Nancy, and grandchildren.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

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

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

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 29, 1997, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 30

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the regulation of international satellites.

SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on S. 1059, to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

SD-406

Indian Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 569, to amend the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 to provide for retention by an Indian tribe of exclusive jurisdiction over child custody proceedings involving Indian children and other related requirements; to be followed by an oversight hearing on the Bureau of Indian Affairs Special Trustee's strategic plan to reform the management of Indian trust funds.

SD-106

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Financial Services and Technology Subcommittee

To resume hearings to review information processing challenges of the Year 200 for certain financial institutions.

SD-538

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider the Agreement between the Government of the

- United States and the Government of Hong Kong for the Surrender of Fugitive Offenders signed at Hong Kong on December 20, 1996 (Treaty Doc. 105-3), S. Con. Res. 39, expressing the sense of the Congress that the German Government should expand and simplify its reparations system, provide reparations to Holocaust survivors in Eastern and Central Europe, and set up a fund to help cover the medical expenses of Holocaust survivors, and pending nominations.
- SD-419
- Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
- SH-216
- Judiciary
To resume hearings to examine certain issues with regard to the proposed Global Tobacco Settlement which will mandate a total reformation and restructuring of how tobacco products are manufactured, marketed and distributed in America.
- SD-226
- 2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the management and operations of concession programs within the National Park System.
- SD-366
- Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
- SH-219
- 2:30 p.m.
Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider the status of the investigation into the contested Senate election in Louisiana.
- SR-301
- JULY 31
- 9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine how trade opportunities and international agricultural research can stimulate economic growth in Africa, thereby enhancing African food security and increasing U.S. exports.
- SR-332
- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on S. 268, to regulate flights over national parks.
- SR-253
- Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings to examine the organizational structure, staffing, and budget of the Forest Service for the Alaska region.
- SD-366
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1026, authorizing funds for the Export-Import Bank of the United States.
- SD-538
- Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
- SH-216
- Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
- SD-226
- 2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review annual refugee admissions.
- SD-226
- 2:30 p.m.
Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider the status of the investigation into the contested Senate election in Louisiana.
- SR-301
- AUGUST 1
- 9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings to examine the employment-unemployment situation for July.
- 1334 Longworth Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Administrative Oversight and the Courts Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the operation of the FBI crime laboratory.
- SD-226
- 2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
Administrative Oversight and the Courts Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the negative impact of bankruptcy on local education funding.
- SD-226
- POSTPONEMENTS
- JULY 29
- 10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the copyright infringement liability of on-line and Internet service providers.
- SD-226