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Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mancel Page, a dedicated watchmaker from Grand Junction, Colorado. Mancel is retiring at the age of 81 after 40 years in the jewelry business, and I want to take this opportunity to recognize his many years of service to his community before this body of Congress and this Nation.

Mancel came by the jewelry business naturally. His mother's uncle was a jeweler in Germany, and Mancel began taking apart and repairing clocks when he was ten years old. His store, Page Parsons Jewelers, located on the main street of downtown Grand Junction, was founded in 1895 and is one of the oldest businesses in the city. Mancel, grew up repairing clocks and loving sports. He played basketball for his school in Missouri and during the time he served in the military during World War II. Athletics are something outside of work that he still makes time to enjoy.

While in the military Mancel worked at a local jewelry store and then went on to college. He still makes time to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read this essay and I would like to have the text of this essay placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my statement.

OUTSIDE VIEW: BIG PROGRESS IN KAZAKHSTAN
(By Gregory Fossedal)
WASHINGTON, DC, Sept. 24 (UPI).—Kazakhstan held national elections on Sunday, prompting comments from a number of outside observers, and all the local opposition, that the vote was a step backwards for democracy. Was it that—or was it just not as much progress as democracy-lovers around the world, including the United States, have at long last been hoping for?

To answer that question, we need to decide what Kazakhstan's admittedly sloppy democracy today is being compared to; the country, 12 years ago, other countries in the region 10 years ago, or Russia, China, Iraq or Florida?

By most of these standards, the country seems to have made a lot of progress. Progress, that is to say, motion towards a goal. Furthermore, considering Kazakhstan's and demographic position on the world's political map, that's important to U.S. security and democracy in general.

Measuring a democracy's progress at the end of 2004 is a tricky matter, but Kazakhstan's recent vote appears to have at least two positive signposts.

First, the vote was held, and with numerous international observers. Some of these, especially as covered in the major press, had complaints about both voting mechanics and the size of the opposition. However, the vote took place—especially including reports of "intimidation" of some voters on Election Day, and the lack of a paper trail from voting machines used by about 20 percent of the voters.

In fact, to an extent, that's the point. Kazakhstan has now held a competitive election with a large number of international observers per capita compared to (say) recent votes in Venezuela, Indonesia or the Philippines. Critics can point out flaws, document the ruling party's heavy-handedness, and urge future improvements.

The most balanced report to emerge, by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, generated Western headlines saying the election "failed the democracy test" (The New York Times) and even was "fraudulent" (The Washington Times). But the report itself noted positive areas of "progress" as against previous Kazakh elections—the relevant unit of comparison.

Professor Frederick Starr of Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C., judged the voting as fundamentally improved over recent Kazakh standards. "Overall ... the election was "a step forward, not backwards," regarding the importance of the sequencing of the elections, 10 years after the last.

Second, and more important, if the results hold up, at least one opposition party will be seated in the Kazakh Parliament. This is an important signpost in democratic development in the post-Soviet world. And, while some Kazakhs still small for an emerging middle-income country with 16 million people. But of course, every such user has family, friends, and business associates. In emerging democracies, as in Poland in the 1980s, information can spread quickly. As well, Kazakhstan now has a number of independent service providers less amenable to direct government control.

The government has tried to block access to critical news sources at home and abroad. Such efforts, however, are generally doomed to failure. Unless one good im-
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in an interesting 2001 report. As well, President Nazarbaev, stung by international criticism of his efforts to regulate speech, has rescinded a number of the 1998–2000 decrees.

This shows that immutable economic or social forces will bring about a full Kazakh democracy no matter what the authorities do. Countries like China, for example, have neither a free press nor internet access and a large middle class—but still no elections, and no substantial opposition parties.

In Kazakhstan, however, the Internet and other information sources act in combination with independent parties, muddy elections—but elections nevertheless—and what should be sturdy opposition has been muted, and the government has moved gradually (tortuously gradually; perhaps) towards more free; not less, since the country achieved independence.

The election itself raised several problems. For example, a Monday item in The New York Times, “Intimidation Alleged in Vote in Kazakhstan,” starts with a quote harshly condemning the elections from Dos Kusshy who is described as “the director of the Network of Independent Monitors,” which placed observers around the country.

This caught the attention of at least one seasoned Kazakh who sent me a number of pre-election clips referring to approximately accredited election observers in the country—total, from all outside groups. How could one fellow, running an organization never mentioned before, have 2,000 observers?

It turns out that Dos Kusshy is an opposition figure and whatever 2,000 “observers” he fielded, few were accredited. This doesn’t mean their opinions should be dismissed. But neither should his complaints be taken at face value, still less as coming from a wholly disinterested group.

Most Western press quoted only Kazakh officials defending the election or putting it in context. In other words, they presented criticism from independent sources, and praise only from the government, whose motives are likely to be questioned by any skeptical reader. What they didn’t do was refer to the numerous independent observers, some cited above, who said that on balance, the election didn’t meet Western standards—but was an improvement.

The government also used voting machines, which are, indeed, a problem—especially given that the computers Kazakhstan deployed, like some of those coming into use in a number of U.S. states, left no “paper trail.” “This is not a best practice. One can sympathize, however, with the government’s decision to go with expensive, high-tech systems from the West, thinking this would buy some credibility.

The United States—which in contrast to Kazakhstan is allowing a total of 20 (that’s right, 20) independent observers for its 2004 vote—should be a little reticent about raising this complaint.

Still less should U.S. policy aim at punishing the country with economic aid restrictions and sanctions, as some in Congress have proposed.

Unlike other countries in what one observer has called “the suez belt,” Kazakhstan doesn’t need piles of aid (Turkey, Afghanistan, Iraq) to hold votes or stay on the democratic path. It hasn’t built or tried to build nuclear weapons (Pakistan, India, China). It seems, knock on wood, to be moving its way back into society.

This is said not to criticize the other countries mentioned, but to point out that the Kazaks are building democracy quietly and by tugging their own bootstraps, and without evident imperial ambitions or terrorist-nationalist remnants.

Kazakhstan is an important potential ally to the United States, Russia, and its neighbors in the “war on terror.” It’s also a potential bulwark for the fainely democratic tide among countries with large (about 45 percent) Muslim populations. There is a prospect of a ring of democracies on the borders of China and Iran, the better to raise the heat on those undemocratic states. Large Muslim-population states—Turkey, Indonesia, the Philippines, Mongolia, and potentially Iraq and Afghanistan—serve as examples and proof that Islam need not be anti-democratic.

Thus Kazakhstan is moving in a democratic direction—too slowly, but not going the wrong way. The right response for friends of democracy is to offer encouragement. If matters reverse, it’s time for some mild sticks. Working slowly by contrast, should bring soft applause and some small carrots.
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Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Richard Steinel, Jr., for more than 30 years of outstanding public service on the police force. He is being honored today, October 8, 2004, at a retirement party in Union City, New Jersey.

Chief Steinel began his career in 1974 as a patrolman in the Union City Police Department where he worked with the Safe and Clean Neighborhood Program. He later spent time working for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey before returning to Union City and advancing through the ranks of Sergeant, Lieutenant, and, in 1992, Captain of Police. After years of quality service as a Captain, he was promoted to Deputy Chief of Police, a position he held for the rest of his time on the force.

Earning the respect and admiration of his colleagues for his reputation for fairness, Chief Steinel was especially successful in matters concerning domestic violence enforcement and education. In addition to his police service, he was a guest lecturer at universities and was a member of the State Attorney General’s Criminal Justice Training Staff. An accomplished law enforcement officer, Chief Steinel was the first person from Union City to attend the FBI National Academy in 40 years.

Continuing a long-standing family tradition of police work, Chief Steinel joined his great-grandfather, grandfather, father (Captain Richard J. Steinel, Sr.), and uncle in their proud service to the community.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Chief Richard Steinel, Jr., for his years of dedicated public service. His strong leadership and commitment to improving law enforcement and safety has benefited the lives of the police force and the citizens of New Jersey.

TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN K. GOYA ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AFTER 31 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
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Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Stephen K. Goya for his 31 years of dedicated service with the California Department of Corrections, Parole and Community Services. Mr. Goya is an example of the hard work and a commitment to excellence shown by California’s Corrections Officers. He will be honored by the Department of Corrections on October 29, 2004 in the city of Brea, California.

Stephen K. Goya began his career as a Parole Agent I with the Department of Corrections on October 10, 1977. Prior to that, he worked as a Probation Officer for the Orange County Probation Department. He was promoted to Parole Agent II/Supervisor in January 1983. He then further advanced his career with the Department of Corrections to become Parole Agent III Unit Supervisor in October 1985 and in 1987, he was promoted to Parole Administrator I. In December 1992, Mr. Goya was once again promoted to Parole Administrator II Level. In that classification, Mr. Goya functioned as the Operations Manager for the Parole Division in Sacramento as well as the Deputy Regional Administrator in Region IV Headquarters. Mr. Goya’s current classification is that of Regional Parole Administrator over Region IV. Mr. Goya was promoted to Regional Parole Administrator CEA III Level on January 20, 1998. Region IV is comprised of five different counties (Orange, San Diego, Imperial, San Bernardino, Riverside), 51 field units, 21 office locations and over 742 parole staff.

We rely upon our Corrections, Parole and Community Services Officers to keep our community safe and monitor those who are making their way back into society. Stephen K. Goya has worked tirelessly for over three decades to lead these Officers in their mission. His efforts have improved life in Southern California. Stephen K. Goya has earned my many thanks and I wish him great success in all his future endeavors.
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Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the San Fernando Valley (SFV) Sun, an important local newspaper in my congressional district.

On October 25, 2004, the Sun will celebrate its 100th anniversary. The Press—precursor to the Sun—was the San Fernando Valley’s first newspaper and is the oldest continuously published newspaper in the Valley. Throughout its history, the publishers have been committed to serving the local needs of its readers and vertisers.

This is not a best practice. One can sympathize, however, with the government’s decision to go with expensive, high-tech systems from the West, thinking this would buy some credibility.

The United States—which in contrast to Kazakhstan is allowing a total of 20 (that’s right, 20) independent observers for its 2004 vote—should be a little reticent about raising this complaint.

Still less should U.S. policy aim at punishing the country with economic aid restrictions and sanctions, as some in Congress have proposed.

Unlike other countries in what one observer has called “the suez belt,” Kazakhstan doesn’t need piles of aid (Turkey, Afghanistan, Iraq) to hold votes or stay on the democratic path. It hasn’t built or tried to build nuclear weapons (Pakistan, India, China). It seems, knock on wood, to be moving its way back into society—opposed to Iran, Saudi Arabia, and others.

This is said not to criticize the other countries mentioned, but to point out that the Kazaks are building democracy quietly and by tugging their own bootstraps, and without evident imperial ambitions or terrorist-nationalist remnants.