

card and dice games, watching nightly films or reading books. Those with more religious ties spent time in the ship's Protestant, Catholic or Jewish chapels. Daily lifeboat and abandon ship drills also made the monotony more bearable, and some units occupied their time with training lectures and exercise. Eating and sleeping schedules were rotated in order to accommodate the troops. The elegant First-Class Dining Room became a 24-hour mess hall.

The Grey Ghost also served as a means of transporting prisoners, patients and "very important passengers." Her most notable wartime passenger was British Prime Minister Winston Churchill. Churchill and his entourage of government officials were housed in staterooms outfitted with the trademark Cunard luxuries. Instead of having to stomach such wartime staples as chipped beef on toast, Churchill and his staff savored such specialties as macaroni Bolognese, Navarin of Lamb and Corn Ox Tongue. Cigars and dinner mints, displayed on silver trays bearing Churchill's family coat of arms, were passed butler-style for all to enjoy. Despite the indulgence, Churchill and his staff maintained a grueling schedule aboard. Plans were orchestrated for an allied invasion; aerial offensives against Hitler were worked through, and many other strategies were in place before the ship reached its destination.

THE END OF THE WAR

On May 7, 1945, Nazi Germany surrendered ending the Second World War in Europe and in August, Japan would be forced to do the same. Almost immediately, The Grey Ghost began transporting American soldiers home. As the ship approached New York Harbor, troops swarmed the upper decks to get their first glimpse of the Statue of Liberty. Within two months, the troopship had returned more than 31,000 American soldiers to their native land, and the numbers would increase dramatically as similar voyages were made.

The ship's final tour of duty was one of her most pleasant, "Operation Diaper" was announced in January 1946, and more than 66,000 women and children were to be transported to their new homes in America and Canada. Before she could begin her "Bride and Baby" voyages, the ship had to be demilitarized in order to comfortably accommodate the women and children. Each of the staterooms was equipped with six comfortable beds—compared to the 12 to 16 standing room bunks occupied by the troops. Additional cabins, which would house expectant mothers, were installed with call bells connected to the ship's hospital. The functional mess halls—designed to move the troops in and out—were restored to relaxing dining areas complete with starched linens, china, crystal and silverware. The ocean liner was also given a clean sweep from stem to stern as engines, boilers and steering equipment were examined. Although her exterior was still painted a dull gray, the ship took on an air of elegance as she prepared for yet another historic voyage.

In February of 1946, the Queen Mary joined the "Bride and Baby" fleet and traveled from Southampton to New York in just five days. The war brides enjoyed an array of lectures, classes and social gatherings such as cooking and sewing classes; English language lessons; afternoon teas; bingo games and dancing lessons. The Queen Mary traveled more than 31,000 miles and transported more than 12,000 war brides and their children to America before embarking on several "Bride and Baby" voyages to Canada. Overall, the Queen Mary safely transported nearly 25 percent of all service dependents brought from Europe following the end of the war.

THE LEGEND

After transporting more than 800,000 troops, traveling 600,000 miles and playing a major role in virtually every Allied campaign, the Queen Mary retired from her 79-month military career. In the course of her duties, the Queen Mary had become a shipping pioneer. She was the first to carry 10,000 people at one time, the first to transport an entire American military division in a single crossing, and the first and only ship to ever carry 16,500 persons on a single voyage. The Queen Mary was constantly hunted by the enemy, but was never attacked. She never had to fire her guns in anger and never lost a single passenger to enemy action.

FLEXIBILITY FOR SCHOOLS TO MEET THE DIETARY GUIDELINES

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1995

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress enacted changes to the National School Lunch Program and required schools to meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and breakfast programs.

Schools were allowed to use nutrient-based menu planning, assisted nutrient-based menu planning or a food-based menu system—which was the only method of menu planning used under prior law—as long as they met the dietary guidelines.

On Tuesday, June 13, 1995, the Department of Education published their final regulation on the School Meal Initiatives for Healthy Americans.

Schools throughout the Nation are concerned about the implementation of these final regulations. Of special concern are changes to the food-based menu system which will add from 10 cents to 17 cents to the cost of school meals. The reason for the increased cost is the requirement to add additional servings of grains, bread, and fruits and vegetables. Even schools currently meeting the dietary guidelines under the previous food-based menu plan would have to enact such changes. Estimates are that this will add \$550 million per year to school costs—just for food. The alternative would be to use the nutrient standard menu plan, which would require schools to make a significant investment in computer hardware and require extensive training and technical assistance to implement the new software and procedures associated with this plan.

The legislation introduced today, will continue to require schools to meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans. However, it will permit schools to use any reasonable approach to meet the dietary guidelines, including nutrient-based menu planning, assisted nutrient-based menu planning or a food-based menu system contained in the regulations issued by the Department. This legislation will neither negate or postpone the requirement that schools implement the Dietary Guidelines for Americans as currently required by law.

This is sound policy and reflects my support for providing students with healthy meals which both meet the dietary guidelines and which provide schools broad flexibility in designing menus which appeal to students.

ELECTIONS IN ARMENIA—REPORT OF OBSERVERS

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1995

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the Republic of Armenia held national elections. The country's citizens were called to the polls to decide both who would serve in their National Assembly and whether they would adopt a new constitution.

Because this was Armenia's first post-Soviet election for these purposes—a president was democratically-elected in 1991—there was widespread international interest. Additionally, controversy occurred in electoral preliminaries that prompted a widespread wish that the process be internationally monitored.

At the request of the Armenian Embassy, I was invited to join as an observer. Although commitments in my own schedule precluded personal participation, two members of my senior staff agreed to my request that they take part.

My decision to be so represented in the Armenian electoral process had a particular basis in my constituency. California's San Joaquin Valley, and especially the community of Fresno, much of which I represent, is the home of many American citizens whose forebears came to this land from Armenia. Thus, the term, "diaspora," is heard to define the settlement of Armenians in the 19th Congressional District and other parts of America.

The report prepared by my staff members, Mr. Speaker, I believe is worth of being examined by our colleagues, and I ask that it be entered in the Congressional Record accordingly. In doing so, I also want to add my appreciation to the individuals and institutions that their report notes afforded assistance in conducting their mission.

Finally, I wish to offer special thanks to the Lincy Foundation for covering the costs of travel and lodging for my staff members. By doing so, as is permitted by House ethics rules, the Foundation made it possible for an important international undertaking to go forward without its having to be a burden on the public purse.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESSMAN

(By Will Dwyer II, Counsel and Steve Samuelian, District Director)

INTRODUCTION

The maxim that the past is prologue certainly helps an understanding of modern Armenia.

More than two millennia ago, the then kingdom of Armenia controlled an empire that stretched from the Mediterranean to the Caucasus. But, it fell first under the Byzantine Empire, followed by the Muslim Turks, then the Mongols, the Ottomans, and the Soviets.

Subordination to and maltreatment by foreign powers produced an intense national sensibility. Indeed, the Armenian-American author, playwright, and novelist William Saroyan (born in Fresno in 1908) captured that consciousness in perhaps his most famous quotation about his ancestors, "When two of them meet anywhere in the world, see if they will not create a new Armenia."

In this century, Armenia and her people have been put to tortured tests. An estimated 1,750,000 Armenians were massacred or deported by the Turks in and around 1915.

With the fall of the Ottoman Empire, Armenia was briefly independent from 1918 until it was occupied by the Red Army in 1920, ultimately being incorporated into the USSR in 1936.

The so-called "glasnost" or openness policy that was adopted by the Soviet Union in the mid-1980s saw Armenian national identity reawakened. A declaration of independence was made in August 1990 but it was ignored by Moscow.

Armenia boycotted the March 1991 USSR referendum on the preservation of the Soviet Union, and held its own referendum in September 1991. After 94% of the Armenian people voted for secession from the USSR, independence was formally proclaimed.

By March 1992, Armenia had joined the new Commonwealth of Independent States, been accorded diplomatic recognition by the USA, been admitted into the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), and become a member of the United Nations.

What democracy has added to Armenia, two neighboring countries and nature, itself, have been busy subtracting.

Energy supplies and raw materials do not flow readily into Armenia because its traditional foe Turkey imposes a border blockade on the west as does Azerbaijan on the east. Those embargoes aggravate the national need to rebuild from an earthquake that hit Armenia on December 7, 1988, destroying 48 villages, and leaving 25,000 people dead and more than half a million homeless.

The Armenian conflict with Azerbaijan is rooted in many centuries of Christian Armenian and Shiite Muslim Azeri enmity over Nagorno-Karabakh, an autonomous region in southwestern Azerbaijan. Eighty percent of the enclave's total population of 193,000 are ethnic Armenians.

Since 1988, Nagorno-Karabakh has been in rebellion against the Republic of Azerbaijan. The conflict has claimed more than 15,000 lives and left an estimated 1 million people homeless. In 1994, Azerbaijan allowed Russian troops into its territory to help bring an end to the fighting.

THE ELECTION

Against this backdrop of history, culture, and economic tribulation, the adult (18 and older) members of the 3.6 million Armenian population, a third of whom live in the ancient capital city of Yerevan, were called to the 1,590 polling places of this landlocked, Maryland-sized country on July 5, 1995. (The official number of eligible voters was stated to be 2,189,804.)

Voters made their decisions on three ballots:

1. A referendum ballot regarding adoption or rejection of the Constitution (adoption requires a simple majority as long as the votes in favor equal at least one-third of all listed voters).

2. A candidate ballot on the "majoritarian" system providing for the election on 150 National Assembly Deputies (one candidate is elected in each district provided he or she receives a majority of the votes cast in the district and the total votes received is at least 25 percent of the total votes cast).

3. A bloc ballot for political public organization on the "proportional" system providing for the country-wide election of 40 additional National Assembly Deputies (votes are cast not for individuals but for a political party that has selected a list of candidates to fill any seats won by it, based on a percentage share of all votes cast as long as their bloc receives a minimum of five percent).

Post-election reports by the Armenian government relate that "an estimated 65 percent of the eligible voters cast ballots for

about 1,500 candidates who were campaigning for 150 majoritarian seats of the 190-seat parliament." Preliminary figures indicate the pro-government Hanrapetutium (Republic) bloc gained "a clear majority" of the parliamentary seats. The same reports also say that the Constitution was favored by 68 percent of the voters, assuring its adoption.

The fairness and freeness of Armenia's election are likely to be debate sources for some time to come. There is little doubt that during the run-up to Election Day, the banning of a leading opposition party, closing of the newspapers, the disqualification of several of the opposition parties, and other deprivations of human rights raised serious questions about fair play.

In addition, we share a concern that even if the government has evidence of wrongdoing on the part of several Dashnak party leaders (as the government claims) that may not be sufficient justification for banning the entire party from participation in elections. It certainly is not justification for the closing of several newspapers, many of which were not even Dashnak, but the newspapers of other opposition parties that are not included in the government's allegations. It also needs noting that one of the newspapers closed is the undisputed leading newspaper in the Republic of Armenia with the most circulation and readers.

Where one observed actual balloting played a part in judging how well or poorly the system functioned. At some of the precincts we monitored, voting seemed to proceed smoothly. At others, objections were heard over procedural shortcomings in polling place practices. For example, Steve was witness to posters on the doors of several polling stations urging a "yes" vote on the government supported constitution.

We believe that general unfamiliarity with conducting elections contributed to difficulties of a mechanical kind. We also are of the view that lack of training and organization contributed to the election-day problems.

We share the concern issued by the U.S. State Department on January 18 about the pre-election closing of newspapers and banning of parties. Furthermore, we share the concern that many international organizations have expressed that the jailed opposition party leaders have been held for over six months without any evidence being brought forth by the government. As well, the fact that the prisoners have not been allowed visits by their lawyers or family members is a cause for concern. These actions do not seem to accord with democratic principles of due process.

Let it also be said that we recognize that Armenia is a young nation and that its current government faces difficult circumstances that include two unjust blockades and an economy that has been burdened for over seventy years with socialist policies. In addition, the tradition of closed elections in Armenia makes it difficult for the Armenian government to immediately and instantly make Armenia a Western U.S.-style democracy. The government has made some notable progress on economic reforms towards private property ownership and a market economy; it deserves recognition for these achievements.

Our observer work leads both of us to endorse, without reservation or condition, the content of the two-page press release issued by the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly delegation in the wake of the election. We also are aware that many of the monitors with whom the two of us collaborated during our Armenian activity also accept this statement as constituting an objective evaluation worthy of broad appropriation. To that end, we incorporate it in our report hereat:

[Press Release 6-7-95]

OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS IN ARMENIA

A delegation of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly monitored the parliamentary elections in Armenia on 5 July 1995 at the invitation of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Armenia. The Delegation, which was led by Annette Just, Member of the Parliament of Denmark, included 13 parliamentarians from eight countries and four members from the International Secretariat. Countries represented in the delegation include: the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, the Netherlands, Romania and Sweden.

During their visit to Armenia, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly delegation met with representatives from registered and unregistered political parties, the mass media, the Chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, the President of the Supreme Council, the President of Armenia, the Chairman of the Supreme Court, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, members of national minority groups, and non-governmental organizations.

On election day, members of the Delegation visited 15 administrative regions of Armenia, including Yerevan, and 60 polling stations, including their opening and closings.

The Delegation congratulates the government of Armenia for holding its first multi-party elections and recognizes this effort as a first and vital step towards democratic development. The Delegation also strongly encourages the citizenry of Armenia to participate in any subsequent rounds of voting that may be necessary to seat the new Parliament. In order for Armenia to take further steps in the democratization process, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly delegation believes it is vital for the population of the republic to continue to participate fully and peacefully in all aspects of the electoral process. If election results or procedures are disputed, they must be protested through the appropriate legal channels and exhausted in the appeals process.

It is the opinion of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly delegation that a lack of democratic traditions (both in governmental bodies and in the politically active population) in Armenia may have caused some difficulties in the electoral process in the republic. However, these were not determined to be the sole reason for all of the problems which were observed. The delegation considers that the elections, while generally well run in terms of procedures on the day of the elections, were also seriously marred by other pre-election conditions. Therefore, the delegation believes that the elections may only be considered by international standards as generally free but not fair.

The government is to be commended for allowing large numbers of domestic monitors to be an integral part of the election process. Inviting international monitors to observe elections is also an important step in opening up the electoral process. The following areas were highlighted as significant problems by Delegation members calling into question the fairness of the overall process (particularly in the pre-election period):

- (1) *Level Playing Field*—(a) A six-month ban on the activities of an entire political party (as opposed to individuals accused of crimes) resulted in the removal of a major opposition voice from the elections process.

- (b) A significant number of accusations of violence and intimidation against independent candidates (to encourage their withdrawal from the election) were heard by the delegation from a sufficient number of sources to raise reasonable speculation that such instances occurred.

(2) *Election Law and Implementation*—(a) The system to resolve complaints and grievances within the time required was insufficient to address the large number of appeals that were made. This potentially precluded some candidates from participating in the elections.

(3) *Election Management & Conduct*—(a) A lack of standardized procedures and training of local polling station workers resulted in disparities in conditions between polling sites. Although this may not have been intentional on the part of authorities, it belied the fact that apparently no effort was made to educate officials on correct procedures for democratic elections.

(b) Voter lists appeared to be grossly outdated and included large numbers of voters who no longer reside in those districts.

(4) *Voter Information, Media Access & Coverage*—(a) Although technical problems and a lack of media sources exist in Armenia, insufficient press coverage resulted in significantly large numbers of voters not knowing anything about candidates, platforms, or referendum issues.

(b) The heavy involvement of the executive branch of government, through the broadcasting and distribution of biased information to voters and displayed at polling sites, greatly overshadowed opposition points on view regarding the referendum and the campaign.

The Delegation wishes to note that although procedural and technical violations were witnessed in some polling stations, this generally appeared to be due to poor organization by local officials. Proper procedures at polling stations were observed to be more the rule than the exception. Adherence to the one-man one-vote principle was generally observed, as was the sanctity of the secret ballot. The Delegation also wishes to emphasize that a multiple number of parties and points of view were represented in the election and there appeared to be a definite choice between candidates. This combination of circumstances allowed for generally free election activity on July 5. Pre-election flaws, however, marred overall election fairness.

Although the conduct of the elections and referendum in Armenia was not perfect, the Delegation urges the Armenian population to continue to strive for the republic's future democratic development through continued high turnouts in subsequent run-off elections.

The Delegation will immediately send its initial findings to the Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, currently meeting in Ottawa, Canada, and will present its final report to the subsequent Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in Stockholm, Sweden, scheduled for July 2-6, 1996.

Further information can be obtained from Mr. Eric Rudenshiold, Program Director of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly: Raadhusstraede 1, 1466-Copenhagen K, Tel +45 3332 9400, Fax +45 3332 5505

Congressman, it was an honor to represent you and your constituent interest in officially observing the recent Armenian elections. Thank you for permitting us the opportunity.

In closing, we add our appreciation to:

The Lincy Foundation for its generosity in making our mission possible without cost to American taxpayers, especially Jim Aljian for handling details superbly.

The Armenian Assembly of America, especially Tim Jemal of its Washington office and Edith Khachatourian and her staff in Yerevan for visit logistics.

The Armenia National Committee of America, especially Chris Hekimian, its Governmental Affairs Director, for so helpfully preparing us with information.

The Embassy of the Republic of Armenia, especially Ambassador Rouben Shugarian and First Secretary Tigran Martirosian for visa and related help.

The Armenian Technology Group (ATG), especially Executive Director Varoujan Der Simonian of Fresno and Chairman Dr. Arthur O. Hazarabedian of Lafayette, California for effective examples of assistance.

The American Embassy in Yerevan, especially Ambassador Harry J. Gilmore, Deputy Chief of Mission Ted Nist, and USAID Representative (Caucasus Regional Office) Fred E. Winch for hospitality and briefings.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would restrict the Corps from using funds appropriated under this bill to study the capacity needs of the Mississippi River above Lock and Dam 14 in the vicinity of Moline, IL, and Bettendorf, IA. The amendment explicitly protects the Corps' environmental baseline studies required to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.

The Gunderson amendment is necessary because the resources required to improve the lock and dam system will be available only for those locks and dams that are insufficient to handle increasing commercial barge traffic. For that reason, we must limit the resources appropriated under this bill to those locks where navigation improvements are most needed.

The Upper Mississippi River System is extremely rare among large rivers. It is a vital navigation channel and its five refuges provide vital habitats for fish and waterfowl of all types. Recreation on the upper river yields \$1.2 billion annually in economic benefits. For these reasons, Congress has recognized the Upper Mississippi as a dual-purpose waterway: a nationally significant ecosystem and a significant commercial navigation system.

Congress authorized the current 9 foot navigation channel and system of locks and dams in 1930. The system has flourished ever since, and today the Upper Mississippi System includes 37 locks and dams and over 360 terminals. The navigation system carries a large portion of this Nation's coal and corn—over half the corn exported from this country is shipped via the Upper Mississippi River by barge.

Gradual increases in commercial barge traffic, especially in the last 30 years, have strained the lock and dam system on the lower portion of the Upper Mississippi River. Cargo transported on the Upper Mississippi has increased from about 27 million tons in 1960 to 91 million tons in 1990—about a 340-percent increase. Because many of the locks were designed to handle only a fraction of this traffic, backlogs on the lower locks have

formed. Much of this is due to the confluence of several large rivers below Lock and Dam 20—the Missouri River, the Illinois Waterway, and the Upper Mississippi.

Evidence of the delays on the lower locks has begun to mount. In a November 1994 newspaper article, the Corps indicated that there is a bottleneck at four or five locks just above St. Louis. Barges delayed because of heavy traffic cost consumers, farmers and businesses a great deal of money. In 1992, tows at the Upper Mississippi River locks 20 through 25 were delayed a total of 87,000 hours at a cost of \$35 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Corps began the Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway System Navigation Study in 1993 to assess the need for expansion at all 37 locks in the system. In addition, the study is designed to determine the potential impacts on the river, navigation, the economy and the environment and to prioritize infrastructure improvements over a 50-year time frame. Although I agree with the need to assess the needs for additional investment on a system-wide basis, Mr. Chairman, the fiscal realities are that no significant lock and dam improvements will be done above Lock and Dam 14. In fact, the Corps itself does not foresee any major improvement projects in that area before the year 2050.

At a time when the Congress is trying to balance the budget in 7 years, we must insist that the money we do allocate is used efficiently. Locks 1 through 14 on the Upper Mississippi have the lowest proportion of traffic, so substantial navigation improvements are not a high priority in that area. My amendment would recognize this need by restricting the Corps' navigation study to the lock and dam system below Lock and Dam 14 near Moline, Illinois. However, the amendment specifically allows the Corps to fulfill its responsibilities for conducting baseline environmental studies under the National Environmental Policy Act, and for determining the economic impacts of projects on the lower portion, if such impacts can reasonably be foreseen above Lock and Dam 14.

Substantial improvements on the first 14 locks on the Upper Mississippi River will not be funded in the next 50 years because the Inland Waterway Trust Fund does not have sufficient funds to pay for such improvements. Improvements on the inland navigation system, including on the Mississippi River, are funded 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the inland Waterway Trust Fund. The commercial navigation industry supports the trust fund through a fuel tax.

Assuming a current rate of increase, the trust fund will not even be able to support major improvements to the most heavily congested locks on the upper river, let alone locks 1 through 14. In fiscal year 1994, the trust fund had a net increase—receipts minus appropriations—of \$21 million; in fiscal year 1995, the trust fund had a net increase of \$43 million. Assuming a net increase of \$50 million a year, and not considering other construction projects undertaken by the Corps—for example, Ohio River improvements, by the year 2025, the Inland Waterway Trust Fund would only contain approximately \$1.8 billion. The cost of building a new lock, by Corps estimates, is \$350 million. Given that, construction of six new 1200 foot locks in the most congested areas of the river would cost as much as \$2.1 billion in fiscal year 1995). The trust