

HONORING DR. JAMES GLOVER  
SITES

**HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 20, 1995*

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor a man who has given so much for his community, Dr. James Glover Sites. Dr. Sites was born in Gladstone, VA, attended Appomattox High School, American University, and earned an M.D. from the George Washington University in 1947.

He has been a practicing physician in many Washington area hospitals including Gallinger Hospital, D.C. General, and the George Washington University Hospital. He has authored and coauthored over 38 papers covering gynecology and obstetrics, been instructor, assistant professor, and later as chairman of obstetrics and gynecology at Fairfax Hospital.

While chairman, he oversaw the growth of their OB-GYN department: from 3,000 deliveries in 1977 to over 9,000 deliveries in 1994. His vision took the department into the development of subspecialties such as perinatology, endocrinology, infertility, and gynecological-oncology.

Perhaps his greatest contributions, however, was presiding over the construction and opening of the Women's and Children's Center at Fairfax Hospital, combining total care for women, infants, and small children. This combined facility is one of the premier facilities of its type, in the country.

On Sunday, January 20, 1995, many of Dr. Sites' friends and colleagues are joining with him to celebrate his many accomplishments and honor him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. James Glover Sites for his many contributions to the families of northern Virginia, and for future beneficiaries of his handiwork.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES W. "BILL"  
DINN—THE 1995 GRAND MAR-  
SHALL HOLYOKE ST. PATRICK'S  
DAY PARADE

**HON. JOHN W. OLVER**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 20, 1995*

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Charles W. "Bill" Dinn of Holyoke, MA on being named the 1995 Grand Marshall of the Holyoke St. Patrick's Day Parade.

Mr. Dinn and his wife Patricia have been married for over 30 years. They have five children, Carol, Kathleen, Paul, William, and Michael.

He is a graduate of the Holyoke public schools and is a recent inductee to the Holyoke High School Hall of Fame.

Mr. Dinn is a well respected member of the community and successful businessman. Bill and his brother Paul started Dinn Brother Trophies in 1956 and have led it to become a major retailer of awards both locally and internationally.

Bill is a veteran of the U.S. Army and is a reserve police officer. He is a member of the

Elks, trustee of Peoples Bank, and has been honored by Jericho with a Humanitarian Award.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday the 20th of January a reception will be held in honor of Mr. Dinn and I would ask that my colleagues join me in saluting, Mr. Charles W. "Bill" Dinn as the 1995 Grand Marshall of the Holyoke St. Patrick's Day Parade.

**CONSEQUENCES IN SENTENCING  
FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT**

**HON. RON WYDEN**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 20, 1995*

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, in searching for a strong, practical strategy for reducing crime, both Democrats and Republicans have given short shrift to the growing problem of violent crime perpetrated by juveniles.

The growth rate of violent crime committed by juveniles now exceeds that of adults. For example, in my home State of Oregon on May 24, 1994, The Oregonian reported that "adult crime statistics have flattened out, but the number of violent juvenile crimes increased by 80 percent between 1988 and 1992."

Nationally, according to a 1994 Department of Justice report, youth arrests for murder increased 85 percent, while adult arrests only increased 21 percent between 1987 and 1991. More generally, the violent crime index for juveniles increased 50 percent over the same period, while the adult violent crime index only increased 25 percent.

Despite the dramatic increase in violent crimes by juveniles, both the 1994 crime bill and the crime provisions in the Republican Contract With America are business as usual with respect to juvenile crime.

The 1994 crime bill allocates \$7.9 billion for correctional facilities and a relatively paltry \$150 million for alternative juvenile correctional facilities. The Republican Taking Back Our Streets Act contains nine law enforcement titles but doesn't once address the issue of violent juvenile crime.

To their credit, the Clinton administration is trying to fill the gaps in the 1994 crime bill provisions. Despite controversy, they have interpreted the Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth in Sentencing Act to be applicable to juveniles. However, the clear thrust of the violent offender provisions in the 1994 crime bill is to reform the adult system and guarantee that our communities are safe from violent adult offenders. In fact, the bigger law enforcement challenge for our country is to reduce juvenile crime.

My legislation, the Consequences in Sentencing for Young Offenders Act, pursues a fresh strategy against juvenile crime and sends a straight-forward message: young people who commit a crime will face real consequences for each criminal act and those consequences will increase each time they commit an additional offense.

At present, juvenile criminals face few if any consequences. For the first offense—and often many thereafter—there is likely to be probation at best. A bit of history is in order.

At the turn of the century, States began to separate the juvenile system from the adult system because of a belief that children who committed crimes could be rehabilitated. The

States introduced the concept of *parens patriae* or a system that might act in the interests of the child. By 1925, all but two States had juvenile courts separate from adult courts. As long as this system was dealing with kids who used bad language and shoplifted, the system got by.

In the 1960's and 1970's, with escalating rates of juvenile crime, new standards for juvenile justice were developed with an emphasis on placing juveniles in the least restrictive situation and on counselling instead of punishment. This system was based on a medical model approach grounded in the theory that young people could be cured of their criminal habits. However, little convincing evidence has emerged to show that programs based on the idea of rehabilitation have been effective in reducing recidivism and in protecting our communities.

In reality, the understandable anger Americans direct at the juvenile justice system stems from the fact that the medical model has often ended up putting our communities at serious risk from young offenders.

Several cases from Portland, OR illustrate what is wrong with the medical model: In 1993, 9 months after being convicted of raping a 4-year-old and facing absolutely no penalty for this crime, a 15-year-old youth and another juvenile who also had a record of violent crime and had faced few penalties, assaulted an Oregonian who was left permanently brain-damaged by the attack. In another case, described in The Oregonian, a child committed 50 crimes, 32 of which were felonies, before the juvenile justice system took action to protect the community.

Nationally, only 50 percent of juvenile cases even go to juvenile court. Most cases are handled by some form of social services division. The majority of juveniles who do go to court are given probation. Incredibly, there is little follow up: many jurisdictions do not collect data on what happens to youths referred to the local juvenile services division.

In Portland, until recently it was common practice for a juvenile to commit three crimes before being referred to juvenile court. When an offender was diverted from court they were required to sign a contract specifying what they would do to help themselves change their ways. This contract included such basic elements as attending drug or alcohol counselling programs, community service or restitution, or participating in a Big Brother/Big Sister Program.

An audit of this system found that only 40 percent of the juveniles ever completed their contracts. Ten percent partially completed them, and the other 50 percent just slipped through the cracks. The major reasons for nonparticipation given were that the families were not responsive, or they just refused to participate.

This system in Oregon was actually profiled in 1990 as being a model for the Nation by the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention!

According to New York Magazine, the situation in the Empire State is far worse. Thirty thousand juveniles picked up for misdemeanors in 1993 were issued youth division cards and then released—essentially the paperwork was filed and the child walked out.

The Consequences in Sentencing Act that I introduce today seeks to address the glaring

shortcomings in juvenile justice by giving incentives to States to adopt a new philosophy of juvenile justice—one built on a system of meaningful sanctions that increase with each juvenile offense.

This concept has been endorsed by the likes of James Q. Wilson from the University of California at Los Angeles who states that "the juvenile courts ought to manage the young people brought before them by a system of consistent, graduated sanctions that attach costs to every offense, beginning with the first." Dr. Wilson has been good enough to counsel me with respect to the legislation I offer today, and I would like to thank him for his suggestions and years of outstanding scholarship.

Additionally, I have worked closely with Oregon's attorney general, Ted Kulongoski who chairs the National Attorney General's Association task force on juvenile justice, and prosecutors, judges, law enforcement, and juvenile services directors both in Oregon and across the country. I would especially like to commend and thank Attorney General Kulongoski, Portland district attorney Michael Schrunck, Bend juvenile services director Dennis Maloney, Judge Stephen Herrell, and Portland Police Chief Charles Moose for their commitment to juvenile reform and their assistance in drafting this legislation.

Under the first part of my bill, I would amend the 1994 crime bill to give States with a system of graduated sanctions preference in receiving discretionary grants under the violent offender incarceration provisions. Additionally, these States would be able to access unused truth-in-sentencing funds for juvenile correctional facilities. The second part of the bill allows States with graduated sanctions the option to use any future funds allocated for adult correctional facilities for juvenile facilities.

This approach gives States willing to put new accountability in their juvenile justice systems the opportunity to secure additional Federal resources. States are given considerable flexibility as to how they devise their own systems, but must show that they have adopted a system of meaningful graduated sanctions with the following characteristics:

First, every offense carries a sanction of at least reimbursing the victim for the crime and for the bureaucratic cost of dealing with the crime.

Second, juveniles will move up a scale of increasingly severe sanctions if they break probation or commit a repeat offense.

Third, violent juveniles should be efficiently remanded to adult court.

Fourth, all juveniles who enter the juvenile justice system should answer to the court.

Fifth, to the extent practicable, parents should be held responsible for their child's conduct.

Sixth, the juvenile system should be periodically audited for its effectiveness in protecting the community safety, reducing recidivism and ensuring compliance with sanctions.

For the most part, there is a consensus among judges, prosecutors, police and people working in youth services, that any new philosophy of juvenile justice should place emphasis on community safety, individual accountability, work, restitution to victims and community, parental involvement and responsibility, certainty and consistency of response and sanctions, zero-tolerance for noncompliance and the highest priority given to community safety.

My sense is that some States are beginning to integrate these objectives in their juvenile justice systems—the Federal Government needs to provide States with the incentives and resources to continue in this direction. Incentives and resources for these purposes is what my bill is about, and I hope others will join me and the police, prosecutors, judges and juvenile services directors in a national effort to rethink our juvenile justice systems' philosophy and priorities.

#### WHY WE NEED THE "NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT"

**HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1995

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend to my colleagues and all the citizens of our country the following testimony given yesterday to the House National Security Committee. Norm Augustine's comments are right on target regarding the direction we should be taking with defense spending.

STATEMENT BY NORMAN R. AUGUSTINE, CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, MARTIN MARIETTA CORP.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Norman Augustine, chairman and chief executive officer of the Martin Marietta Corporation. I appreciate the opportunity to present views on several critical defense issues related to legislation which this Committee is considering and which will directly impact the nation's ability to achieve both defense and budgetary objectives in the years ahead.

Today, I represent a consortium of 13 associations whose members comprise a broad cross section of companies and individuals with experience in many different aspects of America's defense needs. The organizations are the Aerospace Industries Association, the Air Force Association, the American Defense Preparedness Association, the American Electronics Association, the Association of Naval Aviation, the Association of the United States Army, the Association of Old Crows, the Contract Services Association, the Electronic Industries Association, the National Security Industrial Association, the Navy League of the U.S., the Professional Services Council, and the Security Affairs Support Association.

Needless to say, it is not possible to speak on behalf of so large and diverse a group of organizations on other than rather broad, generic issues. This I will do, but I can also tell you that there is in fact wide agreement among these organizations on the most critical issues relating to the National Security Revitalization Act. With regard to more specific matters, I will share with you views that I must characterize as my own. In this latter regard, I speak from the personal perspective of one who has spent a decade in five different assignments in the Pentagon serving under Presidents from both parties, and another 25 years in various defense-oriented companies in the private sector. Over the course of these assignments, I have seen enormous changes in the defense establishment—but nothing like the tectonic shifts we are facing today.

Having observed from both the private and public perspectives the way America funds, equips and fields its armed forces, I can say with some degree of authority that somehow it works. In the last decade alone, America's

defense apparatus helped stimulate the favorable conclusion of the Cold War, helped crush a well-equipped aggressor in the Persian Gulf, and contributed to America's reign today as the world's only "full-service" superpower. Indicative of this success, our military hardware is sought by virtually every nation in the world.

In short, America's defense establishment—its armed forces and the industry that underpins them—has served the people of the United States successfully and with distinction. This establishment is, in my judgment, well led today by both the civilian and military leadership in the Pentagon. Nonetheless, the very fact that we are here points to the fact that there are serious issues facing all of us, and if we fail to address these issues in a timely fashion, we will surely pay a price in terms of opportunities lost in the future. These issues generally focus on the adequacy of resources we devote to our military and to the manner in which we expend these resources.

Let me observe at the outset that in my opinion—and it is strictly my own opinion—this nation owes nothing to its defense contractors with regard to future business or prosperity. We as a nation can set forth a variety of alternative defense strategies that might require small, medium or large defense industrial bases to underpin them. The choice among these alternatives is a policy decision to be made by government leaders and not by industrial executives, and should be made on the basis of national objectives, the price we are willing to pay in meeting those objectives, and the degree of risk we are willing to accept in so doing.

But I do believe that once this choice has been made, it behooves our government to make certain that its policies affecting the defense industrial base are consistent with the national security objectives which have been established. To do otherwise is in fact to *maximize risk* . . . and brings us not the best but the *worst* of all possible worlds. And I further believe that, whatever may be our established set of national security objectives, we should maintain a *balance* of force structure, readiness and modernization.

Finally, I believe that we should view the capability of the defense industrial base much as we view the need to provide capable armed services. A nation cannot prevail, or at least not prevail without heavy casualties, in modern warfare without a strong defense industrial base. Such an industrial base, as I will discuss further, is not self-generating . . . it must be consciously nurtured.

There are two general points I would like to make this morning—the first relating to the private sector participants I represent and how they have been responding to the new realities of the post-Cold War defense environment. The second point has to do with the government's reaction to the same circumstances, both in Congress and in the Department of Defense.

Let me begin by briefly reviewing the events that have brought us to this committee room today. More than five years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, rapid and fundamental changes continue to ricochet throughout the world political order. Ironies abound: Consider, for example, that among the differences today between the United States and many of the former Warsaw Pact states is that the U.S. has a legal Communist party. Or that each of the recent times I have visited Moscow there were longer lines at McDonald's than at Lenin's tomb. Or that in one trip to what was then Leningrad, I met a very distraught politician who was exceptionally curious about the democratic political system. It turned out that he had just run for re-election unopposed—and lost. And a former Soviet state