

rights conditions that would promote a political solution to a war that has undermined Turkish democracy, boosted the power of the military, drained the economy and divided Turkey from its European allies. Placing such conditions on assistance would also reduce America's complicity in Turkey's repressive internal war." Administration representatives, many of my colleagues, and political leaders around the world are urging the Government of Turkey to pursue nonmilitary solutions to the Kurdish crisis because Turkey's purely military approach has failed to do anything but prolong the bloody, divisive and costly conflict. Mr. Speaker, I would also ask how the transfer of an advanced, destructive weapons system serves long-term United States interests in promoting nonmilitary solutions to Turkey's internal conflict?

Mr. Speaker, on December 24, national elections will be held in Turkey which will have far reaching implications for United States-Turkish relations and the course of democracy in Turkey. Most observers believe the Islamic-based Welfare Party is poised to win more votes than any other party and will play an important role in, if not lead, Turkey's post-election government. This anti-Western party has declared its intentions to reevaluate the foundations of Turkey's strategic and economic relationship with the United States. This raises the question of whether United States policy makers have thought about the consequences should Turkish voters bring the fundamentalists to power? If the Turkish military is to remain subordinated to civilian authorities, then should we not think twice about providing sophisticated weaponry to a regime whose leaders have stated their opposition to United States interests in the region?

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my opposition to this sale on the grounds that it is amoral and undermines U.S. security interests. Turkey's leaders have not sought to assuage concerns that such weapons would be used internally, by publicly committing to nonuse of this United States-supplied weapon on its own territory, against its own citizens. Mr. Speaker, I believe the sale of ATACMS to Turkey is a mistake we will come to regret. It is shameful that these implements of civilian death and destruction will be labeled "Made in the USA."

REMARKS BY MARVIN LENDER ABOUT THE TRAGIC DEATH OF YITZHAK RABIN

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1995

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to share a statement made by my dear friend Marvin Lender about the tragic assassination of Yitzhak Rabin. A resident of Woodbridge, CT, Mr. Lender is the former national chairman of the United Jewish Appeal and has a long and distinguished record in helping others. He has made countless contributions to community and civic affairs, but has concentrated his efforts on the Jewish community and the people of Israel.

Before assuming the chairmanship of the United Jewish Appeal [UJA], Mr. Lender was UJA's national chairman for major gifts, and contributed greatly to the Passage to Freedom

Special Campaign for Soviet Jewry and Operation Exodus. The success of Soviet Jewry's settlement in Israel in freedom and dignity is due to his extraordinary efforts on their behalf. He served as UJA's cochairman for the northeast region, general chairman of New Haven's Combined Jewish Appeal, and president and chairman of the boards of directors of the United Israel Appeal and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.

Mr. Lender currently resides in Woodbridge with his wife and three children. He serves on the board of trustees at Yale New Haven Hospital and is the cochairman of the annual drive for the New Haven chapter of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation. Mr. Lender cochairs the New Haven Holocaust and Prejudice Reduction program which helps eliminate prejudice by making school-age children aware of the horrors of the Holocaust.

Through his following statement, it is clear that his countless efforts on behalf of the Jewish Community and the people of Israel were inspired by the achievements and the example of Yitzhak Rabin. I applaud Mr. Lender's heartfelt statement remembering and honoring Yitzhak Rabin. Mr. Rabin's life and his achievements will be remembered and revered for many years to come.

I am returning to Israel after just arriving back in the states on Friday. Sleeping on the flight is impossible. My mind never stops thinking about Prime Minister Rabin. The times that I had the privilege of being with him are so vivid to me. I have feelings of sadness. I feel that the Jewish people have experienced another major tragedy. Israel is at the center of it all again—the bombing of a bus in Tel Aviv or Beit Leit—soldiers being killed in South Lebanon—and now the taking of the life of the Prime Minister of the State of Israel. Israel, the homeland of the Jewish people. And to make matters worse, if that is possible, Rabin was murdered by a Jew. For many reasons, I felt I needed to be there—to attend his funeral—to pay my respects and personally say good-bye—to be there as a representative of the United Jewish Appeal, as a strong supporter of Israel, as a Jew, and most of all, as a friend and admirer of Yitzhak Rabin. In fact, ironically, after many years of interacting with him, and especially over these last two years, I had come to know him more intimately, and to some extent he began to know more about me and how I felt about what he was doing.

Our first meeting was on the day after he was elected Prime Minister. I remember it as though it were yesterday. I remember September 13, 1993, on the lawn of the White House. I will never forget his demeanor. He was so uncomfortable. His body language was so obvious. He did not want to be there, but he knew he had to be in order to lead our people to a new phase in our history. This was the first significant step in the peace process. Rabin had the courage to take this momentous step, beginning the long rocky road that he would travel to achieve peace. He spoke, and you could hear his concern, his emotion and his passion. He concluded his poignant remarks with the Hebrew words so familiar to us, "Ose sholom binromov hu yasase sholom Olaynu v'al kol yisroayl v'imru omayn." And at the end, which was a beginning, he shook hands with Arafat, symbolizing a time for change and peace.

Immediately after the signing, Brian Lurie, executive vice president, United Jewish Appeal, Joel Tauber, president, United Jewish Appeal, and I, flew to Israel and met with the Prime Minister to define UJA's role in peace. He was very clear about our responsibility to Aliyah and Klitah (immigration

and absorption). After watching the historic vote in the Knesset, we took the message back to America. Our meeting with Mr. Rabin once again demonstrated his ties as well as expectations vis-a-vis Jews in the Diaspora. From that moment, Mr. Rabin was under a different kind of pressure. Every time an Israeli died or was injured in a terrorist attack, it was like losing his own child. He despised fanaticism and terrorism by all people. There were no distinctions between Jews and non-Jews. The Baruch Goldstein event was a tragedy for him, not unlike any Arab terrorist activity.

My image of Prime Minister Rabin is that of a shy man. One who preferred not to make speeches. He was direct and focused—yet one could sense his strong feeling and sensitivity every time he spoke. If you were fortunate to be with him in a small group, it became even more evident how bright, intelligent, sharp and knowledgeable he was about any subject. It did not matter whether it related to the United Jewish Appeal, the Jewish Agency for Israel, or any other subject matter, the Prime Minister would always offer a solution. Peace was his focus. It impacted on all of the issues that he talked about during his campaign and his term in office—the economy, immigration and absorption—as well as the social issues of the country.

A year ago, I heard the Prime Minister speak at a meeting in London. That evening, he recounted a number of significant events of the week. He spoke of the arrival of the Chief Rabbi of Syria, marking the end of a movement to free Syrian Jews, as well as the signing of the Jordanian Peace Accord in Arava.

But he spoke most emotionally as he recounted the shiva call that he had made to the family of Nachon Waxman. I saw his tears and pain as he described the attack that he authorized in an attempt to release a Jewish hostage.

There were many meetings over the last three years—from the day after he won the election, to our meetings in Washington several days ago. He was always focused, determined and very clear about his mission. However, one could see the passion and compassion that this great man possessed. He knew, and so did we, that he was making great progress on the road to peace, albeit with great sacrifice and pain. He was deeply hurt by the demonstrations and personal attacks on him by the right wing in Israel and America. But he was a man driven by his desire for peace. He did not want the children to die in a war. Little did he know that he would give his own life for peace. Yitzhak Rabin was a warm, caring man—a husband, father, grandfather, and a friend. He loved his country. He loved Jerusalem.

On October 25, in Washington, D.C., in the Rotunda, how proud I was when the Prime Minister spoke about "my Jerusalem." His words were those of a poet. How beautiful. How poignant. It really is his Jerusalem. That evening, he presented President Clinton with the Isaiah Peace Award on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal. It was truly their peace. The strong feeling of affection that they had for each other were very obvious.

At the funeral, I will always remember the siren blasting for two minutes. I watched Israelis, dignitaries from around the world, and representatives of world Jewry, as they bowed their heads in sorrow. His loss will be felt by all. When President Clinton walked by the casket and bowed his head, I cried. When I listened to Shimon Sheves, his granddaughter, and Etan Haber, I cried. The people who spoke reflected the true feelings of all of us, and all those from around the world honored him with their attendance, attesting to his greatness.

We appreciate and are grateful for having had him as our leader. Yitzhak, we will truly

miss you—I will truly miss you. May your life and commitment to peace be an inspiration to all mankind.

VIEW FROM CALIFORNIA: THROW PEOPLE OFF MEDICAID TO MAKE THEM GO TO WORK

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget cuts Federal support for Medicaid by an unprecedented \$163 billion—over 10 times anything ever enacted by any Republican or Democratic President. The Republican plan achieves these savings by capping overall spending. This means that spending growth per beneficiary would fall from the current 7 to 1.6 percent annually—far below the rate of inflation. States cannot sustain coverage when Federal funds are increasing at only 1.6 percent per beneficiary. States will be forced to reduce benefits and/or provider payments and eliminate coverage for millions of people on Medicaid.

A recent column in the November 28 edition of the Sacramento Bee leaves me fearful for the poor in our California. The author, Mr. Dan Walters, was commenting on California's plans for Medi-Cal if the Republican welfare bill becomes law.

Currently, more than 5 million Californians receive their medical care through Medi-Cal. If the Republican welfare bill becomes law, California and other States will have to decide whether to maintain current eligibility and make up the shortfall with their own money or begin cutting caseloads. California may well slash Medi-Cal recipient rolls by hundreds of thousands.

The column reports that Eloise Anderson, California's social services director, is urging the Wilson administration to adopt a policy that would focus Medi-Cal benefits on some subgroups and deny benefits to others. She advocates a program of varying benefits that depends on one's suitability to obtain employment. Anderson is quoted as saying:

By denying or limiting Medi-Cal availability, families could be further encouraged to exercise personal responsibility and to obtain self-sufficiency through full or part-time work.

This philosophy is frightening. What will happen when a poor, non-Medicaid person gets sick? Won't those eliminated simply turn up in hospital emergency rooms? Are they supposed to go to work sick?

Ms. Anderson recommends cutting Medicaid for people on welfare or trying to leave welfare as a way to prod them into work. What if they have a minimum wage job—how much would it cost to buy a health insurance policy for a mother and a child? Is it realistic to expect that to happen? What about the extensive medical literature which shows that people who don't have health insurance tend to be sicker and less dependable workers? Are the types of jobs a welfare mom is likely to get the ones that offer employer-paid health insurance? Of course not.

The reduction in Federal support under the Republican plan could force States to deny coverage for nearly 8 million Americans in

2002 alone. California is considering a dramatic reduction in eligibility. How will other States respond? Will they also cut their program, to be competitive with California's reduced tax expenditures? Who knows—the Republicans have stripped away the Medicaid guarantee for the sick, elderly, poor, blind, or disabled. The States will have the choice whether to cover these vulnerable citizens. Statements like Ms. Anderson's point to a "race to the bottom"—a race which will leave the most vulnerable in our society sick or dead.

TRIBUTE TO LT. COMDR. PETER R. MCCARTHY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1995

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a long time friend and constituent of mine, Lt. Comdr. Peter R. McCarthy, USMC, retired.

He has made an excellent transition from a Marine officer to a private sector businessman, providing continued support to the military, much of which is on a pro bono basis.

His philosophy is simply to pass on to the next generation for their benefit, all of the professional transition knowledge and know how that he has gained. He has been highly successful in this regard.

I am placing in the RECORD an article describing his efforts which appeared in a recent Washington Post Sunday magazine.

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1995]

BASIC RETRAINING

(By Brigid Schultz)

"In the '60s, '70s and '80s you could carpet-bomb the marketplace with résumés and get a response." Peter McCarthy is conducting a briefing. "You could shoot a shotgun in the sky and ducks would come down." His voice is loud though his audience is small. "You could spray machine-gun fire and you'd get a hit." Eight officers are sitting posture-perfect behind oversize cards with names like Warren, Dick and Mark scrawled in big letters.

"Today you've got to be an Olympic rifle shooter." McCarthy's voice quiets and his face grows stern. "You've only got two magazines." He slams an imaginary cartridge into an imaginary rifle and holds it to his shoulder. He squints one eye, takes a step forward and aims. "You pick your targets, and boom!" He pulls an imaginary trigger. "Into the black. boom!" He fires again. "Into the black. Every time."

The officers—seven men and one woman—nod solemnly. They have reported to this room at the Radisson Executive Retreat Center in Alexandria expecting grim news, and they are getting it. The U.S. military is downsizing. These officers—Army colonels, Marine Corps majors and Navy captains—will be among those to go. They have come to learn how to search for a job.

As McCarthy's report sinks in, some of them twist their bulbous service-academy rings and stare out the window.

"P and L." He is pacing in front of them. He served in the Marine Corps for 20 years, some of them in Vietnam. "To you, that has meant professionalism and loyalty. But in the private sector, it's the 23rd of December, you've got a number of kids, and on your desk you find a pink slip. There's P and L for

you: profit and loss. A knife in the back. . . . You guys are so used to knowing who's in the next foxhole, counting on him, that you've got a built-in naivete."

McCarthy has made his own foray into the private sector as a consultant specializing in helping service personnel cross to the other side. Many of them have been in uniform since the day they got out of school. Most of them are only in their forties. After 20 years in, they can draw a pension of half their base pay; for people with children and mortgages, that isn't enough. Civilian firms are eliminating the middle-management jobs for which they would be best suited.

"There's a psychological bridge between you and the private sector. At the top of the bridge is a granite wall 12 feet high and 12 feet thick. Once you walk over that bridge, it's a whole different culture. . . ."

The first lesson is in "creative research." Before the officers arrived, they were asked to fill out a form titled "Understanding You." McCarthy asks them to identify their hidden skills, assets and interests that may translate to a civilian enterprise. "If you were recruiters, you're great salesmen," he says. The group brainstorms about growing opportunities in law enforcement, leisure, finance. "Child-abuse counseling seems to be a growth industry," offers one Marine colonel. McCarthy hands out a reading list: *Age Wave*, *Megatrends 2000*, *Powershift*, *What Color is Your Parachute?*

For the "primary attack," he says, you have to research companies, figure out what they need and tailor your résumé, appearance and demeanor to fit. But don't be too hasty: Get your act together first.

"Look, you're a battleship heading up this way." He draws a pencil-shaped ship steaming head-on toward enemy targets. "I don't want you to fire now. You've got one gun firing at the target. Instead, I want you to come here." He positions the ship closer to the target and swings it around, broadside. "Fire all your guns at all the targets. Mass your fire, just like a column of artillery. Get ready get organized and—boom!"

Networking is next. McCarthy tells them to run their friends, family, neighbors and acquaintances as if they were intelligence agents, using them as "listening posts" doing "recon" on the marketplace. Their "secondary attack" is to "explode" these "intel" networks, adding more and more listening posts to report back to them.

Then, résumés. McCarthy tells them not to use acronyms like CINCEUR and JIB and LANTCOM. Instead of saying Marine Corps, say "large international organization." He turns to the board and begins writing an outline: Situation. Goals. Parameters. Execution. Administration. Control. "This look familiar to you guys?"

Relief washes over their faces.

"This plan was used by Moses to cross the desert, by Arthur Andersen to expand globally, and by Norman Schwarzkopf to go into Kuwait." It is the field order that the military uses for combat and just about every other situation. McCarthy takes them through it point by point, and after "Control," he also asks them to add a "love statement"—family considerations.

After lunch, the officers study how to dress. For this representative of Nordstrom has been enlisted to outfit some mannequins with dark blue and gray suit coats, red patterned ties and braces. McCarthy shows off his own Hickey-Freeman suit and wingtips.

They start with the basics: Never wear a brown or olive suit to an interview. Never wear a plastic running watch. Do wear pressed French cuffs with gold cuff links, but skip the monogram. Do wear natural fibers . . .

The officers are scribbling in their briefing books.