

Pacific Fleet emerging from its restructuring as a lean formidable, combat ready force with a strong commitment of quality of life for our people. America needs its navy more than ever as we contend with regional conflicts, proliferation of weapons, and political uncertainties around the globe. Today the Navy-Marine Corps team is forward-deployed, first on the scene, and flexible enough to respond to almost every contingency from the sea. With fewer U.S. bases overseas and uncertain access to bases of the nations, the Navy will be the primary guarantor of American interests in the Pacific for decades. End quote."

And the Navy needs your continued support as Navy League members, educating the public on the need to maintain a strong maritime armed service and helping to recruit quality people like the officers and crew you see here tonight. I was on a Trident ballistic missile submarine on alert patrol in the Northern Pacific when the Soviet Union dissolved, ending the Cold War. Yet there was no celebration or overt glee—just the feeling that our mission had changed in ways we didn't quite know yet. And today, one gulf war later, the world is not a safer, more stable place for you and your children, but more unstable than ever before. And the United States is the only country which will make the right things happen, when we choose, because our Navy, first on the scene, has the "right stuff." As George Will concludes his Jefferson City essay, "And the history of this century teaches a grim truth: When at peace the nation should always assume that it may be living in what subsequent historians will call "interwar years."

But now I'd like to conclude my remarks so that we can all enjoy these interwar years. (Pause) And I'd like to especially thank Melody Green for her dedicated work as President of the Navy League in maintaining what is undoubtedly one of the strongest and closest ties between a ship and her namesake city. I know that this visit is one of the highlights of my naval career, and I think it is for my crew here tonight as well. Knowing how much you support us, and your warmth and friendship, makes us work a little bit harder every day and puts a proud gleam in our eyes when we say we are on the USS JEFFERSON CITY. On behalf of my crew, I would like to express our heartfelt appreciation for your wonderful hospitality, and your work as members of the Navy League in keeping the United States Navy such that generations to come can continue to enjoy such birthday celebrations as we enjoy tonight. Thank you all very much.

POTABLE DRINKING WATER FOR PARTS OF MONTANA

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today there are folks who are forced several times each week to travel miles to fill tanks and barrels with pure water to drink. The situation I refer to is not somewhere in a Third World country, but—remarkably—in Valley County, Montana. Because groundwater supplies in this part of Montana are not potable, the residents of these communities drive in their trucks for hours each week, both summer and winter, to deliver this water to hundreds of people.

The irony of this situation is that these folks live adjacent to one of the largest bodies of water ever developed by the Federal Govern-

ment in the West, the Fort Peck Reservoir, which stores over 18 million acre feet. The bill I am introducing today will authorize the development of a rural municipal water system for the residents of the Fort Peck Rural Water District. This much needed project will tap into Fort Peck Reservoir to construct a safe and reliable drinking system for both municipal and agricultural purposes. When this project is completed, it will also enable this area of Montana to attract economic development, which up to now has been stifled due to the unavailability of water.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Reclamation has completed a needs assessment and feasibility study on this project, and I am proposing its construction through a partnership arrangement where State and local interests will contribute 20 percent of the cost toward its completion. The feasibility study estimates that the total Federal expenditure will be less than \$6 million. If we can afford to spend much more than this to help undeveloped nations all around the world to develop safe supplies of drinking water, we can certainly afford to do this for folks living in Montana.

A TRIBUTE TO CARL L. "PAT" PATRICK

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a real gentleman of Georgia. Carl L. "Pat" Patrick of Columbus is a man who is known and admired greatly by industrial, civic and community leaders throughout our State. He is the founder and chairman of Carmike Cinemas Inc. which operates movie theaters throughout Georgia and the South.

And while he is known best for his work in the cinema industry, it is his generosity and selfless charitable acts for which I commend this man. Pat and his wife, Frances, have long been supporters of and contributors to Columbus community causes such as Columbus Technical Institute, the Columbus Museum and the John B. Amos Community Cancer Center at the Medical Center.

Pat's most recent contribution, however, is one of his greatest. He donated \$1 million to St. Francis Hospital of Columbus—the hospital where his son was born during the facility's first year of operation in 1950. St. Francis now specializes in cardiac medicine and the Patricks want to ensure the hospital is able to purchase the necessary equipment to keep pace with the strides being made in this field.

On a more personal note, when Julie and I received our Christmas card from Pat and Frances this year, we had a most pleasant and touching surprise awaiting us. In addition to the wonderful holiday message, the card informed us that a contribution had been made by the Patricks in our name to the Will Rogers Memorial Fund.

Again, I commend Carl L. "Pat" Patrick. He has touched the lives of so many people in so many ways with his warmth and generosity. Thank you Pat and Frances.

SINGLE-ASSET BANKRUPTCY

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to address an injustice that exists within title 11 of the United States Code regarding single asset bankruptcies.

This injustice stems back to the 103d Congress when an 11th hour decision placed on arbitrary \$4 million ceiling on the single asset provisions of the bankruptcy reform bill. The affect has been to render investors helpless in foreclosures on single assets valued over \$4 million.

To rectify this problem, my bill eliminates the \$4 million ceiling, thereby allowing creditors the ability to recover their losses. Under the current law, chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code becomes a legal shield for the debtor. Upon the investor's filing to foreclose, the debtor preemptively files for chapter 11 protection which postpones foreclosure indefinitely.

While in chapter 11, the debtor continues to collect the rents on the commercial asset. However, the commercial property typically is left to deteriorate and the property taxes go unpaid. When the investor finally recovers the property through the delayed foreclosure, they owe an enormous amount in back taxes, they receive a commercial property left in deterioration which has a lower rent value and resale value, and meanwhile, the rent for all the months or years they were trying to retain the property went to an uncollectible debtor.

My bill does not leave the debtor without protection. First, it is only as a last resort when the investor brings a foreclosure against a debtor. This usually is after all other efforts to reconcile delinquent mortgage payments are unsuccessful. Second, the debtor retains up to 90 days to reorganize under chapter 11. It should be noted, however, that single asset reorganizations are typically a false hope since the owner of a single asset does not have other properties from which he can recapitalize his business.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, my bill helps all American families by making their investments more secure and more valuable. The hard-working American families who depend on their life insurance policies and who have paid for years into their pensions will save millions in reduced costs. My bill protects the "little guy" from being plagued with years of litigation while the commercial property owner continues to collect the rent to line his own pockets.

WHAT'S WRONG ON THE RIGHT

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the following article from the "Outlook" section of the December 17 Washington Post. The author, noted Boston University economics professor Glenn Loury, has a valuable lesson for both conservatives and liberals alike. Though condemning the paternalism of the left, which has

helped exacerbate the awful conditions of our inner cities, he observes that "a conservatism worthy of majority support would not view with cool indifference a circumstance in which so many Americans suffer such unspeakable degradation." I enter the full article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and urge all my colleagues to read it.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 17, 1995]

WHAT'S WRONG ON THE RIGHT: SECOND
THOUGHTS OF A BLACK CONSERVATIVE
(By Glenn C. Loury)

The recently deceased British writer Kingsley Amis, celebrated by conservatives on both sides of the Atlantic, was never comfortable with political movements nor those who champion them. In the poem, "After Goliath," Amis wryly noted that " * * * even the straightest of issues looks pretty oblique when a movement turns into a clique." As a black American who nevertheless came to call himself a conservative, I have recently watched with growing dismay how this "movement" has dealt with racial issues, and have thereby gained new appreciation for the wisdom of Kingsley Amis.

Looking back, three factors seem to have been paramount in my move toward conservatism. The first attraction was that it was not liberalism. By the end of the 1970s I had become disgusted with the patronizing relativism that white liberals seemed inevitably to bring to questions of race. Wearing their guilt on their sleeves, they were all too ready to "understand" the shortcomings and inadequacies of blacks. Obsessed with the wrongs inflicted by society on the supposedly hapless victims of discrimination, they were blinded to the desperate need of these "victims" to take responsibility for their own lives. They therefore supported and reinforced what I saw as the debilitating tendency among many blacks to avoid facing squarely the real challenges of the post-civil rights era.

There was hypocrisy in this liberal stance. Though advocating racial equality, liberals did not treat blacks and whites as moral equals: Historic oppression precluded blacks from being held accountable for their actions; whites, suffering no such disability, warranted criticism by liberals because they could choose to stop being racists, or to become more generous and compassionate. In effect, the liberals were saying that whites were powerful moral agents, and blacks were pitiable subjects shaped by forces outside themselves. This smacked of racism, and I hated it.

The second attraction of conservatism was that, on the range of policy issues with which I was most concerned, it made intellectual sense to me. As a professional economist, I have always been sensitive to the deep incentive problems that plague the liberal social vision. High taxes, heavy-handed regulation, bureaucratic service provision and expansive social benefits tend to reduce economic growth and foster dependence. Some social programs would always be necessary, of course, but liberals seemed too little concerned about the costs of their ambitions. Moreover, again in the late 1970s, I watched workers in the auto and steel industries price themselves out of their burgeoning international markets while liberals cheered them on. Public employee unions often seemed to be feathering their own nests, with little apparent concern for the public interest, and with the broad support of the Democratic Party.

Finally, the cultural assumptions of social conservatism seemed like an appealing alternative to those of liberal secularism. In no small part, my move to the political right has been a move away from the people on the

left who seemed unremittingly hostile to any evocation of spiritual commitments in the public square. With the family disintegrating before our very eyes, liberals could only heap ridicule on "traditional values" advocates who expressed alarm. In the face of over 1 million abortions per year, liberals could find no place in their political lexicon for a discourse on the morality of this course of action in our society.

For all of these reasons, I was drawn to embrace conservatism. Yet now, some years later, these same beliefs are provoking my growing discomfort with the conservative ascendancy, particularly on the issue of race.

It is certainly true that liberals adopted a condescending posture on racial questions. Their methods—such as strong affirmative action leading to racial double standards, or an excessive concern to avoid "blaming the victim" that precluded acknowledgment of social pathology—were definitely flawed. But there was never much doubt that liberals sought to heal the rift in our body politic engendered by the institution of chattel slavery. The liberal goal of securing racial justice in America was, and is, a noble one. I cannot say with confidence that conservatism as a movement is much concerned to pursue that goal.

This is not the old canard that conservatives are inherently racists because believers in states' rights opposed the civil rights revolution. Rather, my concern is that too many conservatives seem blind to the need to constructively engage the problem of racial division. Yet the success of any governing coalition, whether it is the conservative "revolution" or something else, will ultimately depend largely on how well it deals with a problem that cannot be wished away.

It is now fashionable for conservatives to attribute the catastrophe unfolding in the urban ghettos to some combination of mistaken liberal policies and the deficiencies of inner-city residents themselves. Yet a conservatism worthy of majority support in this country would not view with cool indifference a circumstance in which so many Americans suffer such unspeakable degradation, from lack of shelter, health care, education, nutrition or any hope for a better life. The efforts of various conservative writers to attribute this deep-seated, complex problem to the disincentives of federal assistance programs, the so-called pathologies of black culture, or the cognitive disabilities of certain group of Americans, seem designed mainly to rationalize their disengagement from it.

Where is their passion? Where is their moral outrage? In light of the scale of the tragedy unfolding in cities across the land, the narrowly academic and highly ideological posture of conservative intellectuals—who are in effect saying, "Too bad about what's happening, but we told you liberals so"—is simply breathtaking. Is it paranoia for a black to wonder whether this posture toward urban problems would be embraced with such confidence among conservatives if those inner-city hell holes were populated by whites?

Conservatives should view with skepticism the notion that economic or biological factors ultimately underlie behavioral problems like those involving sexuality and parenting. After all, behaviors of this sort reflect people's basic understandings of what gives meaning to their lives. The idea that the mysteries of human motivation within the family are susceptible to calculated intervention by the state would have been rejected out of hand by a classical conservative like Edmund Burke, to whom the phrase "conservative revolution" would have seemed an oxymoron. Yet, today's conservative revolutionaries would have us believe that only by dismantling the federal estab-

lishment can the deepest social problems of American society be solved.

I doubt that the most clever of economists (and I know some smart ones) could design an incentive scheme to insure responsible parenting that would work as effectively as the broad acceptance among parents of the idea that they are God's stewards in the lives of their children. The best pregnancy deterrent may be to inculcate in the heart of each adolescent the belief that, as Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "Your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit . . . Therefore, honor God with your body."

There is also wisdom in the New Testament for those conservatives who see in America's black communities another country, separate from and unrelated to the one in which they live, inhabited by a different kind of man. In Acts 10:34-35 one finds Simon Peter saying, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." The point here is that the problems observed in the darkest corners of our society are human problems, not racial ones. The fault-line between civilization and barbarism runs down the middle of every human heart, and the grace of God remains available to provide a way out for all who would seek it. While we reject moral relativism, and so stand ready to judge between better and worse ways of living, we should strive to avoid self-righteousness. We certainly should eschew completely any notions of collective, racial condemnation or virtue.

Unfortunately, some conservatives now write about "the problem of black crime," about "the crisis of black illegitimacy," about "the threat of black social pathology." But what has race to do with these problems, per se? I am, of course, keenly aware that the rates of crime and illegitimacy among blacks are substantially higher than among whites. I am merely observing that neither the causes nor the cures of such maladies depend on one's skin color. Which group of Americans are innocent and which are the culprits in these affairs? These are problems of sin, not of skin. I would have thought that religious conservatives would be the ones objecting most strenuously and insistently to this lapse of social virtue on the right. Sadly, they have not been.

It is true that, in the recent history of American social policy, it was liberals who "played the race card" by arguing that the disadvantages of blacks justified race-based remedies. Some liberals even claimed that the self-esteem of black youngsters could not be secured without rewriting history so as to provide minorities with equal time. But, while these liberal efforts are largely discredited, we now find conservatives, with the political initiative in hand, acting to maintain and reinforce this inordinate focus on race.

Thus, when conservatives talk of the "culture of poverty" in reference to urban black communities they miss the deeper truth—that America's real problem is its reluctance to affirm those common moral standards that could guide the behavior of blacks and whites alike. Similarly, one conservative critic now declares victory over Afrocentrists by noting that the latter's search for a black Shakespeare has ended in failure. But surely the larger point is that such a search was unnecessary all along, because Shakespeare belongs every bit as much to the ghetto-dwelling black youngster as he does to the offspring of middle-class whites. Why are conservatives, who make so much of the importance of being "color-blind" in public policy, not the first to stress this point?

There is hypocrisy in this conservative stance. Though advocating race neutrality,

conservatives do not treat blacks and whites as moral equals. Critics of affirmative action often invoke Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who in 1963 said famously, "I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character." It is a corollary of this principle that, when gazing upon Americans who are welfare mothers, juvenile felons or the cognitively deficient, we should see human beings with problems, not races of people plagued by pathology. Yet, as I have argued, conservatives do not always do so.

Perhaps more significantly, this selective remembrance of Dr. King's moral leadership diminishes the challenge which his life, and death, should pose for all Americans. Two years before his most famous speech, in a commencement address at Lincoln University, Dr. King made a less well known reference to his dream for our nation:

"One of the first things we notice in this dream is an amazing universalism. It does not say some men [are created equal], but it says all men. It does not say all white men, but it says all men, which includes black men. . . . And there is another thing we see in this dream that ultimately distinguishes democracy and our form of government from all of the totalitarian regimes that emerge in history. It says that each individual has certain basic rights that are neither conferred by nor derived from the state. To discover where they come from, it is necessary to move back behind the dim mist of eternity, for they are God-given. Very seldom, if ever, in the history of the world has a sociopolitical document expressed in such profoundly eloquent and unequivocal language the dignity and the worth of the human personality. The American dream reminds us that every man is heir to the legacy of worthiness."

This too would be a worthy dream for conservatism: to insure that every American can lay claim to his most precious civic inheritance—a legacy of worthiness. To secure it, conservatives must learn not to look upon poor urban blacks as the Others—aliens apart from and a threat to our civilization. Instead, these Americans should be seen as inseparably interwoven constituents of the larger social fabric.

MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT CLINTON: END IMPASSE, BALANCE THE BUDGET

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday December 20, 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues this editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on December 20, 1995:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Dec. 20, 1995]

MESSAGE TO CLINTON GROWS LOUDER: END IMPASSE, BALANCE THE BUDGET

Wall Street may have accomplished something that the public—which, in opinion surveys, tilted toward President Clinton's position on a balanced budget—had failed to do. Traders and investors sent a strong message to Washington about the urgency of ending the impasse over a balanced budget.

The message came in the form of a decline in the value of stocks and bonds as the street expressed its concern over the collapse of budget negotiations between the White House and GOP congressional leaders. By the

end of the day Monday, the White House was setting a new round of talks in motion.

For such indications of urgency have come from the general public. Clinton's approval rating has risen to a two-year high since he began characterizing the GOP budget as an act of cruelty against the poor, the sick and the elderly. Republicans, in effect, have been punished in the polls for trying to keep their 1994 campaign promise to balance the budget.

Not all Democrats, however, were buying the White House line. On the same day that Wall Street roared its disapproval of the impasse, a bipartisan group presented a position paper at a symposium in Minneapolis. The group included former office-holders Paul Tsongas, Richard Lamm, Gary Hart, Tim Penny, Lowell Weicker and John Anderson. All but Weicker and Anderson are Democrats.

Their statement included this "core principle": "We can no longer stay the course, spending more than we earn." They said, "We are maintaining our standard of living by borrowing from our children." They urged that the nation's leaders commit to a policy of economic stability, which means no inflation and no federal budget deficits "to soak up an already inadequate national savings pool."

Sacrifice will be necessary, they said. Among other things, Social Security and Medicare must be reformed to prepare them for the retirement of large numbers of baby boomers after the turn of the century. Clinton has described even the modest adjustments the Republicans have proposed as draconian. He simply must compromise on Medicare and Medicaid, bring himself to take the decisive actions that moderates in his own party are increasingly coming to consider necessary.

Another message was leveled at Washington Tuesday morning. In a "bipartisan appeal from business leaders," published as a newspaper advertisement and carrying the names of more than 90 business executives, Clinton and Congress were urged to remember that the health of the economy rests on the ability of the government to agree on a credible plan.

Among other things, the business leaders said, it's time to accept the economic projections from the Congressional Budget Office—projections that Clinton has opposed because they would allow less spending than the more optimistic White House figures. The bipartisan business leaders also said long-term entitlement spending should be "on the table" for reconsideration, as should any proposed tax cuts.

Little by little, Clinton's attempts to exploit the situation for political gain are being called to account by members of his own party. Something has been needed to neutralize his tacky insistence that the struggle has been between an enlightened, compassionate White House and an evil gang of GOP extremists. Some Democrats have helped set the record straight by adding their voices to bipartisan messages.

REVISED BUDGET RESOLUTION REFLECTING THE PRESIDENT'S MOST RECENT PROPOSAL

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the most important debate in decades is taking place right

now. It is a debate about whether this Nation should balance the Federal budget in 7 years.

In October, my Republican colleagues and I did what needed to be done for decades. We made difficult decisions and Congress passed a historic balanced budget—a budget that finally reforms the Nation's welfare system, provides pro-family and pro-jobs tax relief, and saves Medicare from bankruptcy. The President has chosen the veto pen over the balancing pen. Apparently, he and his Democrat colleagues are not interested in a budget agreement if it means actually cutting spending and saving billions of dollars for our children.

This week, parts of the Government are shut down because the President chose to veto three appropriations bills. With the stroke of a pen, he could open the Government. But he would rather posture and make speeches than roll up his sleeves and sit down in good faith to negotiate a balanced budget that we can all agree on.

What the President and Congress do now about balancing the budget, will define the scope and the nature of our Government well into the 21st century. Mr. Speaker, this is a rare chance to step off the deficit treadmill. My Republican colleagues and I have delivered to the American people a budget plan with honest numbers that balance in just 7 years. The President must step up to the plate, live up to his word and do the same.

LEGISLATION DEPLORING HOLOCAUST DENIERS AND COMMENDING THE HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM HOUSE RESOLUTION 316

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution, House Resolution 316, on behalf of myself and my House colleagues on the Holocaust Memorial Museum Council, Mr. YATES, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. LANTOS, which deplores the persistent, ongoing, and malicious efforts by some persons in this country and abroad to deny the historical reality of the Holocaust, and which commends the vital, ongoing work of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Yesterday, the House adopted legislation that will facilitate the museum's annual Days of Remembrance ceremony in the Rotunda on April 16, 1995. Yet, the work of the Holocaust Memorial Museum is conducted year-round, as evidenced by the larger than expected attendance at the museum, which is steadily increasing.

One of the reasons for the museum's existence is to counter Holocaust deniers. Those who promote the denial of the Holocaust do so either out of profound ignorance or for furthering anti-Semitism and racism. The Holocaust Memorial Museum, through its permanent exhibitions, traveling programs, and educational outreach efforts, both memorialize the victims of the Holocaust, and counters these accusers through its honest and sensitive approach to one of the most ferociously heinous state acts the world has ever known.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I request that the full text of the legislation be printed at this