

House Resolution 120, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yes". I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote Nos. 280 and 281.

SCOHARIE COUNTY, NY,
CELEBRATES BICENTENNIAL

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have always been proud of the heritage and physical beauty of the 22d Congressional District of New York which I have the privilege of representing. It is for this reason, to savor the history and character of the picturesque towns and counties, that I return home every weekend.

We often forget, Mr. Speaker, that the real America is not Washington, but the small towns and villages where real people live and work. I would like to talk about a collection of such towns today.

On Saturday June 3d, Schoharie County, NY will celebrate its 200th anniversary. This county was formed by the New York State Legislature from parts of Albany and Tryon Counties in 1795. However, its history began long before this official action. The area was settled by German explorers in 1712 when they arrived from the lower Hudson Valley. This frontier region prospered with its rich farmlands, rolling countryside, and quiet streams. In fact, this county adopted the Indian name for the river which ran through the valley, Schoharie.

With its splendid forests and fertile river bed, the Schoharie Valley was an agricultural hotbed for many years. However, the county has changed since those days, like just about everything else in America. Now, Schoharie County employs only 5 percent of its population in agricultural and forest work. Still, it has retained its small town character and charm and the Schoharie Valley remains one of the most scenic regions in New York State.

One thing that thankfully hasn't changed, Mr. Speaker, is the pride and values of the citizenry. On June 3d, residents of Schoharie County will take part in day-long festivities commemorating their heritage. There will be tours of the various historical sites which mark the region as well as parades and plenty of small town camaraderie. I commend the people here for their commitment to their region and the Schoharie County Bicentennial Committee for their hard work in organizing this event.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me in an anniversary tribute to Schoharie County, a great place to live.

CONGRATULATING THE WESTFIELD HIGH SCHOOL CONCERT BAND

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to congratulate the Westfield High

School concert band in Houston, TX, on recently winning the Sudler Flag of Honor, which is presented to the most outstanding high school concert bands in the United States and Canada.

Under the direction of Mr. Philip Geiger, the Westfield High School concert band is just the 31st concert band to earn the Sudler Flag of Honor in the 12 years that it has been awarded. The award is presented by the John Philip Sousa Foundation and is intended to recognize and salute high school concert band programs of international-level excellence.

Winning the Sudler Flag of Honor proves what many of us have known for along time: that the Westfield High School concert band is among the very best concert bands in North America.

The Sudler Flag is designed in red, white and blue and features the logo of the John Philip Sousa Foundation. The flag becomes the property of the band. Each member of the band receives a personalized certificate and the band director receives a personalized plaque.

To be eligible for the Sudler Flag, a high school must have maintained a fine concert band for at least 7 years. Although the band's concert activities receive the most attention in the selection process, the high school's band program must be a complete one and must include a marching band, small ensembles, and solo participation by its members in contests and festivals. Also, the band conductor must have been at the same high school for at least 7 consecutive years and is expected to be involved in professional band and music education organization and activities on the local, State and national level.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you join with me in congratulating the young men and women of the Westfield High School concert band—as well as conductor Philip Geiger—on this significant achievement, and I know you join with me in wishing everyone associated with the band continued success in the years ahead.

SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE EXPLAINS REPUBLICAN WELFARE REFORM

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Chronicle has done a superb job cutting through the deceptive rhetoric of the majority in Congress to reveal the real reason behind welfare reform, Republican style: massive tax cuts for the rich paid for by cutting benefits to the millions of poor, elderly, disabled, and legal aliens of our country. As the editors so aptly point out, simply cutting benefits to our most vulnerable citizens will do absolutely nothing to solve the most difficult problems facing them and our society as a whole.

Meaningful welfare reform must replace dependency with independence while maintaining the safety net for those truly in need. Although real reform will not be simple and it will not be cheap, the alternative—cutting off our most needy citizens—is the epitome of shortsightedness. Mr. Speaker, I commend your attention and the attention of my colleagues to this excellent and timely editorial, and I ask that it be placed in the RECORD.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 3, 1995]

WELFARE ON THE CHEAP IS NOT REFORM

Any hope that the Senate might salvage some glimmer of actual "reform" from the House-passed welfare bill largely vanished last week when Senate Finance Committee chairman Bob Packwood, R-Ore.—who will draft the Senate version—indicated he would go along with the House in ending the federal entitlement nature of most welfare programs and turning them into block grants to the states.

That basic approach has everything to do with cutting spending for the poor in order to heap tax cuts on the rich—and virtually nothing to do with welfare reform.

As Senator John Chafee, R-R.I., noted last week: "Instead of focusing on employability * * * out-of-wedlock births and * * * intergenerational welfare dependency, the focus (of the House bill) seems to be entirely on how to save money. * * *"

That, in fact, is the basic flaw in the Republican approach: the contradiction between saving money and reforming welfare. Real welfare reform, the kind that ends dependency and self-defeating behavior by putting people to work, costs money, it doesn't save it. It requires, at a minimum, paying for job training, child care and job creation—none of which are adequately provided today.

The original GOP contract spoke of spending \$10 billion on jobs programs. The House-passed bill offers nothing—simply the requirement that welfare recipients must work after two years, whether there are any jobs or not, or lose benefits.

Trying to do welfare on the cheap will result only in a system even less effective and more wasteful than the present one. It is not simply foolish, but mean-spirited, for it arises not from any desire to improve an imperfect system, but from the barely disguised motive of trying to pay for \$190 billion worth of middle- and upper-class tax cuts at the expense of the weakest, most disenfranchised members of society: poor women and children, who are the major beneficiaries of welfare, and legal resident aliens, who have paid taxes and played by all the rules but can't vote.

What would real welfare reform look like? It might well include the GOP demand to turn programs over to the states, as President Clinton has also urged, so that flexibility and experimentation might flourish free of burdensome federal mandates. It would also include more money, not less, for innovative jobs programs.

But the Republican block grant approach simply replaces liberal federal mandates with conservative ones, and it further constricts the states by reducing overall projected spending by some \$65 billion over five years in order to pay for tax breaks.

As the Economist magazine observed last week, the Republicans are passing up a chance "to do welfare reform in a way that is right rather than merely right wing." If the Senate goes along, the only hope for real welfare reform will be the veto pen.

TRIBUTE TO THE MONMOUTH COUNTY URBAN LEAGUE

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 6, 1995, the Monmouth County, NJ,

Urban League will hold its Second Annual Equal Opportunity Awards Dinner at the Long Branch Ocean Place Hilton. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Monmouth County Urban League, and its new president Dr. Webster Tremell, for the excellent work that the league has done in lending a helping hand to those in our community who need it most—and to give my strongest encouragement for their future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, the mission of the Urban League as a nonprofit community-based social service and civil rights organization is to assist African-Americans and other minorities and low-income families and individuals to achieve social and economic equality. The league, whose national headquarters is in New York City, has 114 affiliates across the nation. Working through social work, economics, and the law, the league seeks to secure equal opportunities in all sectors. While seeking to improve the quality of life for racial minorities, the league is also devoted to the goal of building bridges between the races.

The league was founded in 1910 in response to the needs of southern blacks who migrated to New York seeking enhanced economic opportunities, only to be confronted with unemployment, scarce health care, and overcrowded housing. The league was created through the merger of several organizations dedicated to assisting these new arrivals and combatting the racism of that era. In the years since, the league has expanded into a nationwide organization, and many distinguished leaders have presided over the league in the years since, including, Whitney Young, Vernon Jordan, and the current president and chief executive officer, John E. Jacob.

The Monmouth County League has sought to bring together a broad cross-section of public and private sector leaders representing the corporate, banking, legal, government, and educational communities. Among the major goals of the Monmouth chapter of the league are programs to assist unemployed and underemployed people to become self-sufficient through job readiness counseling, job development, job bank and referral services, and entrepreneurial advocacy. The league also works to address the housing needs of the community, through the development of affordable housing and counseling to assist families and individuals who may qualify for various forms of rental or home ownership assistance programs. The league also works in developing leadership through the support of young adults and professionals serving in mentorship and tutorial programs. Efforts also focus on health education and prevention programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to pay tribute to the work of the Monmouth County Urban League, and to wish for its continued success in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF LORIN AND
ANN WASHER

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently a couple from my district, Lorin and Ann Washer, needed to cancel a long-awaited trip to the Nation's Capital due to health reasons. It would have been a special trip for them, as

50 years ago this month they met in Washington on a blind date. That night, April 12, 1945, was the day President Roosevelt died. Ann and Lorin had to change their plans to dine out and instead ate at the home of a friend. Obviously the location of their meal was unimportant, as their courtship began in earnest shortly thereafter, and they were married in October 1946.

Mr. Speaker, although Ann and Lorin cannot come to Washington to celebrate the April 12 anniversary of their first meeting. I am pleased to honor them for a relationship that has endured 50 years. It is increasingly rare in our society that a couple exhibits the qualities of loyalty and love demonstrated by the Washers, and I am pleased to draw attention to this outstanding couple as the reminiscence about not only their courtship, but so many years of married life. Couples like the Washers have much to teach and much to remember, and deserve our congratulations on this unique day in their lives.

CLINTON RELISHES HIS UNNECESSARY INVASION

HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of President Clinton's visit to Haiti is occasion to reflect on the ill wisdom of his policy there. It is "his" policy because, as he did with Mexico, he bypassed the Congress. The following article by Sir Eldon Griffiths is a sobering analysis of the Clinton Haiti policy.

CLINTON RELISHES HIS UNNECESSARY INVASION

By the time you read this, U.S. troops in Haiti will be pulling out in favor of a U.S.-led, U.S.-munitioned, and largely U.S.-financed U.N. army. President Clinton is in this tiny speck of an island, ready to pass the baton—I almost said the buck!—to U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, whose thankless task now becomes to hold the ring in Haiti while the smallest, poorest country in the Western Hemisphere struggles to construct a "viable democracy."

I wish the United Nations better luck than its hapless multinational forces experienced after the United States handed over Somalia. Let's also acknowledge that six months—and several billion dollars—after Jimmy Carter brokered his deal and Bill Clinton sent in an air-sea armada with more firepower than all the armies of Latin America combined. Port au Prince is probably less dangerous than it was under the rule of Raoul Cedras and his thugs. With the U.S. embargo lifted, some, though by no means all, of Haiti's services and small firms are back in business. Most of those Haitian boat people intercepted by the U.S. Coast Guard as they tried to get to Florida are being repatriated, many forcibly, from the unsanitary camps that shame America in Cuba and Panama.

Last Tuesday's high-noon murder of a prominent Haitian lawyer who had criticized President Aristide is, however, a reminder that Port au Prince still is riven by dangerous elements, but thanks to the U.S. Marines (and a growing Haitian police force), the situation in the capital has improved to a point where it's less frightening to walk in the streets at night than it is in, let's say, Washington, D.C.

Clinton has every reason to praise the U.S. forces. They did what he told them to do.

But his claim that his Haiti was a "triumph" is none the less as spurious as it is self-deceiving. This version of events may sit well with those Haitians who've done well from Aristide's return; it may also carry the day with the liberal press and what's left of the Black Caucus in Congress. But history, I predict, will judge Clinton's Haitian adventure less generously. More likely it will be seen as an unnecessary, grotesque mismatch of U.S. power to U.S. interests.

Is that too harsh a verdict? If you think so, just ask three questions:

Did Haiti under Cedras (or any other ruler) pose a threat to U.S. security? It didn't. It couldn't. It doesn't. Haiti has no military airfields, no naval ports, no missiles sites like those in Cuba that enemies of America might use. Militarily, Clinton's invasion was a classic case of using a billion dollar hammer to crack a 20-cent nut.

Was Haiti crucial to the economic interests of the United States? No, it wasn't. It isn't. It couldn't be. Haiti has no oil, no minerals, no products of any kind the United States needs to earn its living. Trade with Haiti is so insignificant that when the United States imposed a total embargo, few Americans even noticed, outside a few travel agents in Miami.

Were the lives of American citizens at risk in Haiti? No, they weren't. Despite all the efforts of the State Department, not one example was found of Americans suffering oppression or wrongful imprisonment in Haiti. Lacking these or any other reasons of U.S. national interest, President Clinton based his case for invading Haiti on the need to impose—or restore—democracy. But why in Port au Prince, but not—as Ronald Reagan sought to do in the face of Clinton's criticism at the time—in Salvador or Panama or Nicaragua?

Okay, Cedras was a rightwing brute, just as Aristide is a leftwing demagogue. But if Cedras was grinding down the Haitian people to a level that justified U.S. intervention, why didn't Washington first try to overthrow him with the CIA (as it did in Guatemala and Cuba)? And how come, when Jimmy Carter went to Haiti with Colin Powell and Sam Nunn, Carter claimed the U.S. embargo was "shameful" and called Cedras "an honorable man" with whom the United States could do business?

When the full story comes to be told, Haiti, I suspect, will turn out to have been the Unnecessary Invasion. The United States got sucked into it in large part because candidate Clinton publicly broke with George Bush's policy of sending back the Haitian boat people, with the result that hundreds of thousands set off for Florida, creating a problem that Clinton in office found he couldn't handle. Clinton was then humiliated when he sent in the *USS Harlan County* supply ship with a bunch of officials on board who turned tail at the first whiff of grape-shot from Cedras's goons on the dock. And so it came to pass that stopping the flow of refugees (that Clinton himself had invited), and putting Aristide back in Cedras's place, became the leitmotifs of U.S. foreign policy.

Never mind Cuba, where the dictatorship was harsher and the outflow of migrants larger. Forget Rwanda, where millions died, or Angola and all the rest. Haiti was a case of presidential pique and strategic misjudgment, of liberal idealism, and Florida's Democratic politics getting in the way of any objective long-term assessments of U.S. diplomatic priorities and America's true national interests.

So when the president returns to Washington, let's hope he lays aside his mantle of Liberator—or is it Conqueror?—of Haiti.