

IN HONOR OF REVEREND MONSIGNOR JOSEPH A. MARJANCZYK CELEBRATING HIS 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORDINATION

### HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 2, 1995*

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Reverend Monsignor Joseph A. Marjanczyk on the 50th anniversary of his ordination. The parishioners of Our Lady of Mount Carmel will hold a dinner-dance in Father Marjanczyk's honor on May 6, 1995.

Father Joseph Marjanczyk was ordained by Archbishop Thomas A. Walsh of Newark on May 5, 1945. Prior to his ordination, Father Marjanczyk was a seminarian at the Immaculate Conception Seminary. While at the seminary, he compiled and edited four volumes of Sacred Scripture handbooks and authored a comprehensive history of "Christianity in Poland."

Father Joseph Marjanczyk was first assigned to the Polish parish of St. Valentine in Bloomfield, N.J. He served as chaplain to the Bloomfield Police Department and was Faithful Friar of Fr. Isaac Jogues Fourth Degree Assembly of Knights of Columbus Council 1178. Father Marjanczyk was on the archdiocesan Continuing Education of Priests Committee and also served for 12 years as an adjunct professor of Polish language at Seton Hall University.

He was later named to the Board of Trustees Seton Hall and at the Immaculate Conception Seminary.

Pope John Paul II named Father Marjanczyk a Prelate of Honor to His Holiness and bestowed upon him the title of Monsignor on May 29, 1979. Despite all his responsibilities Father Marjanczyk found time to serve outside of his jurisdiction as trustee of the City of Elizabeth Board of Education. On May 19, 1988, Pope John Paul II proclaimed Monsignor Marjanczyk a Protonotary Apostolic, and on January, 1991 Archbishop McCarrick of Newark appointed him as Vicar Episcopal of South Hudson County.

Father Joseph Marjanczyk was vested with the Knight of the Order of Polonia Restituta by the Polish Government-in-Exile, London England. He was decorated with the Gold Insignia of the Order of Merit by the Republic of Poland. The Paderewski Memorial Committee Bayonne Chapter honored him with the Paderewski Memorial Silver medal on his name day, March 19, 1994.

Father Marjanczyk is a man dedicated to helping and serving the people. He has devoted his life to serving God and to help all those that are in need. Again, I congratulate Father Marjanczyk on the 50th anniversary of his ordination. May all his kindness and generosity be rewarded in the years to come.

### TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM AND FUNG HSIEH

### HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 2, 1995*

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to recognize two re-

markable people from my District, William and Fung Hsieh. Recently, reporter Ben Fox wrote in one of the leading papers in my District, the Tri-Valley Herald, that the Hsieh's are "an advertisement for graceful aging." Their remarkable lives and their 78 years of marriage—yes, 78—have been a testimony to what William rightly calls three of the great essentials of marriage: love, mutual trust, and reasonableness.

William, then called Wen-Lung, and Fung were married in 1917 in China. In the early 1920's, William traveled to the United States, where over the course of 5 years he obtained a doctorate in transportation and economics from the University of Pennsylvania. He returned to China to become a civil engineer, and was awarded the Medal of Freedom from the American Government in 1946 for his work in assisting the U.S. Army transport military supplies during the Second World War.

After fleeing China in the wake of the Communist takeover in 1949, the Fungs were separated again as William remained in Hong Kong and Fung lived in the United States pursuing the citizenship she had lost as a result of marrying a foreign national. Eventually, the Hsiehs and their eight children arrived in the United States, and William became a naturalized citizen in 1986.

Currently, the Hsiehs live in Livermore, which is a lovely city in the East Bay region of the San Francisco area, where they are near their son, Ed, and his wife, Cynthia.

The Hsiehs have much to teach about love, loyalty, and long-term commitment. They have weathered many storms in their lives, and yet their marriage has endured. In our era of family breakdown, the Hsiehs are a welcome reminder of the importance of the traditional values on which our country is based. It is a pleasure for me to honor the Hsiehs today, and to thank Mr. Fox for his touching piece about this wonderful couple.

### THE PRICE OF AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 2, 1995*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered last week by Anthony Lake, the President's National Security Adviser.

Mr. Lake states well the importance of American leadership and the necessity of the President to have the tools and the resources to be able to protect and promote our national interests.

The upcoming debate over resources for the 150 international affairs budget account will help determine whether the United States can sustain its world leadership. This account must take its fair share of cuts, but those cuts must be carried out with care and with bipartisan agreement so that the national interest of the United States will not be harmed.

I urge my colleagues to reflect on Mr. Lake's remarks before the National Press Club April 27, 1995. His speech follows:

#### THE PRICE OF LEADERSHIP

Let me begin with a simple but alarming fact: The United States could be on the brink of unilateral disarmament.

Did that get your attention? I hope so, because it is true.

No, we are not about to junk our jets or scuttle our ships. Our military is strong and ready—and there is a strong bipartisan consensus to keep it so. But we are on the verge of throwing away—or at least damaging—many of the other tools America has used for 50 years to maintain our leadership in the world. Aid to emerging markets, economic support for peace, international peacekeeping, programs to fight terrorism and drug trafficking, foreign assistance: Together with a strong military, these have been key instruments of our foreign policy.

Presidents since Harry Truman have used these tools to promote American interests—to preserve our security, to expand our prosperity and to advance democracy. Their efforts were supported by Democrats and Republicans—and the broad majority of the American people. Congress consistently provided the needed resources for these tasks. Because of this resolve, coupled with our military might, we prevailed over the long haul in the Cold War, strengthened our security and won unparalleled prosperity for our people.

Now, I deeply believe our success is in danger. It is under attack by new isolationists from both left and right who would deny our nation those resources. Our policy of engagement in world affairs is under siege—and American leadership is in peril.

A few of the new isolationists act out of conviction. They argue that the end of the Soviet menace means the serious threats are gone—that we should withdraw behind our borders and stick to concerns at home. Fortress America, they say, can shut out new dangers even though some of the new threats facing us—like nuclear proliferation, terrorism, rapid population growth and environmental degradation—know no boundaries.

But most of the new isolationists do not argue such a position or even answer to the name isolationist. They say they are part of the postwar bipartisan consensus that their goals are its goals—democracy, security, peace and prosperity. But they won't back up their words with deeds.

These self-proclaimed devotees of democracy would deny aid to struggling democracies. They laud American leadership, but oppose American leadership of coalitions, advocating only unilateral action instead.

Yes, they praise peace. But then they cut our help to those who take risks for peace. They demand greater prosperity. But they shy away from the hard work of opening markets for American workers and businesses. Under the cover of budget-cutting, they threaten to cut the legs out from under America's leadership.

These are the back-door isolationists—and they are much more numerous and influential than those who argue openly for American retreat. They can read the polls, and they know that the American people want the U.S. to be engaged in the world. Support for American leadership in the world is about as strong as ever—a Chicago Council on Foreign Relations survey shows two-thirds or more want us to remain deeply engaged. So these back-door isolationists and unilateralists cast themselves as the true guardians of American power. But through their actions, they could become the agents of a America's retreat. They champion American leadership, but they want it the one way you can't have it: and that is on the cheap.

They want America to turn its back on 50 years of success. They are working—whether they know it or not—to destroy part of the foundation for our peace and prosperity, the great legacy of our postwar leaders. Vandenberg, Truman, Marshall, Acheson. These men

faced their own challenge from isolationists. But they saw the cost of our earlier withdrawal after Versailles was terribly, terribly damaging—saw it in the wreckage of Europe and Asia after World War II and the casualties America suffered liberating those continents. And they understood that investing in a vigorous foreign policy was the only way to prevent another catastrophe.

They knew the price of leadership. They spent what was necessary to maintain America's security. And they went further, creating the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions and covering those bills, pouring Marshall aid into Western Europe to save it from despair and communism and they and their successors in later Administrations developed the new tool of technical assistance—so that democracy and prosperity got a better chance around the world.

Look at the results: the map is almost covered with democracies, many of them strong allies. Markets that fulfill needs and dreams are expanding. A global economy supports American jobs and prosperity. These are the returns on 50 years of American political and economic investment abroad—the benefits of 50 years of bipartisan engagement.

But these achievements are not cut in stone. We will not go on reaping these benefits automatically. Back-door isolationism threatens to propel us in the wrong direction at a real moment of hope—when our engagement can still make a dramatic difference, by securing rather than frittering away our victory in the Cold War.

We could forfeit that victory because in many places, democracy still needs nurturing. Some market economies have not sunk deep roots, and the post-Cold War world has brought into new focus real and powerful dangers that threaten what we have worked for: aggression by rogue states, international terrorism, economic dislocation. These are new forms of an old conflict—the conflict between freedom and oppression, the conflict between the defenders of the open society and its enemies.

There is no expiration date on these lessons from five decades: Defeating these threats requires persistent engagement and hands-on policies. Defeating them demands resources. Throwing money at problems won't make them go away—but we also cannot solve problems without money. The measure of American leadership is not only the strength and attraction of our values, but what we bring to the table to solve the hard issues before us. That is why President Clinton has said that he will not let the new isolationism prevail.

Make no mistake: The American people want their nation to lead. Americans know the world is growing closer; they know our security and prosperity depend on our involvement abroad. And they agree with the President, who has said before and since he took office: "For America to be strong at home, it must be strong abroad."

Plenty of Americans also say they want us to spend less abroad—until they know the real numbers. Most think that we spend 15 percent or more of the federal budget on foreign aid. They think 5 percent would be about right.

They would be shocked to know that little more than 1 percent—\$21 billion out of a \$1.6 trillion dollar budget—goes to foreign policy spending, and less than \$16 billion to foreign assistance. That's a lot of money, but not the budget-buster that neo-isolationists pretend. And that is 21 percent less in real terms than spent in FY 1986. They would also be surprised to learn that others recognize the reality of necessary resources far better than we. The richest, most powerful nation on Earth—the United States—ranks dead

last among 25 industrialized nations in the percentage of GNP devoted to aid.

These are facts that should be better known. And more of our citizens should know that our foreign policy resources are devoted toward goals that the American people support.

\$6.6 billion a year promotes peace—including our efforts in the Middle East, the help we give U.S. allies to defend themselves, and our contribution to UN peacekeeping missions around the world, such as those on the Golan Heights, the Iraq-Kuwait border and in Cambodia.

\$2.4 billion builds democracy and promotes prosperity—helping South Africa, for example, hold free elections and transform itself peacefully.

\$5 billion promotes development—that includes jobs programs in Haiti to increase employment, improve infrastructure and help that nation get back on its feet.

\$1.7 billion provides humanitarian assistance—like caring for refugee children in the former Yugoslavia—because Americans have always wanted their country to alleviate suffering in areas of the most compelling need.

And the remainder is for the State Department and other agencies that work every day to advance America's interests abroad.

This is the price of American leadership—and the backdoor isolationists don't want us to pay it. But imagine how the world would look if we did not. Take what I call the George Bailey Test. You remember George—he is the character played by Jimmy Stewart in the Christmas classic "It's a Wonderful Life." In that film, the angel Clarence shows George how Bedford Falls would have fallen apart without him.

Allow me to play Clarence briefly and take you through a world without American leadership. Imagine:

If Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan joined the club of declared nuclear weapons states because we couldn't do the deals to denuclearize them.

If Russian missiles were still pointed at our cities, because we couldn't push to detarget them.

If thousands of migrants were still trying to sail to our borders, because we had not helped restore democracy in Haiti.

If nearly 1 million American jobs had not been created over the last three years alone—because we had not promoted U.S. exports.

If we had to fight a war on the Korean peninsula—the implication of what some critics urged—because we did not confront the threat of a North Korea with nuclear weapons.

If another quarter of a million people had died in Rwanda because we had not deployed our military and they had not done such a fine job in the refugee camps.

Or, if we had paid tens of billions of dollars more and suffered more casualties because we insisted on fighting Operation Desert Storm against Iraq by ourselves.

Imagine that. Each of these efforts cost money and the hard work of building international coalitions. But you and I are safer, better off and enjoy more freedom because America made these investments. If the backdoor isolationists have their way, much of what we have worked for over two generations could be undone.

Speaker Gingrich recently described what the world might look like if America retreats. He described "a dark and bloody planet \* \* \* in our absence you end up in Bosnia and Rwanda and Chechnya." He added, "They are the harbingers of a much worse 21st century than anything we've seen in the half century of American leadership."

It does not have to be that way. If we continue to invest in democracy, in arms con-

trol, in stability in the developing world, in the new markets that bring prosperity, we can assure another half century of American leadership.

But already, because of decisions in the last few years, we sometimes cannot make even modest contributions to efforts that deserve our support. America is a great nation—but we cannot now find the small sum needed to help support peacekeepers in Liberia, where a million people are at risk from renewed civil war. Or the money to fund adequately UN human rights monitors in Rwanda. We can barely meet our obligations in maintaining sanctions on Serbia. This is no way to follow the heroic achievements of the Cold War. And I can't imagine that this fits any American's vision of world leadership. It doesn't fit mine.

Nickel and dime policies cost more in the end. Prevention is cheap—and doesn't attract cameras. When the all-seeing eye of television finds real suffering abroad, Americans will want their government to act—and rightly so. Funding a large humanitarian effort after a tragedy or sending in our forces abroad to assist will cost many times the investment in prevention.

Some costs of short-sighted policies must be paid in our neighborhoods: In 1993, Congress cut by almost one-third our very lean request for funding to combat the flow of narcotics into our country—and that funding has been declining in real terms ever since. As a result, we are scaling back programs to wipe out production of drugs and block their importation, as well as training programs for police, prosecutors and judges in foreign countries. America pays a far higher cost in crime and ruined lives.

These are some of the constraints we have lived with in the past few years. And now, however, American leadership faces a still more clear and present danger. Budget legislation being prepared in Congress could reduce foreign affairs spending by nearly a quarter—or \$4.6 billion. That would mean drastic cuts or the elimination of aid to some states of the former Soviet Union, and into the security assistance programs that help U.S. allies and friends provide for their own defense. It would sharply reduce or eliminate our contributions to international peace operations. It would lame the agencies—like OPIC and the Ex-Im Bank—that have played a key role in expanding U.S. exports. It would threaten our non-proliferation efforts and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It would eliminate assistance for some programs that save children's lives.

These cuts would cripple our legacy of leadership. The strength to lead does not fall from heaven. It demands effort. It demands resources.

A neo-isolationist budget could undercut our strategic interest in democracy in Russia and the former Warsaw Pact. And it would directly affect America's security: We must continue to fund the farsighted programs begun by Senators Nunn and Lugar to reduce nuclear arsenals in the former Soviet Union. The \$350 million in Nunn-Lugar funds made it possible for Ukraine to dismantle its arsenal and accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. That made it easier for us to pull back from the Cold War nuclear precipice—and save some \$20 billion a year on strategic nuclear forces. That is just one of the more dramatic examples of how our foreign spending literally pays off.

A neo-isolationist budget could harm our efforts to prevent rogue states and terrorists from building nuclear weapons. We are spending \$35 million over three years to employ thousands of weapons scientists in the former Soviet Union on civilian research

projects. That helps keep them off the nuclear labor market—and form selling their skills to an Iraq or Iran.

A neo-isolationist budget could nearly end our involvement in UN peace operations around the world—operations that serve our interests. Presidents since Harry Truman have supported them as a matter of common sense. President Bush in particular saw their value: last year nearly 60 percent of our UN peacekeeping bill went to operations begun with his Administration's support. His Secretary of State, James Baker, made a strong defense for these operations when he remarked that "We spent trillions to win the Cold War and we should be willing to spend millions of dollars to secure the peace."

This is burdensharing at its best. UN peace operations.

Save us from deploying U.S. troops in areas of great importance—for example, Cyprus or the Indian sub-continent.

They help pick up where our troops left off—for example, along the border of Iraq and Kuwait. In Haiti, UN troops are saving us resources by replacing most of our own withdrawing troops.

They are building democracy in Namibia, Mozambique and Cambodia—all missions we helped design. In Cambodia, the UN negotiated the withdrawal of Vietnamese forces and then held the country's first democratic election. After the years of the Killing Fields, 90 percent of the electorate turned out to vote—while UN peacekeepers protected them for the Khmer Rouge.

We would pay much more if we performed even a small number of these missions unilaterally. Instead, the price we pay now in manpower and money is reasonable: Of the 61,000 UN peacekeepers deployed around the world, only some 3,300 are American. We pay the equivalent of half of one percent of our total defense spending for UN peace operations—less than a third of the total UN cost and less than the Europeans pay in proportion to their defense spending. We participate in these operations only after careful consideration of the command arrangements and costs—but we gain immense influence through our ability to lead multinational efforts.

And a neo-isolationist budget could severely undercut our work for peace. The President has said that "America stands by those who take risks for peace." That is true in Northern Ireland, in South Africa, the Middle East and around the world.

For the Middle East peace process to continue—and for negotiations in other regions to succeed—we must have the resources to support the risk-takers. We cannot convince the holdouts from the peace process that will stand behind a just and lasting settlement if we back away from our current commitments. That means maintaining aid to Israel, Egypt and the Palestinians and fulfilling our pledge of debt relief to Jordan. In the Middle East our vital security and economic interests are on the line. We must not fold our hands—and leave the game to the opponents of peace—just when we are so close to the verge of winning.

A neo-isolationist budget could throw away decades of investment in democracy. In the last 15 years, the number of democracies in the world has almost doubled—and USAID provided assistance to most of the newcomers. For example, in Mozambique, a nation emerging from years of strife, AID assistance helped register 6 million out of a possible 8 million voters and turn the polling there into a success. Now, when these societies are most fragile, is not the time to cut this lifeline for democracy.

And a neo-isolationist budget would directly damage our own livelihoods. Our economy depends on new markets for U.S. goods

and high-paying jobs for American workers. That is why President Clinton led efforts to expand free trade with the landmark GATT agreement, NAFTA, and the free trade agreements in the Asia-Pacific region and in the Americas. And this Administration has worked harder, I believe, than any other to promote American exports. Imagine, for example, where we would be without the Commerce Department's efforts on this score. Secretary Brown's staff worked with other agencies last year on export deals worth \$46 billion for American businesses—deals that support 300,000 U.S. jobs.

In many cases, we were in a position to close deals because America had been engaged in those countries for years. Consider two statistics. AID programs in some countries have helped increase life expectancy by a decade. And every year, AID's immunization program saves 3 million lives. These are statistics not only of humanitarian hope. They are part of efforts to help create stable societies of consumers who want to buy our goods—not masses of victims in need of relief.

In addition, our support of the multilateral development banks also helps nations grow and their economies prosper. We contribute \$1.8 billion while other nations contribute \$7 billion—and that capital leverages more than \$40 billion in lending. If we stopped our contributions, we would lose our influence. And others might also follow our lead, and that would cripple these important institutions.

The backdoor isolationists who claim they are saving America's money cannot see beyond the green eyeshades. Our assistance has repaid itself hundreds and hundreds of times over. That was true when Marshall aid resuscitated European markets after the war. And in South Korea, which now imports annually U.S. goods worth three times as much as the assistance we provided in nearly 30 years.

And while we preserve our tradition of assistance, we are reforming its practice. AID has become a laboratory for Vice President Gore's efforts to reinvent government—it is eliminating 27 overseas missions and cut its workforce by 1200.

Now, with the "New Partnership Initiative," we will improve our assistance programs even more—by focusing on the local level. This will enhance the efforts of non-governmental organizations and raise the percentage of our aid that is channeled to them to 40 percent—because these organizations are on the ground and more responsive than distant national governments. This puts our resources to better use, helping nations so they can become self-sufficient.

Every one of us in this room knows that winning support for an activist foreign policy has never been easy in America.

Throughout the history of our Republic, we have never lived in literal isolation. In a world of instant communication and capital flows, we cannot do so now. That is not the issue. Literal isolationism is not an option.

What is at issue is whether we will have the policies and resources that can shape and support our involvement in ways that benefit our people in their daily lives—whether by opening markets or by preventing conflicts that could embroil us. It is at those times that our government failed to engage in such efforts that our people have paid the greatest price—as in World War II, following a period of irresponsible American retreat.

The genius of our postwar leaders was to see that technology and American power had changed the world and that we must never again remain aloof. But they had a hard time winning support even with the memories of war still fresh.

As he put his case forward, President Truman had an uphill struggle. But a foreigner

saw that it was America's moment to lead—and told us so. Winston Churchill stirred the nation with his appeal for an engaged foreign policy. Today, we remember his address as the Iron Curtain speech, but Churchill called it "The Sinews of Peace." The phrase plays on a saying of the Romans: "Money is the sinews of war." Churchill's message was that preserving peace—like waging war—demands resources.

Today, that message rings as true as ever. This is a moment of extraordinary hope for democracy and free markets. But nothing is inevitable. We must remain engaged. We must reach out, not retreat. American leadership in the world is not a luxury: it is a necessity. The price is worth paying. It is the price of keeping the tide of history running our way.

#### TRIBUTE TO JASON SCHUBACH

##### HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 2, 1995*

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize an exceptional young man from my district who has recently accepted his appointment as a member of the class of 1999 at the U.S. Naval Academy.

Jason Schubach will soon graduate Old Fort High School after 4 years of outstanding academic achievement as well as extracurricular involvement. While in high school Jason has distinguished himself as a leader among his peers. He is an outstanding student and patriot.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important responsibilities of Members of Congress is to identify outstanding young men and women and to nominate them for admission to the U.S. service academies. While at the Academy, they will be the beneficiaries of one of the finest educations available, so that in the future, they might be entrusted with the very security of our Nation.

I am confident that Jason Schubach has both the ability and the desire to meet this challenge. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him for his accomplishments to date and to wish him the best of luck as he begins his career in service to our country.

#### TRIBUTE TO VAL ARTURO HENRY

##### HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 2, 1995*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Val Arturo Henry for his yeoman's work to improve his community, and his pursuit of individual excellence. Val was born in Colon, Republic of Panama, and immigrated to New York City when he was 2 years old.

Val attended public and secondary schools in Brooklyn and graduated from Franklin D. Roosevelt High School as a National Merit Scholar. He obtained his undergraduate degree in economics from Bucknell University. He then attended Fordham Law School, served as president of the Black Law Students Association, and passed the New York State Bar.