

convince people is to speak with authority. And if that authority is matched by knowledge then the chances for leadership are greatly enhanced.

The development of the concept of amphibious warfare was initiated by Marine Corps Commandants who combined authority with conviction and knowledge. From its origins during the tenures of Commandants John Lejeune, Wendell Neville, and Benjamin Fuller, through the establishment of the Fleet Marine Force under General John H. Russell, all Naval Academy graduates, the development of the Marine Corps as America's expeditionary force was the result of leadership. It was backed by the experience of campaigns in the Caribbean, Central America, the Pacific and China. These leaders spoke with authority in directing new ideas because they had experienced the old ideas and borne the scars.

Likewise, when Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Arleigh Burke (Class of 1923) began the project to build the first fleet ballistic missile submarine, he needed to convince both the civilian leadership and the Navy itself that the program required top priority. The authority of his presentation was fortified with his combat experience—and his reflections about the deterrence implications of that experience.

A leader strengthens others. A good leader does not seek to impose his or her own attitudes or solutions on others. Rather, the leader provides the support and guidance that prompts others to have confidence in their own abilities and decision-making.

When Fleet Admiral Chester Nimitz (Class of 1905) arrived to take command of the remnants of the Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor, his first effort was to renew the confidence of the staff and the commanding officers that they could go on to victory. Rather than making heads roll, he made them think. Rather than emphasizing the mistakes, he convinced his subordinates that they were the ones to overcome the past. Those who served under him recalled that his very "presence" seemed to give confidence wherever he was. He strengthened others to believe their abilities could achieve the crucial victory that they sought.

A leader remains optimistic and enthusiastic. To lead effectively, see the glass as half-full, not half-empty. Believe, every morning, that things are going to be better than before. Attitudes are infectious. Optimism and enthusiasm overcome the greatest challenges.

Captain John Paul Jones captured this idea with the immortal quote, "I have not yet begun to fight." I have a painting of that famous battle between the Bonhomme Richard and Serapis hanging in my office and it inspires me every day. John Paul Jones's spirit of optimism and enthusiasm has been a part of our Navy since the American Revolution.

A leader never compromises absolutes. Defense of American freedom and obedience to the Constitution of the United States are two absolutes the Naval Service lives by, and for which our Sailors and Marines may face death.

Admiral Hyman Rickover (Class of 1922), the father of the nuclear Navy—by whom I was interviewed for the Navy's nuclear program—vividly demonstrated this commitment to absolutes. He wanted to ensure there was no compromise in the safety of our submarines. And he did this by setting an example. Most Americans don't know that Admiral Rickover went on the first trial dive of every nuclear submarine the Navy built. He knew that it wasn't enough to simply certify on paper that a new submarine was safe. If Sailors were going to trust their lives to an untested submarine, he would go with them.

If something seemed like it was going wrong during the dive, he would calmly go to the compartment where the problem appeared and sit to watch the crew handle it. How could you be afraid when this small, wrinkled old man was not? How could you treat safety as anything but an absolute.

This leads to the final quality on this list of traits: example. The best leaders need fewer words than most, because they lead with their lives. In the sports world, example is not just ability, but both the willingness to lead and the humility to support a team effort that is stronger than one skilled individual. Roger Staubach class of '65 and David Robinson class of '87 are competitors who set the example as both leaders and teammates.

Among today's Naval leaders, Rear Admiral Anthony Watson, class of 1970, has set an example that many young Americans have decided to follow. Raised in a public housing project in Chicago, he was a recognized leader in every position from midshipman to Commanding Officer to Deputy Commandant here, and became the first African-American submariner to make flag rank. He takes over soon as Commander of the Navy Recruiting Command, a position that demands a very public example.

And finally, I want to mention an academy graduate who exemplifies the fact that women in the Navy and Marine Corps no longer face any limits to their dreams. Since the age of ten, LCDR Wendy Lawrence, class of 1981, dreamed of becoming an astronaut. Three years ago she fulfilled that childhood dream. She became the first female naval aviator chosen by NASA for the astronaut program and was a mission specialist on the shuttle Endeavour's last mission. LCDR Lawrence demonstrates that what matters to the Naval service, above all else, is your performance as an officer. Man or woman, you will rise as high as your abilities will take you.

These eight traits of leadership provide a path, a course that has been marked for almost two thousand years.

There is a long line of Naval heroes before you . . . men and women tried by history. Your turn has come. That's what you were trained for. That is why the Naval Academy has existed for 150 years. Not just to educate . . . not just to train you in the arts of war . . . not just to provide competent officers. But to instill you with a commitment and tradition of service and leadership that will remain with you forever.

In character and in deed, you will always be the ones to set the example. This institutional is unique because its mission is to ensure that in your hearts you are unique . . . that foremost and everywhere the defense of American liberty will remain your task . . . whether in the Naval Service or elsewhere. Those people behind you are counting on you. When you shake hands with me as you receive your diploma, let's regard it as a pact—a bond between two graduates of this extraordinary institution—to be as worthy as we can possibly be of those who have gone before us . . . of those who march with us today . . . and of those who will follow us. In a few moments, your diploma and our handshake will seal that bond. And then the real challenge will begin.

God bless you. God bless the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps. And God bless America.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EHLERS addressed the House. HIS remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### IN OPPOSITION TO FRANCE'S RESUMPTION OF NUCLEAR TESTING IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as a Member from the Pacific Islands, I rise again in strong protest of France's decision to resume detonating nuclear bombs in the South Pacific on French Polynesia's Moruroa Atoll.

French President Jacques Chirac claims that the eight atomic bomb explosions planned—about one a month between this September and next May—are completely safe to the environment. I am not persuaded.

The people of the Pacific know from firsthand experience the horrors associated with nuclear bomb explosions and testing. As an American, I am not proud of the legacy of the United States testing program of the 1940's, the 1950's, and the 1960's on Bikini and Rongelap Atolls in the Marshall Islands. Even now, a half-century later, that bitter legacy is still being felt in the Marshall Islands.

In particular, I have long believed that when the United States detonated the "Bravo Shot" on Bikini Atoll—a 15-megaton thermonuclear bomb, a 1,000 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb—the Marshall Islanders residing on nearby Rongelap and Utirik Atolls were deemed expendable. These Pacific islanders justifiably believe they were used as "guinea pigs" and test subjects for nuclear radiation experiments conducted by our Nation. People there have not forgotten memories of the offspring of Pacific islander women infected by radiation from the nuclear explosions—where babies were born dead and didn't look human and were sometimes called "jelly babies."

Although our country, decades ago, stopped its nuclear testing in the Pacific, our Nation is still mired in the process of facing responsibility and making financial reparations for the devastating impact that our nuclear bomb explosions had on the Pacific people of the Marshall Islands.

France has detonated over 200 nuclear bombs already, with almost all of those nuclear explosions taking place

□ 1430

in the South Pacific. After sustaining the incomprehensible destructive energy unleashed by these bombs, French Polynesia's Moruroa Atoll has been described by scientific researchers as a "Swiss cheese of fractured rock." Leakage of radioactive waste from the underground test sites to the surrounding waters and air has been predicted and is inevitable; this embodies the environmental nightmare that the people of the South Pacific have long dreaded.

According to the international physicians for the prevention of nuclear war, underground nuclear tests, such as those at Moruroa Atoll, cause radioactivity to leak out into the sea and reach human beings through the food chain. Previous nuclear explosives in the South Pacific have resulted in a number of epidemic-like outbreaks in surrounding communities, where symptoms included damage to the nervous system, paralysis, impaired vision, nausea and diarrhoea. I do not find it surprising that reports of increased cancer rates among Tahitians have surfaced. The damage to the marine environment can only be imagined.

Political leaders in French Polynesia, including French Polynesia's President Gaston Flosse, have registered strong objection to resume nuclear testing in their homeland. A hostile reaction from the Tahitian public is generating and efforts to discourage violence are being undertaken. Understandably, the people of French Polynesia are greatly disturbed by the rebirth of the nuclear monster in their midst and the nuclear poison to be spawned.

I and many other Pacific islanders have the greatest respect for French oceanographer Jacques-Yves Cousteau, who over the years came to the shores of many South Pacific islands for research and while there gained a special sensitivity for the pacific lifestyle and our vital dependence on the sea. Jacques Cousteau, in my mind, is the leading international spokesman for protection of the environment and conservation of all forms of marine life.

I am gratified to learn that Jacques Cousteau has condemned his Government's decision to resume exploding nuclear bombs in the South Pacific. In a statement from Paris, Cousteau stated his regret that France has given in to outdated arguments, as great wars are of the past. Cousteau declared that today's wisdom makes it necessary to outlaw atomic arms.

With French opinion polls documenting Jacques Cousteau as the leading popular figure in France, I would urge him to take up the fight with the good people of France to stop their Government's resumption of nuclear bomb detonations in French Polynesia. Jacques Cousteau, perhaps more than anyone else, has a unique and keen appreciation of how nuclear bomb explosions constitute the ultimate rape of the South Pacific's fragile marine environment.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the good people of France, your Government has already exploded over 200 nuclear bombs and yet it seeks to further pollute the South Pacific with eight more nuclear bomb detonations. With the world moving toward agreement that nuclear weapons should be outlawed, France's action encourages the exact opposite. By dismissing criticism of additional tests with the excuse that France has tested less than other nuclear powers, France opens a Pandora's box that may undermine negotiation of a comprehensive test ban treaty. This also leaves the door open to justify China's nuclear testing program and the fact that China has only tested 34 nuclear detonations, so by this reason let us allow China to test 174 times or explode 174 more nuclear bombs, and then in addition to that let us allow China to explode 900 more nuclear bombs to catch up with the United States.

What madness, Mr. Speaker. What madness.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following article:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1995]

CHIRAC, THE OLD NEO-GAULLIST, IN THE LEAD  
(By Craig R. Whitney)

TOURS, FRANCE, March 21.—Jacques Chirac, the Mayor of Paris, who has run for the French presidency and lost twice, now looks set to win on his third attempt, unless every public opinion poll is wrong or some surprise turns up before the runoff on May 7.

Mr. Chirac surged past his fellow conservative, Prime Minister Édouard Balladur, a month ago to become the favorite to succeed President François Mitterrand, a Socialist, who has been in office 14 years.

How Mr. Chirac, a 62-year-old conservative politician, has managed to make himself the image of change incarnate is the phenomenon of the 1995 presidential campaign.

His supporters say he has done it by patiently cultivating the grass roots since the summer of 1993 and listening hard to what voters say they want. With unemployment stuck at over 12 percent and French industries struggling under the burdens of an expansive welfare state, what many voters want is change, and Mr. Chirac has convinced a lot of them that he can deliver.

Although himself a graduate of the elite School of National Administration, Mr. Chirac says he wants to free France from technocrats and restore the egalitarian values that have given the country vitality for 200 years. He has promised job creation by making it less costly for businesses to hire new employees.

By now, Mr. Chirac is greeted by big crowds wherever he goes. Five thousands people—students and pensioners, farmers and workers—packed a fairgrounds hall outside Tours on Tuesday night to hear him explain how he would restore hope and unity to a country that he says is troubled by a lack of self-confidence.

"What I expect from him if he wins is a big reduction in unemployment," said Jean-Charles Paronnaud, a 28-year-old unemployed supermarket clerk.

Another supporter, Marie-Jeanne Avril, said: "I'm here because I'm an old Gaullist. For 45 years I've been voting for the general, even though he left us long ago, and this time I'll vote for Chirac."

Mr. Chirac founded his and Mr. Balladur's party, Rally for the Republic, in 1976 to per-

petuate the legacy of President Charles de Gaulle, the founder of the Fifth Republic. He often shares the general's stubborn vision of France's destiny in a Europe of proudly separate countries rather than as part of a federal United States of Europe.

Given France's economic and financial problems, if he does win this spring Mr. Chirac may also need de Gaulle's ability to convince people that he knows what they want and then to carry through on it, whether they like it or not.

"Politicians all make promises, but this is the first time I've met one who actually seemed interested in listening to me," said Jacques Maurice, a 47-year-old homeless man from Pithiviers whom Mr. Chirac met on the way to Tours. "He'll get my vote," Mr. Maurice said.

Part of Mr. Chirac's appeal has been that, unlike the stiff Mr. Balladur, Mr. Chirac seems to enjoy rubbing elbows with voters and to be at ease with himself. On his campaign tour, he wore a dark green top coat over his suit, and his slicked-back hair looked almost as much in need of a trim as Mr. Maurice's.

But Mr. Chirac's personal image is carefully thought out, as is the impassioned delivery of his campaign speech—a crooning baritone that always recites a prepared text. Nonetheless, his hourlong stump speech here was often drowned out by cheers. "I refuse the idea that one France, more and more people all the time, is doomed to be left behind while the other is more and more heavily taxed to come to its aid with welfare instead of jobs," he told the crowd. "We have to break this vicious circle."

Audiences have also taken to his pro-Main Street, anti-Wall Street style. Capital should be at the service of the people it employs, he tells them, not parked in high-yield bonds.

More and more people are obviously convinced that he has the right answers. Two public opinion polls published on Tuesday showed Mr. Chirac pulling farther ahead of both his Socialist opponent, Lionel Jospin, and Mr. Balladur.

With at least four other candidates expected to be in the race, Mr. Chirac could win about 29 percent of the vote in the election's first round on April 23, the two surveys indicated, with as much as 22 percent for Mr. Jospin and 17 percent for the Prime Minister. A poll for the weekly magazine *Express* showed Mr. Chirac could handily defeat either candidate in the runoff between the two top vote-getters on May 7.

Though he served as Prime Minister under Mr. Mitterrand between 1986 and 1988, Mr. Chirac seldom mentions him by name. He ran against Mr. Mitterrand in 1988 for the presidency, and lost.

When the conservatives won the parliamentary elections in March 1993, Mr. Chirac chose to stay in city hall and let Mr. Balladur find out the hard way what it was like to be Prime Minister and run for President at the same time.

If he has been vindicated by that choice, Mr. Chirac also has some things to live down. One of them is what critics characterized as a chauvinist appeal to the nation made at the end of 1978, when he called for a disavowal of Mr. Giscard d'Estaing's pro-European policies, and spoke darkly of the menace of "the foreigners' party." Ever since, some politicians in Germany have questioned what relations with France would be like if Mr. Chirac became President.

German prowess remains very much on Mr. Chirac's mind. Speaking of the possibility of establishing a common European currency by the end of the decade, Mr. Chirac said he might call for a referendum to be sure France wanted to merge the franc with the German mark and other bills.

"The core of the problem, as General de Gaulle often said, is not whether we surrender this or that bit of sovereignty, but whether we do so on the same terms as Germany does," he said.

#### WE NEED ANSWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some reluctance, but with some determination, to raise some questions about a very serious matter that occurred a short time ago. Together with Captain O'Grady we all thank God upon his return. It was, in fact, a miracle that he has been returned to us seemingly unharmed, and for that we are all very, very grateful, but I think some questions need to be asked about the circumstances under which Captain O'Grady had found himself in the air within the range of a SAM SA-6 missile.

In reviewing some news reports and some quotes of some individuals recently, I was prompted to go back to a report that the House Republican task force on terrorism and unconventional warfare issued in June of 1993 about issues related to this subject. In that month we issued a report, and I would like to read a part of it because it has a direct bearing on this issue.

Part of the report says the Serbian forces operate four SAM regiments, with the main concentration of Serb air defenses around the Banja Luka Air Base, including one SA-2 regiment, one battery of SA-6's, and one battery of old triple-A anti-aircraft weaponry. Now this Banja Luka Air Base also has a facility located on it that repairs and upgrades SA-6 missiles. This was all confirmed in June of 1994 by a well-respected defense publication known as Jane's Defense Weekly when they confirmed all of the information we had in 1993. Unfortunately for us, I think, on June 2 General Shalikashvili, in being interviewed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, said, and I quote:

"We had absolutely no intelligence that Serb SAM's were in the area. For months," he said, "if not for years, there had never been detected an air defense site in that area," and he said the words "Banja Luka."

So I have very serious concerns about the fact that we knew this 3 years ago, that Jane's Defense Weekly reported it in 1994, and our top officials at the Pentagon seemingly had no idea that this in fact was the case, and so I think it raises some very, very important questions.

We read in the other news report more recently, June 13, after we released our report from 1993 just recently to the press, and that was reported that Ken Bacon, spokesman at the Pentagon, said at that time, "Finally, we were well aware of the Banja Luka facility where the Bosnian Serbs

repair and maintain surface-to-air missile systems. The F-16 that Captain O'Grady was flying on June 2 was shot down outside of the area known as the threat envelope of the Banja Luka SAMs."

Now the F-16, as far as I can determine from news reports and from other information that we have been able to gather, was shot down less than 40 kilometers from Banja Luka. It is important to know that these SA-6's are track-mounted vehicles along with a second track-mounted vehicle which carries the radar which integrates into the system, travels 30 or 40 miles per hour, and so certainly it should have been considered, in my opinion, within the envelope that short distance from Banja Luka, and it seems to me that anyone making plans to carry out these missions should have taken that into consideration.

So I think this raises at least three questions, maybe more:

No. 1, what intelligence did the field commanders have at their disposal while making these very, very important and life-threatening decisions?

No. 2, what were the operational policies, and where were they made? What were the operational policies?

Our information is that there were 2 F-16's, and normally, if there is a threat of surface-to-air missiles, there are five aircraft, including radar jamming aircraft. I believe F-4's, known as Wild Weasels, would normally accompany our F-16's on these types of missions to guard against the type of events that actually happened.

No. 3, was it not reasonable to assume that Banja Luka, less than 40 kilometers away, was in fact part of the dangerous envelope into which these airplanes were flying?

So I would just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying this:

In 1993 we were able to gain information that said this was a danger. Jane's Weekly reported in 1994 that this was a danger. Captain O'Grady was shot down proving that it was a danger, and we planned and carried out the mission anyway.

I would like answers to those questions. I have requested the same. I have requested Chairman SPENCE to hold hearings on this issue. I would like to know who is making these decisions, and where they are being made, and under what circumstances they are being made. We have other pilots, soldiers and sailors to think about. I believe this is a very serious issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, today I attended the annual memorial service held at the two Jima Memorial in Arlington, VA sponsored by the Correctional Peace Officers Foundation, Inc., as part of National Correctional Peace Officers Memorial Week. This service was held to commemorate the sacrifice of those correctional peace officers who died in the line of duty and to honor their families. I should like to submit for the RECORD the names of those individuals honored, together with the circumstances surrounding the individuals' deaths.

Inspector Stephen Stewart, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Huntsville, Texas. Killed on January 7, 1994. Surviving: Wife, Debbie Stewart and three children, Clayton—age 22, Casey—age 21, and David—age 11½. Mr. Stewart was a Correctional Officer prior to promoting to Inspector. While transporting an inmate work crew, his vehicle spun out in gravel overturning the vehicle. Inspector Stewart was killed at the site.

Group Supervisor Arnold Garcia, Los Angeles County Probation Department, Dorothy Kirby Center Residential Facility, Downey, California. Killed on April 4, 1994. Surviving: Wife, Alma Garcia and four children, Christian—age 15, Fatima—age 11, Joseph—age 8, and Anthony—age 2. Supervisor Garcia was struck in the head with a desk leg and beaten to death by two wards who attacked him during the graveyard shift in the dormitory housing unit. The two wards were apprehended in a railroad yard trying to leave the area.

Correctional Officer Dennis Stemen, Allen Correctional Institution, Ohio Department of Corrections, Lima, Ohio. Killed on July 5, 1994. Surviving: Wife, Patty Stemen and four children, Elizabeth—age 9½, Johah—age 7½, Jordan—age 5, and Bethany—age 3. Officer Stemen was killed following a transportation detail of an inmate to a hospital for treatment. After dropping off the inmate at the hospital some hours from his institution, he and another correctional officer were asked to stay and work due to a shortage of correctional officers at the hospital. Later, they started the long drive back to their facility when the vehicle they were driving left the road causing Officer Stemen's death. He was killed when he was ejected from the State van.

Correctional Sergeant Marc Perse, Colorado Territorial Correctional Facility, Colorado Department of Correction, Canon City, Colorado. Killed on August 15, 1994. Surviving: Wife, Pam Perse. While a member of the S.O.R.T. TEAM, Sgt. Perse was killed during a rappelling training exercise which required him to rappel down a 90 foot tower. Sergeant Perse was killed when his equipment failed.

Warden Charles Farquhar and wife Doris Farquhar, State Cattle Ranch, Alabama Department of Corrections, Greensboro, Alabama. Killed on October 23, 1994. Surviving: Son Robbie and his wife Nita, and two grandchildren, Drew—age 11, and Charlie—age 5. Warden Farquhar and his wife Doris were assaulted by trustee inmates at the State Cattle Ranch, beaten to death and then burned in their house. Several inmates were also killed trying to come to the Farquhar's aid.

Correctional Officer Louis Perrine, Powder River Correctional Facility, Oregon Department of Corrections. Killed on November 17, 1994. Surviving: Wife, Marilyn and three children, Steven—age 29, Anthony—age 27, and