

HUBZones. My proposal will allow any small business located in a HUBZone and employing people in the HUBZone to obtain a reasonable and meaningful preference in competing for Federal Government contracts against other businesses not located in a HUBZone.

My proposal begins to return the idea behind the 8(a) program to its roots, when it was targeted to inner city areas after the riots following the assassination of Martin Luther King. In this case, government contract set-asides were used to bring in new businesses to areas trying to recover from the dramatic damage and tension that accompanies a riot, such as those that occurred in 1968.

The HUBZone replacement for today's 8(a) program should not be limited, however, to inner cities. My program creates hope and opportunity for all cities, rural areas, and Native American communities that have not prospered while other more affluent areas of our country have flourished.

For too long, we have overlooked programs to bring jobs and wealth to economically distressed areas of our Nation. We now have an opportunity to take a positive step to provide long overdue help where help is needed in our country. The HUBZone proposal will create a powerful private-public partnership to give opportunity to small businesses who locate in economically distressed areas and to give hope to people who have not had much chance until now to pull themselves up the economic ladder. •

#### THE NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION PROGRAM

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, this Defense appropriations bill includes \$7.5 million for the National Security Education Program. I want to congratulate my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for ensuring funding for this important program.

The National Security Education Program has enjoyed bipartisan support. President Bush signed the National Security Education Act, which established the National Security Education Program, in December 1991. The chief Senate sponsor of the bill was Senator David Boren, who is now president of the University of Oklahoma. Senators NUNN and WARNER were co-sponsors.

The National Security Education Program was designed to support study abroad by U.S. students. The program emphasizes the study of foreign languages and preparation for possible careers in national security. Funds go to U.S. institutions, undergraduate scholarships, and graduate fellowships.

The program guarantees a return on the Federal investment by requiring that recipients of fellowships and scholarships be obligated to serve in a Federal Government agency or an educational institution in the area of study for which the scholarship or fellowship was awarded.

According to CRS, this is the only major Federal program that supports study abroad by U.S. citizen undergraduate students.

The program operates from interest on a trust fund, based on a one-time 1992 appropriation of \$150 million. In fiscal year 1995, the trust fund yielded \$15 million.

Pressured to find savings in these tight budget times, the Appropriations Committee voted to cut funding for the program and eliminate the trust fund in the Defense supplemental bill we considered earlier this year. I offered an amendment on the Senate floor that restored funding for the program. The amendment was accepted on a voice vote.

A compromise was reached in conference whereby all 1995 funding was saved but the trust fund was reduced from \$150 million to \$75 million. This was a fair compromise given that the House also had originally voted to eliminate the program.

I am pleased that for fiscal year 1996, the Appropriations Committee decided to continue funding for the program, even though it is necessarily based on a smaller trust fund which yields less interest than it had previously. This is an effective program that addresses a serious national interest and I commend the committee for its wise action.

Foreign language proficiency is crucial to our national defense and security but there is much that needs to be done. Of the 500,000 American troops the United States sent to the Persian Gulf, only five could translate Iraqi intelligence documents. The United States has the only foreign service in the world you can get into without the knowledge of a foreign language.

Foreign language proficiency and knowledge of other cultures is also important for our economic competitiveness. There is a simple rule of business: "You can buy in any language, but if you want to sell you have to speak the language of your customer." The fact is that four out of five new jobs in the United States are created through foreign trade.

An article that appeared on the front page of the business section of the Sunday Los Angeles Times on August 28, 1994 noted that: "In a global economy, study and business experience abroad are critical. Yet Americans stay home while 400,000 foreign students come here to learn."

Last year, the National Security Education Program supported 317 students from 150 U.S. institutions who studied in 48 countries with 34 different languages. The average award was \$8,000 per student. Cutting the program would yield very small savings. But the dividends from such programs are very real.

I hope the Senate can maintain support for this program when the bill moves to conference.

I thank my colleagues. •

#### COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FORMAL SURRENDER OF THE EMPIRE OF JAPAN

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise to offer my thoughts on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the formal surrender of the Empire of Japan and the end of World War II.

Mr. President, September 2, 1995, marked the day, 50 years ago, that the Empire of Japan signed documents of surrender aboard the U.S.S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, formally ending World War II. It is fitting that America commemorated the anniversary of this most pivotal event in human history—the victory of the free world over three irredeemable regimes in which human evil was institutionalized and directed toward world conquest: Germany's nazism, Italy's fascism, and Japan's militaristic imperialism.

In the 2,194 days of World War II, more than 50 million human beings lost their lives. This horrific total includes nearly 300,000 Americans killed in combat, six million Jews murdered in Europe, and one million Chinese slain in the Japanese rape of Nanking.

Fifty years ago, a vicious war had finally ended, but ancient cities lay in ruins. Mighty armies had been vanquished. Proud cultures had been decimated. But today, one overriding truth has gradually become clear: Though much was lost, far more has since been gained.

In the European theater, World War II saw the indescribable bravery of American teenagers at Normandy and Pointe du Hoc, and the unfathomable butchery of the Third Reich. In the Pacific, the hallowed places of valor, suffering, and self-sacrifice continue to echo down the halls of American history: Bataan, Corregidor, Midway, Iwo Jima, Okinawa.

The vast scope of World War II encompassed the final cavalry charge and the first wartime use of the atomic bomb. It is fitting and proper that, 50 years after the end of this conflict, all Americans quietly reflect upon the meaning of the war, and, in particular, upon the awesome destructive power unleashed by these bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki from a U.S. Air Force B-29, killing 200,000. This act of American servicemen, done in our name, does not make them—or us—warmongers. On the contrary, the soldier, sailor, and aviator above all yearn for peace—even while obeying all moral and reasonable orders of civilian leaders—because he or she endures the greatest fear and anguish from war.

Mr. President, our ongoing national debate over the propriety of America's use of these weapons reflects an active national moral conscience. It is an indication that Americans continue to care about what was done by their Government in their name. It signals our appreciation that national choices have moral consequences for which all Americans are responsible. In the case

of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, these consequences continue to reverberate through American and world history.

Fifty years after the fact, it is difficult to recapture the national mood and historical context of August 1945. The temptation of latter-day historians is to narrowly focus on only these two events—as destructive and horrible as Hiroshima and Nagasaki were—apart from the historical context in which they occurred. This is sometimes done with the intent to advance a particular agenda or political point of view. This tendency, known as historical revisionism, was recently seen in the controversy over the *Enola Gay* exhibit at the Smithsonian, and in the debate over changing “V-J Day” to “Victory in the War of the Pacific,” to avoid offending Japanese sensitivities.

Hiroshima and Nagasaki cannot be accurately assessed in the abstract. These events are directly linked to Okinawa, Iwo Jima, Bataan, and, of course, Pearl Harbor, where the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial bears silent witness to the memory of 1,177 American sailors who died on the morning of December 7, 1941. The average age of the 1,102 who, to this day, remain entombed in the *Arizona*’s watery grave, is 18. These teenaged sailors were heroes before they were men.

Some armchair historians, safely ensconced in ivory towers, issue moral condemnations of the very acts of war that saved American lives and, in large measure, preserved their freedom to issue those condemnations. They enjoy the benefits of freedom—particularly, the freedom to dissent—with little appreciation of its costs. They don’t adequately appreciate that freedom is not free, but has been purchased with the blood of young Americans whose names they will never know. In re-writing the events that preserved their freedom, and the freedom of much of the world, they engage in more than dubious scholarship; they dishonor the memory of those of whom General MacArthur said, “they fought and died \* \* \* and left the air singing with their honor.”

A credible historian must endeavor to learn the lessons of history. To learn these lessons, he or she must know the facts on which the lessons are based.

Mr. President, to fairly evaluate Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the historian must strive to see the world as Truman saw it, and to fully embrace the objective facts that he confronted. In this evaluation, all are entitled to their own opinions; none are entitled to their own facts. And facts can be stubborn things. What were the facts on which Truman based his fateful decision to use the atomic bomb?

Truman, as Commander in Chief, was responsible, not only for determining and prosecuting military strategy, but also for the lives of his troops. As a World War I combat veteran, he knew well the brutality of war, and regarded his duty to minimize American casualties to be a sacred moral obligation. One can only imagine the firestorm of

criticism if, in 1947, it was revealed that America had a weapon—no matter how destructive or horrible—that just might have saved American lives had it been used. George Elsey, a young naval intelligence officer in constant contact with Truman prior to and at the time the decision was made, believes that “the answer is impeachment.”

Truman knew well the high cost already paid in taking back the Pacific islands: Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Saipan, Midway. At Iwo Jima—where, in the immortal words of Adm. Chester Nimitz, “uncommon valor was a common virtue”—more marines were killed than in the entire Korean war.

And then, there was Okinawa, the bloodiest battle of the Pacific War and the last great engagement of World War II. Okinawa demonstrated with brutal clarity how viciously the Japanese would fight to defend their home islands. Nearly 190,000 Army and Marine combat troops and an armada of 1,200 ships—second in size only to the Normandy invasion—began the assault. In less than three months of battle, 12,000 Americans were killed, a total representing nearly 25 percent of all the American deaths from 9 years of war in Vietnam. A 19-year-old soldier wrote of the butchery of Okinawa in his last letter home 2 days before he was killed: “the fear is not so much of death itself \* \* \* [as it is] the terror and anguish and utter horror in the final moments that precede death in this battle.”

The losses suffered by American ships and sailors at Okinawa remain the greatest in world naval history: 30 ships sunk, 368 damaged, and more than 5,000 sailors killed by kamikaze attacks during a battle fought after it was clear to the world that Japan had lost the war.

Mr. President, using Iwo Jima and Okinawa as a measure, according to a Pentagon briefing received by Truman, a minimum of 250,000 and as many as 600,000 American lives would be lost in an invasion of the home islands, predicted to be fought out for over a year, island by island, beach by beach, cave to cave, and, in the end, hand to hand. Douglas MacArthur and Winston Churchill both estimated that one million allied soldiers would be killed in an invasion of Honshu, Hokkaido, Shikoku, and Kyushu, the Japanese home islands.

The Pentagon predicted 20,000 Americans would die in the first month alone. For Truman, this potential human cost was intolerable. If there was a way—any way—to avoid such bloodshed, it seemed worth taking. Historian David McCollough said the explanation for why Truman used the bomb was one word: “Okinawa. He wanted to stop the killing.”

I believe this one fact, standing alone, fully justified Truman’s decision to use the atom bomb on Japan: Not one American life was lost in an invasion of the heavily fortified home islands of the Empire of Japan.

Additional facts also support Truman’s decision. Some revisionists argue that the bomb was unnecessary because Japan was planning to surrender. This is plainly refuted by the facts. Three days after the *Enola Gay* dropped the bomb on Hiroshima, killing 70,000 people and virtually destroying the city, the Chief of Staff of the Japanese Army, Gen. Yoshijiro Umezu, assured the Supreme War Council meeting in Tokyo that his troops could “turn back the invading American force and get better terms than the unconditional surrender” demanded by the Allies. On August 9, in a meeting in his bomb shelter, Umezu was interrupted by an officer who announced that a second nuclear weapon had been dropped on Nagasaki. The General’s response: “I can say with confidence that we will be able to destroy the major part of an invading force.”

The Japanese leadership was caught between a realization of the inevitability of defeat and their cultural tradition in which suicide was honorable, and surrender was sacrilege. They did not want a negotiated peace. They chose, instead, to commit national suicide. As the Japanese War Minister, General Anami, said, “would it not be wondrous for this whole nation to be destroyed like a beautiful flower?”

Emperor Hirohito’s war-ending statement confirmed the role the atomic bombs played in ending the war. Hirohito cited the atomic bomb, which Japan was then hurriedly developing, in his taped broadcast to the nation announcing Japan’s surrender on August 15, 1945. “The enemy has begun to employ a most cruel bomb, the power of which to do damage is indeed incalculable. To continue would result in the collapse and obliteration of the Japanese nation.”

So, in assessing whether the atomic bomb was needed to shorten the war and to save the lives of American and Allied soldiers, let us not forget: The surrender of Japan did not occur until 5 days after the second atomic bomb was dropped.

Americans must not glorify in what was done at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but neither should we apologize for it. It is indeed a paradox of the 20th century that the weapons of war are, at times, necessary to end war, to prevent war, and to advance the cause of peace. But, in view of the war’s end and the 50 year peace that has ensued, Pacific war veterans can take pride in just that.

In August 1995, Japan is endowed with political stability and is a thriving nation of human freedom and enterprise. The rubble of war has, phoenix-like, arisen from the ashes as an international center of democracy, culture, and learning. It is a historical aberration that the vanquished of August 1945 arguably benefited more than the victors. World War II freed the Japanese and German people from evil, destructive regimes and re-directed their national potential in ways that have brought their people, and the world,

unquantifiable economic, political, and cultural benefits. Japan, with few natural resources, now produces over 10 percent of the world's goods and services, and has become our friend and ally, our partner in peace and economic enterprise, a source of stability in the bustling Pacific rim, and a major engine of international commerce.

So, as we commemorate the 50 years of peace and stability that began at the end of World War II, let us not forget the ultimate sacrifice made by 300,000 young American soldiers, sailors, and aviators who accomplished the redemption of the Earth.

Surely, these young men and women from Arizona, Iowa, Louisiana, Missouri, and every other State of the Union, realized the risks they ran and the ultimate price that they might pay. But they also knew that, while the price of freedom is high, the price of oppression is far higher. With the courage of this conviction, they willingly offered their lives to defend transcendent principle and to preserve the promise of freedom for fellow human beings born and yet unborn. They fought for neither power nor treasure, and the only foreign land they now revere lies beneath countless crosses and Stars of David where their fallen comrades rest.

America's World War II veterans embody all that is strong, noble and true about this Nation. They and their departed friends—and all others who have protected the United States in peacetime and in war—served as good soldiers and good citizens. Their high standard of allegiance has enriched our national consciousness and has cultivated and sustained a sense of purpose and patriotism in Americans across this great land. In selflessly laying their lives on the line, they helped ensure that, throughout the world, the strong are just, the weak secure, and the peace preserved for generations to come.

Mr. President, in this year of commemoration, I know I share the sentiments of all Americans in saying to World War II veterans and their families: I salute you. Your country thanks you. God bless each of you.●

#### CENTENARIAN THOMAS STAVALONE

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of a great American, Thomas Stavalone. On September 14 of this year, Thomas Stavalone of Saratoga Ave., Rochester, NY, will be celebrating an event few others have been privileged to achieve; he will be 100 years old.

Born in a suburb of Naples, Italy, in the village of Peturo in 1895, Tom emigrated to America in 1904 at the tender age of 9. Together with his family, he originally settled in the Scio Street area, later relocating to the old 9th Ward section of Rochester, which he still calls home. He attended No. 5

School, where he met the girl he would eventually marry.

On June 30, 1917, Tom married his sweetheart, Immaculate LaMarca. She lived to the age of 90, passing away in 1987, after they had celebrated their 70th wedding anniversary. They had four children, Lawrence, Amelia, Margie and Thomas, Jr., who died in infancy.

As a sports enthusiast during his youth, he preferred to be an active participant rather than an observer. Tom is also an avid outdoorsman, enjoying both hunting and fishing. He would always share his bountiful catch with neighbors and friends.

Tom worked in several Rochester shoe factories over the years, but when he retired in 1962 it was from a position with the Rochester Transit Authority.

Tom's chief activity today is gardening, but he also enjoys playing bocce and watching Yankee games. No matter what the weather, he walks daily to the Stardust Room at Edgerton Park to share in their senior citizen lunches. There he also enjoys the camaraderie of both neighbors and friends.

Tom has witnessed 17 men rise to become the President of our country extending from Teddy Roosevelt to Bill Clinton. During his 100 years, Tom has seen the progress in transportation go from the horse and buggy age to man landing on the Moon; mass communication has evolved from just the printed word to radio, and even computers; entertainment has extended from vaudeville to video. Times have certainly changed and Tom Stavalone has been there to witness these many changes.

His family and friends will honor him with a gala celebration on September 17, 1995, at the Mapledale Party House in Rochester, NY. I want to thank Tom for his many contributions to the betterment of our world and with him a very happy 100th birthday.●

#### RICHARD TISSIERE

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, on Friday, September 8, following closely on the heels of our national celebration of the American worker, a prominent labor leader in my State will be honored for his many achievements on behalf of all New Jerseyans and my State's labor movement. Richard Tissiere, the business manager and president of the Laborers' Union Local 472, AFL-CIO, has devoted a lifetime of energy, enthusiasm, and hard work to both the local 472, his community and our country.

Richie Tissiere's commitment to his union, exemplified by his perfect attendance record at union meetings for the entire 43 years of his membership, has contributed to the hard-won achievements of the American work force. Today's American worker enjoys a living wage, company paid health benefits, safe working conditions and a 5-day workweek as a direct result of the fruits of the labor of America's unions. This uniquely American com-

pact between labor and management has rightly been the envy of the world. As the role of unions in today's work force undergoes growing pains, we must remember that we all—rich and poor, management and worker—are in this together. For most of our history as an industrialized nation we have understood this fact. We understood that workers were not interchangeable parts but partners in a quest for productivity and partners in a community. Richie Tissiere understands this compact and has devoted himself to ensuring that America's unique partnership between worker and employer remains a vibrant part of our society.

Richie Tissiere's contributions to New Jersey have been many and they have been varied. I have had the pleasure of working with Richie when he served on my Labor Advisory Board in the State which is only one of the ways that Richie has touched so many of his fellow New Jerseyans. Generations of young soccer players have Richie and area labor unions to thank for supporting their leagues, boys and girls in Newark can tip their hats to Richie for his support of their youth clubs, and thousands of construction, highway, and mass transit workers appreciate the role Richie has played in the booming construction industry in the State.

It is indeed fitting that the Essex-West Hudson Labor Council, AFL-CIO will pay tribute to Richie Tissiere, a fine New Jerseyan and a dedicated union supporter at their annual Labor Day Parade.●

#### THE VISIT OF COMTE RENE DE CHAMBRUN TO THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CELEBRATING MICROFILMING OF LAFAYETTE PAPERS

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress, I want to bring to the attention of this body an agreement between the Library of Congress and the Comte Rene de Chambrun of France to microfilm the Lafayette papers. In June, the Librarian of Congress, Dr. James Billington, agreed to begin microfilming the collection and make it available to scholars from all over the world by 1996. Rene de Chambrun, the great-great grandson of the Marquis de Lafayette, will be honored this evening, Lafayette's birthday, at a dinner sponsored by Congress and the Library.

Many will remember Rene de Chambrun who, like his ancestor Lafayette, was held in high esteem by his American counterparts during World War II. Through a web of connections in the United States, Chambrun was able to convince President Roosevelt and others to send much needed military equipment to Britain in mid 1940. The assistance, instigated by Chambrun, was no small factor in the Battle of Britain—the first battle