

their children. Our graduates are skilled not only in mathematics, science, and social studies, but also have solid backgrounds in sports, debate teams, and other extracurricular activities. This diverse upbringing makes military academy recruiters sit up and take note—indeed, many recruiters know our towns and schools by name.

Since the 1830's, Members of Congress have enjoyed meeting, talking with, and nominating these superb young people to our military academies. But how did this process evolve?

In 1843, when West Point was the sole academy, Congress ratified the nominating process and became directly involved in the makeup of our military's leadership. This was not an act of an imperial Congress bent on controlling every aspect of the Government. Rather, the procedure still used today was and is one further check and balance in our democracy. It was originally designed to weaken and divide political coloration in the officer corps, provide geographical balance to our armed services, and to make the officer corps more resilient to unfettered nepotism that handicapped European armies.

In 1854, Representative Gerrit Smith of New York added a new component to the academy nomination process—the academy review board. This was the first time a Member of Congress appointed prominent citizens from his district to screen applicants and assist with the serious duty of nominating candidates for academy admission. Today, I am honored to continue this wise tradition in my service to the 11th Congressional District.

The Academy Review Board is composed of nine local citizens who have shown exemplary service to New Jersey, to their communities, and to the continued excellence of education in our area—many are veterans. Though from diverse background and professions, they all share a common dedication to seeing that the best qualified and motivated graduates attend our academies. And, as is true for most volunteer panels, their service goes largely unnoticed.

I would like to take a moment to recognize these men and women and to thank them publicly for participating in this important panel. Being on this board requires hard work and an objective mind. Members have the responsibility of interviewing upwards of 50 outstanding high school seniors every year in the academy review process.

The nomination process follows a general timetable. High school seniors mail personal information directly to the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy once they become interested in attending. Information includes academic achievement, college entry test scores, and other activities. At this time, they also inform their Representative of their desire to be nominated.

The academies then assess the applicants, rank them based on the data supplied, and return the files to my office with their notations. In mid-December, our Academy Review Board interviews all of the applicants over the course of 2 days. They assess a student's qualifications and analyze character, desire to serve, and other talents that may be hidden on paper.

Last year, the board interviewed 41 applicants. Nominations included 20 to the Naval Academy, 10 to the Military Academy, 6 to the

Air Force Academy, and 1 to the Merchant Marine Academy (the Coast Guard Academy does not use the Congressional Nomination process). The Board then forwards their recommendations to the academies by January 31, where recruiters review files and notify applicants and my office of their final decisions on admission.

It is both reassuring and rewarding to know that many of our military officers hail from our hometowns or close by. When we consider the role of these officers in peace or war, we can rest easier knowing that the best and brightest are in command. Wherever they are sent, be that Bosnia, Somalia, Haiti, or Vietnam, many of these officers have academy training.

And while a few people may question the motivations and ambitions of some young people, the academy review process shows that the large majority of our graduates are just as highly motivated as the generation before them. They still seek guidance from loving parents, dedicated teachers, and schools, and from trusted clergy and rabbis. Indeed, every time I visit a school, speak at a college, or meet a young academy nominee, I am constantly reminded that we as a Nation are blessed with fine young men and women.

Their willingness and desire to serve their country is perhaps the most persuasive evidence of all.

ACADEMY NOMINEES FOR 1995, 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY

NAME, HOMETOWN, HIGH SCHOOL, AND ACADEMY
Justin White, Basking Ridge, Ridge, Naval.
Robert Vuolo, Morris Plains, Delbarton, Naval.

Renuka Vijayanathan, N. Caldwell, West Essex, Naval.

Kevin Orisini, Sparta, Sparta, Naval.
Meghan Neumann, Succasunna, Roxbury, Military.

John Eure, Rockaway, Morris Catholic, Naval.

Michael Kester, Bridgewater, Bridgewater/Raritan, Naval.

Patrick Nelson, Hackettstown, Bridgeton Academy, Naval.

Brian Fitzgerald, Mendham, West Morris Mendham, Naval.

Daniel Figenshu, Madison, Delbarton, Naval.

Richard Evans, Flanders, Mt. Olive, Naval.
Robert Poggio, Long Valley, West Morris Central, Naval.

Cory Winer, Wharton, Choate Rosemary Hall, Military.

Anthony Bruno, East Hanover, Hanover Park, Naval.

Louis Amorosa, Somerville, Immaculata, Naval.

Jason Corbisiero, Rockaway, Morris Catholic, Naval.

Andrew Gassman, Chatham, Oratory Prep, Naval.

Damon Finaldi, Florham Park, Hanover Park Regional, Naval.

Frederic Haeussler, Florham Park, Choate Rosemary Hall, Naval.

John Neuhart, Chatham, Ohio State ROTC, Naval.

Mary Faulkner, Long Valley, West Morris Central, Air Force.

Brent Krueel, Dover, Randolph, Air Force.
Jeffrey Melitski, Bernardsville, Bernardsville, Air Force.

Hunter Lonsberry, Morristown, Morristown Beard, Air Force.

Timothy Larkin, Long Valley, West Morris Central, Merchant Marine.

James Wong, Randolph, Randolph, Military.

Scott Magaziner, Randolph, Randolph, Air Force.

Mark Chiarvallotti, Rockaway, Penn State USMA Prep., Military.

Victor Camaya, Pompton Plains, Pequannock, Military.

Andrew Moan, Far Hills, Pingry, Naval.

Louis Kuo, Parsippany, Parsippany, Military.

Michael DeCicco, Raritan, Bridgewater/Raritan, Military.

David Esposito, Caldwell, James Caldwell, Military.

Joel Tompkins, Chatham, Chatham, Military.

Tatiana Kazdoba, Denville, Villa Walsh Academy, Naval.

Shane Rowe, Dover, New Mexico Military Institute, Military.

Thomas Rogers, Rockaway, Morris Knolls, Air Force.

TRIBUTE TO SIDDHARTHA SHANKAR RAY

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Siddhartha Shankar Ray for serving with distinction as India's Ambassador to the United States for the past 3½ years. During his tenure, relations between the United States and India have reached a new plateau of strength, friendship, and understanding. The United States has become India's largest investor, and India has been named by the Department of Commerce as one of the key emerging markets for United States business for this decade and the next century.

There are many reasons for this dramatic improvement in relations between our two countries. However, I believe it is clear that no one has made a greater contribution or played a more central role in this transformation than Siddhartha Shankar Ray. He has worked tirelessly with the Congress and the executive branch as well as State and local officials around the country to help ensure that our Government fully understands India's needs and concerns. He has been a bridge builder between the United States business and investment community and the Indian private and public sector. He has been a sought after speaker and commentator in the academic community here, along with numerous important think tanks and private foundations. Finally, Ambassador Ray has been an ambassador "par excellence" in the Indian-American community. He has travelled to almost every State and city with an Indian-American population reminding Americans of Indian descent and of the important economic reforms unfolding on the subcontinent, while urging Indian-Americans to be active participants in the transformation of the Indian economy.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Ray has greatly impressed many of us in the Congress with his artful diplomacy, his keen logic and his persuasive skills. He has taken the thorniest issues in the Indo-United States relationship and presented them to decision makers in the United States in a manner which has been both convincing and reassuring. It is obvious to anyone who has worked with him during the past several years that Ambassador Ray's skills as an imminent India barrister have

served India well during his term as Ambassador.

Of course, Ambassador Ray has not achieved all of these successes by himself. He possesses another invaluable asset: his lovely wife, Maya, who also is a noted barrister and former elected official. Maya Ray has been a gracious host, trusted advisor and articulate spokesperson. Together, they have proven to be a superb team.

Mr. Speaker, later this month, Siddhartha Shankar Ray will leave his position as Ambassador to the United States to return to Calcutta, his home city, to stand for election to the Lokh Sabha, India's House of Parliament. While it would be improper for any Member of this body on either side of the aisle to endorse a candidate for office in India, I am certain all of my colleagues agree that Ambassador Ray will approach the coming campaign with the same level of energy, dedication and articulate persuasion that were the hallmark of his years in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in wishing Siddhartha Shankar Ray and Maya every good wish in the months and years to come. We invite them to visit us in Washington often to witness the fruits of Ambassador Ray's labor as the Indo-United States relationship continues to grow and prosper.

SUPPORT PEACE AND DEMOCRACY IN TURKEY: SUPPORT HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 136

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, 1995, I joined the chairman of the Helsinki Commission, CHRIS SMITH, in introducing H. Con. Res. 136, legislation which advocates a peaceful end to the conflict between the Government of Turkey and Kurdish militants. I urge my colleagues to join us as cosponsors of this important resolution aimed at ending a vicious cycle of violence and terror which has claimed so many lives over the past decade and has eroded the impressive strides made by a government committed to achieving full-fledged democracy.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade Turkey's citizens, especially those residing in the southeast, have suffered the horrors of terrorism and the excesses of a government committed to eradicating terrorism at any cost. More than 20,000 people have died in clashes among security forces, the Kurdistan Workers Party [PKK] and shadowy Muslim fundamentalist groups. Turkish troops in southeast Turkey have forcibly evacuated or destroyed more than 2,650 Kurdish villages, burned crops, killed livestock, and displaced more than three million people. Citizens are detained, tortured, extrajudicially executed or disappear without a trace. The PKK has also killed innocent civilians, mined local roads, and set off bombs in populated areas—contributing to the cycle of violence and the climate of fear that pervades southeast Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, European newspapers printed color pictures of Turkish soldiers posing with the heads of decapitated Kurdish guerrillas. These gruesome and despicable photos all too graphically underline the

hatred and brutality fueling this conflict. But even more, the pictures reinforce the urgent need for reconciliation. Violence and terrorism will not resolve this conflict. Only dialog can help overcome bitterness inspired by 12 years of war. House Concurrent Resolution 136 promotes an end to violence and a beginning for efforts promoting reconciliation and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman SMITH and I are sending letters to officials of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe [OSCE] urging them to initiate and support steps to resolve the escalating conflict in Turkey. We believe the OSCE should establish a million of long-duration to monitor human rights abuses and help defuse sources of conflict and have asked that the OSCE chairman-in-office send a personal representative to develop recommendations concerning the mandate and scope of future OSCE activities in Turkey. We have also asked the president of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to designate a parliamentary delegation to Turkey to assist in this task. The OSCE has played a critical role in conflict prevention, mediation, and human rights monitoring in the former Yugoslavia, the Caucasus, the Baltic States, and elsewhere. An OSCE presence in Turkey would be especially helpful as local non-governmental organizations, international humanitarian groups, including the International Committee of the Red Cross, and even journalists are not allowed by authorities to operate freely in this region.

Mr. Speaker, Turkey and Israel are the only functional democratic states in the Middle East. Turkey is a NATO ally and OSCE member. The government's inability to peacefully and democratically resolve the Kurdish conflict jeopardizes Turkey's democratic foundations, drains a stumbling economy, threatens regional stability, and makes closer relations with Europe and the United States problematic. Our Government has been instrumental in helping resolve conflicts in the Middle East, the Balkans and elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, if we truly value our strategic, economic and political partnership with Turkey, and I believe we do, we must act now to help end this brutal conflict. It is precisely because of that partnership that we seek to assist Turkey in ending this conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to review House Concurrent Resolution 136. I believe it represents a balanced and thoughtful first step that our Government can and should take to promote peaceful resolution of a difficult and divisive conflict. I call on all my colleagues who value human rights and our partnership with Turkey to cosponsor this resolution. We must try to help stop the violence.

THE STATE OF THE UNION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 31, 1996 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Declaring that the era of big government is over, the President embraced a centrist view

of government in his State of the Union address. The speech had no soaring rhetoric, and it was rather blandly written and probably too long, but he delivered it forcefully and appeared robust and strong. By complimenting his chief political opponent he came across as gracious and fair minded. As usual, he threw about everything into the speech. Most observers felt that he had a very good night.

OVERVIEW

He gave an upbeat view of the nation, saying that the state of the union is strong and that America has made progress in reducing the deficit, creating new jobs, and keeping unemployment and inflation low. He emphasized that the crime rate, teen pregnancies, high school drop out rates, poverty and welfare rolls are all down, and that we have had great success in lowering air pollution, cutting tons of pesticides from water and food supplies. He emphasized progress made abroad, with the United States leading toward peace in Haiti, Northern Ireland, Bosnia, and the Middle East.

But the President did not dwell upon the progress; he emphasized the challenges that are before us—to balance the budget, keep families together, provide educational opportunities and economic security, continue the fight against crime and drugs, protect the environment, continue American world leadership, and make our government and its democracy work better for less money.

SIZE OF GOVERNMENT

Throughout the speech the President highlighted the theme of smaller government, saying that big government does not have all the answers, that there's not a program for every problem. He's right. He said that we need a smaller, less bureaucratic government in Washington, one that lives within its means, and he noted that the federal workforce is now at its lowest level in 30 years. He laid out the challenges for an age of possibility. He hit hard on the point that the government shutdowns are a mistake, also now acknowledged by Speaker Gingrich, and he challenged Congress never to shut the federal government down again. The President was equally sharp in his comments on the efforts to threaten the full faith and credit of the U.S. to try to force presidential budget or other policy concessions.

ECONOMY

The President was both optimist and critic of the American economy. He mentioned the impressive list of economic statistics that now characterize the American economy. The economy overall is in good shape, with low inflation and interest rates, steady growth, and relatively low unemployment. Yet at the same time, many Americans are fearful of layoffs, concerned about the growing gap between the rich and the poor, worried that wages are not keeping up with inflation, and doubtful about the future of the American dream.

MAJOR POINTS

As usual in a State of the Union address there was something in it for most everybody. The President hit very popular themes emphasizing a balanced budget, a strengthened American family, moving people from welfare to work, making health care more available to every American, and supporting the efforts of state and local police to catch criminals and prevent crime. He also stressed improving educational opportunities, reducing the drug problem, working with business to cut pollution, curbing the influence of special interests in politics, attacking the problem of illegal immigration, and maintaining America's role as a peacemaker in the world.

Strongly applauded were his references to education and cultural values, and his calls