

disparity is a straightforward solution that will provide financial relief.

A study conducted by Coopers & Lybrand indicates that mental parity legislation would save over \$16 million in Medicaid costs annually. People who exhaust their current health care benefits are forced to fall back on the Federal health care system. This is certainly not my idea of responsible fiscal management of our public health care. America's insurance companies can well afford to equalize caps for both mental and medical conditions. We have waited long enough for this comprehensive, financially prudent approach to health care reform. By providing parity for mental health benefits, we are helping millions of Americans move closer toward meaningful recovery. I urge all of my colleagues to listen to the voices of concerned citizens and guarantee mental health parity for all those in need of long-term treatment.

#### RECOGNIZING OLYMPIC ACHIEVEMENT AND WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

HON. JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 24, 1996*

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to recognize the outstanding accomplishment of a gifted athlete and special constituent of mine. Her name is Diane Madl. She is a talented field hockey player and coach. Diane is also an Olympian. At the Atlanta games, she helped the U.S. women's field hockey team to a very respectable fifth place finish. All of Maine is rightfully proud of Diane's selection for the U.S. team and of her performance at the centennial games.

Perhaps more importantly, however, Maine people are grateful for her work at the University of Maine in Orono. As an assistant field hockey coach, Diane serves as a teacher and mentor to many female athletes. Along with head coach Terry Kix, Diane is helping to build a strong athletic program; one that is instilling valuable lessons in each woman associated with it.

Diane's commitment to excellence in the Olympics and at the University of Maine, as well as her dedication to female athletes and belief in all the good that athletes can do is deserving of our recognition, and a heartfelt thank you.

#### CONGRESS MUST PRIORITIZE STUDENT FINANCIAL AID AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 24, 1996*

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that as the budget process for fiscal year 1997 comes to a close, whether through an omnibus appropriations bill or by normal appropriations bills, this Congress may not sufficiently prioritize student financial aid and education programs. As we all search to balance the budget, let us not forget the heavy burden that our educational institutions have for preparing today's youth to lead America in the next century.

I understand that cuts will inevitably be made, and many of the President's funding requests will not be met as we wind our way through these budget debates. However, to those Members who feel it is necessary to balance the budget by eliminating Goals 2000, Perkins loans, and Healthy Start while also slashing funding for Pell grants, teacher training programs, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools, I must ask that you reexamine your values.

For example, consider the words that Tomika Harris of Fayette, MI wrote as she applied for a summer scholarship for needy students at the University of Southern Mississippi. In response to the question, "What impact will the loss of financial aid have on your educational goals and what does financial aid mean to you?", Ms. Harris gave us an insight into how important financial aid and a higher education are to today's youth:

The loss of financial aid will have a dramatic impact on not only me, but also my peers. In my community, there is mostly lower middle class and poverty stricken people. However, most of the kids want to continue their education, but because we have low employment rates, we depend on financial aid terribly to attend a higher education institution. If Congress takes financial aid away, that will be more students on the streets probably selling drugs instead of learning in a classroom. To me, financial aid is not money to go to college, but an opportunity for success.

Perkins loans, Pell grants, Goals 2000, Healthy Start and many of these other programs serve as primary vehicles to lift by State out of the poverty that has consumed generations of bright, young minds. Even now, I can hear the voices of the mothers and fathers I see each weekend in Mississippi telling me that they know their child will have a chance to end the cycle of broken dreams if he or she can only get a Head Start. Now, just as years of hard work by teachers and public officials have helped Mississippi and this Nation to finally begin throwing off the heavy shrouds of poverty, do not send us back into an abyss of shattered lives and undereducated minds.

Each of us has a duty as elected official to heed these voices. Listen to them, they are the children of today hoping for tomorrow.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE TOWN OF NEW BEDFORD

HON. RON KLINK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 24, 1996*

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the town of New Bedford on the occasion of its 200th anniversary celebration.

New Bedford, located in northern Lawrence County, was settled in 1796 by James, Thomas, and Andrew Black. The Black family established a 400-acre tract which today encompasses the entire town of New Bedford. The town itself was named for Dr. Samuel Bedford, whose Bedford claim included portions of land in Mercer and Lawrence Counties.

The original town, designed by Daniel Inbody, was laid out in 1818, and consisted of 89 lots. In 1827, a post office was established

and other early enterprises included a grist mill, pottery, tavern, tannery, creamery, and distillery. The first school in the area was situated at Hopewell in the old building erected by the Presbyterian congregation. The town of New Bedford was a well-known stopping place for stage and mail coaches traveling between Mercer and Youngstown, OH.

A beautiful, rural area, New Bedford lies hundreds of feet above the water level of the Shenango River. This close-knit community is home to some 300 residents, many of whom can trace their roots of the founding families of the town. Such early entrepreneurial spirit is today reflected in the pride, patriotism, and virtues of the citizens of this outstanding town. It is a pleasure and an honor to congratulate them on the occasion of this historic celebration.

#### PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL OF FREEDOM TO MORRIS UDALL

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 24, 1996*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, President Bill Clinton awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom to our former colleague, and my good friend, Morris Udall. I can not think of a more deserving recipient of our nation's highest civilian award.

Mo represented the 2nd District of Arizona in Congress for 30 years, coming in as a young upstart bent on dismantling the old seniority system and leaving as one of our most revered senior Members.

Mo served as Chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for fourteen years. He was instrumental in leading the way for the enactment of landmark legislation protecting the environment as well as the rights of American Indians and those living in the U.S. Territories.

Some of the laws which now stand as a testament to Chairman Udall are: the Alaska Lands Act, the 1984 Wilderness Act, the 1982 Nuclear Waste Management Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Indian Child Welfare Act, the Alcohol and Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1989, the National Trails System Improvements Act of 1988, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, and the Compact of Free Association with the Trust Territories of the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, Mo Udall was so successful in getting legislation passed because he was a master at building coalitions out of diverse interests. I am inspired each time I sit in the Morris K. Udall hearing room of the Longworth House Office Building where Mo served and presided for three decades. Mo's portrait looking down at us from its perch over the fireplace reminds me of the fairness, humor, and dignity with which he ran the committee. The issues before the Interior (now Resources) Committee have always been contentious. But Mo Udall was able to bring us all together to make the important decisions on how best to protect our precious natural resources for future generations.

In 1976 Mo ran for President of the United States. Many say his incredible wit and unabashed kindness got in his way. He simply would not attack his opponents. After coming in a close second in numerous primary battles, Mo stepped back and refocused on the environment. He also put his carefully collected notes together and authored *Too Funny to Be President*, a compilation of some of his favorite campaign stories and political humor. I think he wrote this book so he could just hand it out each time one of us came up to him and ask him to tell a story just one more time so we could get it straight and then use it ourselves.

Mo is a World War II veteran and played professional basketball for the Denver Nuggets; he is also an attorney and private pilot. Mo lost one of his eyes in a childhood accident. His basketball prowess was so unaffected by this disability that one sport reporter claimed the false eye to be a myth.

Mo's stories are legendary. He made us laugh, he made us think, and he made this Nation a better place for our children and our children's children. As we get caught up in this contentiousness and tumult of this Congress, we should ponder one of Mo Udall's most oft repeated lines: "Oh Lord, may you help me today to utter words which are soft and tender—for tomorrow I may have to eat them."

Mr. Speaker, today our friend Mo Udall remains in a nursing home not far from here. Parkinson's Disease has rendered this excellent communicator unable to regale us with his wisdom and his wit. Yet his good deeds here will be long remembered, just as they so appropriately earned him the Medal of Freedom.

Congratulations, Mo, on receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

#### DEFENSE BREAKS COMMITMENTS TO GUAM

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 24, 1996*

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the past four weeks, Guam has shown once again its immense value to the projection of our national interests in the western Pacific. Guam is the base that launched the B-52s against Iraq. Guam is now the temporary home for over 2100 Kurdish refugees who were evacuated from Iraq. And Guam may be called on again in the coming days to do even more to help with the Kurdish refugees.

Guam is the reliable partner for United States interests in Asia, indeed the world. But recent actions of the Department of Defense threaten to undermine this partnership, and to determine the good will between the people of Guam and the military.

Today DoD sent a letter to the Chairman of the House Committee on Resources objecting to certain provisions of my bill to return excess federal land to the people of Guam. The basis of the DoD objections cause us to wonder if any progress has been made in Guam's efforts to return excess lands over the past twenty five years.

In 1993 and again in 1994, I hosted two Guam Land Conferences that DoD participated in. The first land conference, held on Guam, allowed our people to make a direct

plea for land no longer needed by DoD. The second conference built on the initial good will as we discussed actions to be taken to return land.

It used to be our common ground to agree that DoD should in fact give up land it no longer needs. In preparing for the Guam Land Conferences, DoD prepared a comprehensive study detailing its needs for the future—a study drafted by operational commanders in the Pacific and on Guam. Now we learn today that past assurances by a whole array of military officials over the past twenty five years are no longer valid. Now we learn that DoD does not know what its land needs are, and in fact, would rather not return land to the people of Guam, preferring instead to give its excess holdings to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

It is impossible for Guam to make a case for excess lands if we do not know what DoD's needs are. It is troubling if DoD does not know itself what it needs are. But it is even more ridiculous, if just for the sake of the Fish and Wildlife's interests, DoD would now repudiate its own report issued just seventeen months ago by the operational commands where releasable lands were listed in great detail acre by acre.

We are told today that DoD prefers to give land to the Fish and Wildlife Service just so that it may take these lands back at some indeterminate point in the future for some unknown contingency.

Yet, I would point out that all the operational commanders who gave their input to the 1994 Guam Land Use Plan did in fact consider all their needs for any credible contingency. It is now amazing to me that the Department of Defense has surrendered its military planning functions to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

I want to enter into the record the three taskings that the Guam Land Use Plan addressed:

- (1) Review the requirements for military land holdings based on foreseeable mission taskings and force levels;
- (2) Develop a comprehensive plan for all DoD land requirements on Guam which considers combined service use of property where feasible; and
- (3) Identify opportunities for functional consolidations and joint use arrangements, and address environmental considerations that affect land use.

Nowhere in the Guam Land Use Plan is there any mention of giving excess lands to the Fish and Wildlife Service for some unknown contingency. But now that Congress is considering legislation to give the people of Guam the first right of refusal for any excess Federal land, DoD suddenly remembers that this is what they want to do with excess lands.

This is wrong. This is unfair to the people of Guam who have been the most accommodating community for the needs of our national security.

We cannot make progress on land issues on Guam unless we deal with the issues in a forthright and open manner. We cannot accept double dealing and broken promises. We cannot let a special interest, the environmentalists, and their narrow agenda define and not influence the entire relationship between the people of Guam and the military bases.

That is what happened today in the DoD letter to Congress. I hope that those who are serious about solving land issues to ensure the future good will of the people of Guam to the

military presence on our island will work with us to undo the damage done by this DoD action. After this latest crisis with Iraq passes, Guam will be called upon again to serve the national security interest. If we want to have a reliable partner in Guam, we have to work to return unneeded land to the people of Guam.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,

*Washington, DC, September 24, 1996.*

Hon. DON YOUNG,

*Chairman, Committee on Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request, the Department of Defense provides the following views on H.R. 3501, the "Guam Land Return Act."

The Department of Defense opposes enactment of Section 2 of H.R. 3501. Section 2 would give the Government of Guam a priority over Federal agencies with respect to the acquisition of Federal real property declared by one agency to be excess to that agency's needs. Specifically, Section 2 would amend the Organic Act of Guam to require the Administrator of GSA to transfer to the Government of Guam, at no cost, all Federal real property on Guam declared excess by any Federal agency, notwithstanding the possibility that another Federal agency may have a demonstrable need for that property. In this way, the proposed bill would, in effect, trump the existing GSA property disposal process.

Our principal objection to Section 2 is that it represents a piecemeal approach to the resolution of issues currently being discussed with the Guamanians in the context of a draft Guam Commonwealth Act. The Guamanians, through Mr. John Garamendi, Deputy Secretary of the Interior and the Administration's Special Representative for the Guam Commonwealth negotiations, have proposed a draft Guam Commonwealth Act for consideration by interested Federal agencies. (An earlier version of this draft was introduced in the 104th Congress as H.R. 1056, the "Guam Commonwealth Act"; the draft under consideration in these negotiations has evolved significantly from that which remains before Congress.) The Department of Defense has been actively engaged in discussions and is working with all concerned parties to develop a mutually satisfactory position on all issues presented in the draft Guam Commonwealth Act, including those concurrently presented by Section 2 of this bill. Because the disposition of excess Federal lands on Guam is being addressed in the context of negotiations on the draft Guam Commonwealth Act, and because resolution of this issue is closely linked to other land issues presented by the Guam Commonwealth Act, the Department of Defense believes Congressional action on Section 2 of H.R. 3501 is not appropriate at this time. We recommend instead that this issue be considered only in the context of the more comprehensive Guam Commonwealth discussions. The Department of Defense is committed to making every reasonable effort to reach a mutually satisfactory resolution of all the issues presented by the draft Guam Commonwealth Act, and to that end will continue to participate cooperatively in interagency discussions of that draft Act.

In the event Congress elects to consider H.R. 3501 outside of the Guam Commonwealth discussions, the Department of Defense has several more specific concerns with enactment of Section 2 as currently drafted.

The Department of Defense currently relies on the flexibility inherent in the GSA land disposal process to ensure the viability of current and future missions. The existing process allows the Department of Defense to transfer lands not presently being actively