

threat to Russian security. While NATO enlargement will occur, Russian participation in the Partnership for Peace and the dialogue with Brussels should be expanded simultaneously. A secure Western border is in the interests of Russia, Belarus and other Eastern European countries.

Oppose Russian moves, such as sale of nuclear reactors to Iran, that threaten international security and the interests of U.S. allies in Eurasia. The U.S. should take all the steps at its disposal to prevent Iran, Iraq and other rogue states from gaining nuclear and chemical weapons capabilities. For example, voluntary export controls, similar to the COCOM regime during the Cold War, on technology sales to these countries should be put in place. Pressure should be applied against the governments arming rogue states, up to and including the imposition of selective economic sanctions. At the same time, other options, such as an increase in Russian uranium sales and civilian space launches, should be explored with Moscow, that may bring about a voluntary cancellation of the reactor deal. The U.S. should also cooperate with pro-Western circles in Turkey and Azerbaijan to promote democracy and oppose radical Islam in Eurasia.

Assist Russia and other NIS countries in fighting against organized crime and corruption. This can include help with writing comprehensive criminal and criminal procedure codes. Some of the old Soviet legislation lacks important legal concepts, such as conspiracy to commit a crime. In addition, U.S. law enforcement agencies should cooperate, to the degree possible, with trustworthy and reliable law enforcement personnel in the East. In particular, they can assist in developing a witness relocation program. They should strive to track and penetrate Russian and NIS criminal rings dealing in weapons of mass destruction and narcotics. American law enforcement agencies should monitor East-West financial transactions more closely. Deposits that originate in the NIS should be carefully screened and the legitimacy of earnings established.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Why should we provide aid to Russia?

The window of opportunity for the West in Russia may be closing. While there is still time, we should provide aid that strengthens free markets and free minds. Communism destroyed both of these for seventy years. Many Russians still want to learn about democracy and capitalism, and we should provide them with a fighting chance before it is too late.

What if hard-liners take Yeltsin's place?

We should act now to strengthen relations with all countries in the region, which will be under even more threat than the West if hardliners come to power in Moscow. We should expand NATO to include Poland, the Czech republic and Hungary, and prevent any U.S. or international assistance to an aggressive, anti-American or anti-Western government in Moscow, should one emerge. We should still maintain a dialogue with Moscow, explaining what we will see as unacceptable policies and clarifying what price Russia may pay if "red lines" are crossed. Eventually, if the need arises, we may need to plan for military contingencies.

Doesn't NATO expansion endanger Russia?

No, it does not. NATO enlargement is aimed at creating a zone of stability and security in Eastern and Central Europe, and to hasten the integration of the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary into the West. NATO expansion is also aimed at preventing competition between Germany and Russia in the area which triggered the two world wars. NATO is a defensive alliance, and its posture in Central Europe should remain defensive.

Why shouldn't we be more cooperative with Russia? After all, the cold war is over; Russia is a democracy and a great power, too. Why shouldn't we allow Moscow a greater role in policing unstable regions, such as the Caucasus or Central Asia?

We can cooperate with those in Russia who are interested in building a market economy and democratic polity. Democracy is still struggling for survival in Russia. More time needs to pass before we are sure that it is there to stay. As for Russia's role in the region, it will always be considerable due to Russia's sheer size and economic, political and cultural weight. However, there are forces in Russia that dream of re-establishing the Soviet Union or the Russian Empire. These circles are anti-Western and anti-American. They cannot be ignored. We should oppose Russia's heavy-handed interference into the affairs of its neighbors and attempts to violate their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

In view of Chechnya, what should the U.S. do to prevent Russia from invading its neighbors?

We should boost our relations with Ukraine, the Baltic States, and countries in the Caucasus and Central Asia. There are as many people there as there are in Russia. We should draw "lines in the sand" and stick to them. For example, we should tell Moscow that we will block all IMF and World Bank assistance if an NIS country is invaded. We should clarify to Russia that the U.S. will lead the international diplomatic campaign to restore the independence of a violated country. If Russia crosses these lines, we should consider imposing restrictions on exchanges and economic and trade sanctions against Russia. We should also demand from Moscow that the war in Chechnya stop.

What about organized crime in Russia?

There is wide-spread crime and corruption in Russia. Crime undermines reforms. People mistakenly think that the cause of crime is free market capitalism, but this is, of course, not true. Crime is rampant because there is no rule of law in Russia. Moreover, real democracy barely exists there, and the country still has a long way to go before a free market system is fully established.

Is Russian organized crime a threat to U.S. and Western security?

Yes, it is, because Russian criminals are very sophisticated, well-educated, and well-connected world-wide. They often boast advanced college degrees, KGB and special forces training. There is great potential danger in the merger of former communist, KGB and criminal elements in that part of the world. In particular, access of organized criminals to weapons of mass destruction and technology to produce those makes this threat particularly acute.

How can we stop the Russian "mafia"?

The Russian government will have to deal with its own criminal organizations one day, but many in the current Russian government, including law enforcement officials, are themselves corrupt. Until such time as NIS governments are able to effectively combat criminal organizations, the West has to apprehend and prosecute criminals from Russia and the NIS affecting its interests.

Are all people from the former Soviet Union criminals?

No, because many of them travel for legitimate business, education and tourism purposes.

STAND BY THE AMERICAN FLAG

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, last year this Congress came so close to restoring the American flag to its rightful position of honor and glory. You might remember that an overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the House agreed with the overwhelming majority of the American people and voted in favor of my proposed constitutional amendment allowing States and the Federal Government to prohibit the despicable destruction of Old Glory. Unfortunately, just three Senators couldn't find it in their heart to stand up for the Stars and Stripes and provide the constitutional protection that is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, this fight isn't over yet and it won't be over until we win. Just to demonstrate the support behind that statement, allow me to submit the following piece from the American Legion's National Commander Daniel Ludwig for the RECORD as evidence of that organization's resolve to correct this gross injustice. It was the American Legion and the Citizens Flag Alliance who carried the flag and the flag amendment to within three votes of this ultimate protection. Well, Mr. Speaker, just like you might expect out of a crew of old warriors, they're not going to surrender.

WE WILL CONTINUE TO STAND BY OUR FLAG

(By Daniel A. Ludwig)

By the time you read this, the postmortems on the Senate vote on the flag amendment will largely have subsided. The media may finally have stopped smirking their smirks of (supposed) intellectual superiority. The constitutional scholars who were thrust into an unaccustomed limelight will have gone back to their universities to continue the debate in quieter fashion. The public-interest groups who took sides against us—and, we always believed, against the public interest—will have turned their attention to other cherished aspects of traditional American life that need to be "modernized," which is to say, cheapened or twisted or gutted altogether.

Observers have suggested that we, too, should give up the fight. Enough is enough, they say. "You gave it your best, now it's time to pack it in." Those people don't understand what the past six years, since the 1989 Supreme Court decision, have really been about.

From the beginning of our efforts, debate centered on the issue of free speech and whether the proposed amendment infringes on it. But whether flag desecration is free speech, or an abuse of free speech, as Orrin Hatch suggests (and we agree), there is a larger point here that explains why we can't—shouldn't—just fold up our tents and go quietly.

Our adversaries have long argued that opposition to the amendment is not the same as opposition to the flag itself, that it's possible to love the flag and yet vote against protecting it. Perhaps in the best of all possible worlds we could accept such muddled thinking.

Sadly, we do not live in the best of all possible worlds.

In the best of all possible worlds it would not be necessary to install metal detectors in public schools, or have drunk-driving checkpoints on our highways, or give mandatory drug tests to prospective airline employees. Indeed, in the best of all possible

worlds, the Pope would not have to make his rounds in a bulletproof vehicle. In all of these cases, we have willingly made certain sacrifices in freedom because we recognize that there are larger interests at stake. In the case of the metal detectors, for example, the safety of our children, and our teachers, and the establishment of a stable climate for instruction to take place, is paramount.

If the flag amendment is about anything, it's about holding the line on respect, on the values that you and I risked our lives to preserve. We live in a society that respects little and honors still less. Most, if not all, of today's ills can be traced to a breakdown in respect—for laws, for traditions, for people, for the things held sacred by the great bulk of us.

Just as the godless are succeeding at removing God from everyday life, growing numbers of people have come to feel they're not answerable to anything larger than themselves. The message seems to be that nothing takes priority over the needs and desires and "rights" of the individual. Nothing is forbidden. Everything is permissible, from the shockingly vulgar music that urges kids to go out and shoot cops, to "art" that depicts Christ plunging into a vat of urine—to the desecration of a cherished symbol like the U.S. Flag.

Are these really the freedoms our forefathers envisioned when they drafted the Bill of Rights? Thomas Jefferson himself did not regard liberty as a no-strings proposition. His concept of democracy presupposed a nation of honorable citizens. Remove the honorable motives from a free society and what you have left is not democracy, but anarchy. What you have left, eventually, is "Lord of the Flies."

Amid all this, the flag stands for something. If respect for the flag were institutionalized, and children were brought up to understand the unique collection of principles it represents, there would be inevitable benefits to society, benefits that would help turn the tide of today's chaos and disrespect. For no one who takes such principles to heart—no one who sees the flag as an untouchable symbol of democracy, of decency—could possibly do the things that some people do, these days, in the name of freedom.

The flag stands for something miraculous that took life upon these shores more than two centuries ago and, if we only let it, will live on for centuries more. It stands for a glorious idea that has survived every challenge, that has persevered in the face of external forces who promised to "bury" us and internal forces which promised to tear us apart. Let us never forget this.

And let us not forget that 63 out of 99 senators voted with us, or that we won over 375 legislators in total. Our efforts were no more wasted than were the efforts to take remote outposts in the Pacific a half-century ago. Those efforts, too, failed at first, but eventually we prevailed.

We undertook a noble fight in trying to save our flag, and the fact that we have suffered a temporary setback does not diminish the nobility of what we fought for. This is not over by a long shot. They will hear from us again.

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH DOUPHNER

HON. ANTHONY BEILENSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Topanga, California's

most dedicated and admired citizens, Elizabeth Doupner, who passed away recently.

Betty Doupner served as executive officer-clerk of the Board of Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains, formerly of Topanga-Las Virgenes Resource Conservation District, which carries out environmental education and restoration projects. During the 34 years Betty was employed by the district, she watched it grow from an operation with one employee, herself, to the 50-employee agency it is today.

In her position with the district, Betty worked tirelessly for our community. She helped secure conservation services for landowners in the area, wrote the district's quarterly newsletter, coordinated the annual plant sale, hired personnel, maintained all the district's records, and helped establish and maintain the district's Vance Hoyt Memorial Library. She became an expert on the law governing the operation of resource conservation districts in order to properly advise the district board.

Betty was also responsible for writing and obtaining the first grants that expanded the district's education program. The large number of awards to the district for conservation and education are a testimony to the effectiveness of her work, for which she was twice honored with a distinguished service award by the Employee Association of the California Association of Resource Conservation Districts.

Betty contributed much to the community in other ways as well. For her volunteer work with schools, the Women's Club, and the Strawberry Festival, the Topanga Chamber of Commerce recognized her as the 1979 "Citizen of the Year." She was also a volunteer with Share International, where she helped publish its monthly magazine.

Betty Doupner's warmth, enthusiasm, and dedication are greatly missed by all of her colleagues at the district, and by everyone else who knew her. The entire Topanga community joins me in expressing our deep sorrow to her family and friends, and our heartfelt appreciation for her many years of outstanding public service.

IN RECOGNITION OF LAWRENCE G. REUTER, METRO GENERAL MANAGER

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take this opportunity to recognize the many accomplishments of the general manager of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit System [WMATA], Mr. Lawrence G. Reuter. It is indeed the Washington area's loss that Mr. Reuter has chosen to accept the position of president of New York City's transit system.

Mr. Reuter, as general manager of WMATA for the past 2 years, has consistently proven that he knows how to run a railroad. His administrative skills have been evident as he has kept the fast-track program, designed to complete the planned 103-mile metrorail system in an accelerated time period, on schedule and within budget. Under his stewardship, WMATA now has the remaining four rail segments under construction. Completion will finally provide a complete network linking all of the sub-

urban communities to all of the District of Columbia.

Perhaps the most difficult issues Mr. Reuter has addressed during his tenure at Metro are the fiscal challenges faced by all jurisdictions throughout this region. He has had to be resourceful in order to preserve quality Metro service at a time when State and local response to these budgets are lean, and Federal transit assistance has been diminishing.

Mr. Reuter has provided the kind of leadership necessary to run a public service organization in these tight fiscal times. He has consistently encouraged private sector partnerships in order to fully capitalize on the public investment in Metro. He was instrumental in the negotiation of an agreement with the RF&P Corp. to construct, entirely with private funds, a Metrorail station at Potomac Yard in Alexandria, VA. This is the first agreement of this type ever executed in the United States. His commitment to public-private partnerships has enabled Metro to streamline its joint development program making it easier for the private sector to invest in properties near Metrorail stations. His efforts to bring private sector investment to locations in proximity to Metro reflects his firm view that this region must fully utilize our investment in Metrorail. Mr. Reuter recognizes that the Metro system provides economic opportunity to all of the communities along its lines as well as environmental benefits to the entire region.

Larry Reuter has demonstrated his extraordinary ability to lead during one of the most challenging times for the transit authority. This region owes Mr. Reuter our gratitude for preserving our investment in the Metro system and for continuing to provide quality public transit service to the entire National Capital region.

TRIBUTE TO JONATHAN NEWTON

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, the volunteer fire service community and the entire State of Delaware suffered a tragic loss recently with the death of Jonathan Newton. Mr. Newton, at the young age of 31, was the consummate volunteer firefighter. At the time of the accident, he was en route to a fire safety program at a local middle school. It was not uncommon for Mr. Newton to volunteer his time and energy to programs that heightened public awareness about fire safety. In fact, his community education work earned him recognition as Firefighter of the Year for the Hockessin Fire Company.

When a firefighter in Delaware suffers a tragedy, it is felt by the entire fire service community. They are like a family, a unique group of individuals who take great pride in their heritage of volunteer service. Friends and family members alike spoke of Mr. Newton's altruism, and fondness toward children, as he devoted so much of his time to educating them about fire safety.

What is most tragic about Mr. Newton's death is that he leaves behind a family. He has a wife who is 7 months pregnant and two children—all of whom will always have a special place in the Delaware volunteer fire service family.