

stubbornly clung to their inner city practice for the past 25 years. I applaud Doctors Leo Russ, Robert Russano, and Stephen Sherman for their collective sense of loyalty to the people of Paterson, NJ as well as their unwavering perseverance to do a job well. These men invest in their community, flourish in their practice, and help others to live better, healthier lives.

Benjamin Franklin made the exultation to "work while it is called today, for you know not how much you may be hindered tomorrow. One today is worth two tomorrows; never leave that till tomorrow which you can do today." The doctors of Downtown Dental take this truism to heart. They see more than 200 patients a day with no required appointment 6 days a week. With this miraculous resolve and constancy, the doctors of Downtown Dental perform a genuinely needed service to the people of Paterson. Indeed, Leo Russ, Robert Russano, and Stephen Sherman have never waited for someone else to do the job.

Life's greatest joys are found in what one does with one's life. And, Doctors Russ, Russano, and Sherman should be admired for the great work they are doing with their lives. With Downtown Dental, the character of the work has become inseparable from the character of the men doing the work. Their loyalty to the people of Paterson endures every assault and it does not cringe under pressure.

I congratulate the doctors of the Downtown Dental Center as they challenge all of us to take up the task of helping others. Those who have missed the joy of working on behalf of others have certainly missed something very special. Thank you Doctors Russ, Russano, and Sherman for your true, honest, and willing labor.

NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES RENEWAL ACT OF 1996

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1996

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy today to be able to join a bipartisan coalition of marine sanctuary supporters in introducing the National Marine Sanctuaries Renewal Act of 1996. This bill will reauthorize funding for the National Marine Sanctuary Program which is set to expire on September 30, 1996.

The country's 13 marine sanctuaries are the national parks of our oceans. They celebrate and preserve some of the Nation's most significant ocean resources. Like our national parks, our marine sanctuaries focus attention on how important sound environmental stewardship is to our quality of life and the sustainability of our economies.

The National Marine Sanctuary Program began modestly in 1975 off North Carolina's stunningly beautiful outer banks to protect the Civil War wreck of the world's first iron ship, the U.S.S. *Monitor*. The program expanded several years later to protect sensitive marine resources off the California and Florida coasts. The program reached its full maturity in the fall of 1992 with the designation of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

The Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary embraces the entire coast of my central

California coastal district. It is the largest protected marine area in the United States and second only to Australia's Great Barrier Reef in size worldwide. It encompasses more than 4,000 square nautical miles of open ocean along 350 miles of shoreline. It is unique among all marine preserves in being so accessible from shore. Most of my constituents don't pass a day without seeing sanctuary waters and are grateful that the sanctuary has protected their coast from offshore oil development.

However, marine sanctuaries are not just about conserving resources. They are also about protecting coastal economies. The Monterey Bay Sanctuary is a key to my district's billion dollar tourism industry. Indeed, one of this Nation's premiere tourist attractions, the Monterey Bay Aquarium, is a thriving private business that showcases the extraordinary marine life of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary. The sanctuary also helps support a prosperous fish industry.

All of this comes at a very modest cost. The entire sanctuary program costs less than \$12 million a year to administer. It is truly a bargain for the taxpayers. But, like all government programs, the sanctuaries need to make the most of their funding. This bill helps them accomplish that by allowing the sanctuaries to develop, trademark, and market logos and other merchandise to help supplement their funding.

I urge support of the bill.

LOCKHEED-MARTIN CHAIRMAN
DANIEL TELLEP RECEIVES 1996
JAMES FORRESTAL MEMORIAL
AWARD

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1996

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Daniel M. Tellep, chairman of the board of Lockheed-Martin, who was honored this week with the 1996 James Forrestal Memorial Award. The 1996 annual awards dinner was cohosted by the National Security Industrial Association [NSIA] and the American Defense Preparedness Association. This year, the NSIA presented its Forrestal Award at the dinner held here in Washington.

I wanted to share with my colleagues the remarks Mr. Tellep made in accepting this prestigious award.

SHALL WE WAIT AND SEE?

(Forrestal Award Acceptance Speech)

I thank you from the bottom of my heart for this most special award.

I feel honored . . . humbled . . . and deeply appreciative;

Honored when I think of the names of others to whom you've conferred this award and humbled to join their ranks. I'm

Appreciative because this award also reflects the shining achievements of the men and women I work with.

James Forrestal himself also provides excellent perspective on an occasion like this.

He once said in reference to himself:

"You can't make a hero out of a man in a business suit. I'm just a businessman trying to do a job and that's the whole story."

That's also my whole story. I, too, am just a businessman and it has been my privilege

for the past 41 years trying to do a job in the aerospace and defense industry in support of our military services.

As a businessman, I returned last night from an eleven-day trip to the mid-east. . . .

A volatile, vitally important region.

The trip was a kaleidoscope of countries, cultures, cuisines, people, and events.

During the trip I also tried to stay abreast of the news in this country. The Republican primaries, for example.

Flying home and thinking ahead to my remarks this evening I thought: "How can I make something coherent and relevant out of over two dozen meetings in that complex, turbulent region?" Looking back, there was a common thread to the discussions in each of the countries. Invariably, we discussed three topics:

Economics . . . peace . . . and . . . military preparedness.

What I found was consistent, clear logic on these topics. In each country, their philosophy was basically the same. They said this:

First . . . we desire economic growth and development . . . but that depends on peace and political stability.

Second, peace and political stability depend as much on military preparedness as diplomacy.

Third, military preparedness deserves high priority because it is inextricably linked to national political and economic goals.

As I listened to these recurring themes, I felt that there were great similarities to attitudes in this country on the desire for economic growth and peace.

But there is also a difference here at home on the priority to accord military preparedness. . . . compared to what I found abroad.

In our country we continue to search for a fresh national security policy.

And we debate the proper level of defense expenditures.

Lately, however, these issues appear secondary to the presidential campaign.

This is Super Tuesday and along the way, we've witnessed the ups and downs and then the shakeout of the Republican candidates. As we did, it struck me that something vital was missing from the debates and the news coverage;

Something beyond a flat tax, the deficit, immigration, abortion and trade policy.

What has been missing is any serious discussions of the candidates' views on defense and national security.

This morning's Washington Post, for example, has 115 column inches of space devoted to the election but not one mention of defense.

This diffuse, lower key focus on defense here in the U.S. is strikingly different than what I encountered on my trip.

Abroad, defense is seen as a guarantor for economic health. Here, defense is often seen as a source of budget to be tapped for other purposes.

This is disconcerting since we are about to elect not just our president. . . . but also our Commander-in-Chief.

Defense should be a front-burner topic but it isn't and it is a profound reflection of our times.

The fact that defense isn't very high on the political or national agenda is easy to explain.

With the collapse of Communism and the end of the Cold War, we are having difficulties in seeing threats to our national interests.

For a moment, think back to the Cold War.

Volumes of policy statements could be conveniently distilled into two galvanizing words . . .

These two words telegraphically described a single grave threat, provided continuity of support for a national policy . . . and underpinned our national will.

Those words were, of course, Contain Communism.

Today we lack those two or three words which serve as shorthand for a broadly supported . . . focussed national security program.

It's not "be prepared" and it's not "dial 911 U.S.A."

What it is, is still emerging.

I assert that peacekeeping and nation building aren't it either, because although our military forces can and do perform such missions under special circumstances, this is not what we are trained for and not something which justifies current levels of defense expenditures.

Does our inability to provide a succinct phrase to describe threats to our national interests mean there aren't any? Hardly.

I'll return to this in a moment, but first let's review the course we've been on for the past seven years.

Basically, we've downsized and we've continued to conduct studies to help define our force structure.

I don't have to remind you of the downsizing.

The defense budget is down by some 40 percent in constant dollars since its peak in the late 1980's.

The procurement account is down 72 percent in real purchasing power for \$138 billion in 1985 to \$39 billion in the fiscal year 1997 request.

Our force structure—including Army divisions, warships, carriers, and fighter squadrons—has already been reduced by at least one-third in just over six years. And more cuts are on the way.

In contrast to other areas of the budget where cuts are in the context of reducing the rate of growth, these are deep, real reductions.

I also think that the comportment of the military services and our industry during this massive downsizing has been remarkable. To their credit, the services "saluted" and the industry "got with it."

The question is, "when have you gone too far in downsizing and when do you stop?"

Here are a couple of perspectives worth considering. History shows that five times in this century America's military forces have fought major wars. Following each of the previous four, filled with the promise of peace, America proceeded to dismantle its military capability . . . only to be disappointed to find itself once again engaged in war a few years later.

New York Times columnist, A.M. Rosenthal, recently observed, "the deep reductions in the armed forces . . . could turn out to be the essence of wisdom. It could also turn out to be the greatest misjudgment since the U.S. disarmed itself after World War II knowing that Stalin would not be stupid enough to bother us."

To answer the question on how deep the downsizing should be, we have a penchant for analysis and modelling.

We do bottom up reviews and define MRC's . . . Major Regional Conflicts.

It is almost as if we hope that somewhere in the computer we can find the answer.

Now, I'm not against modelling or computer studies . . .

But it is not a substitute for something more basic—the sort of deep inner conviction President Reagan felt when he launched the Strategic Defense Initiative.

That brings us back to the issue of the threat.

Frankly, I don't think we—the collective "we"—have done a good job in conveying to the American public the worldwide spectrum of threats to our national security and economic interests.

But all it takes is newspapers, a map and a compass.

The public press is a rich source of information on the military activities and postures of nations worldwide. The headlines hardly suggest a peaceful world and an era of tranquility.

We know for example, that the Mediterranean is a virtual stew of over 80 submarines from as many as 12 nations.

We know that over 20 countries are building ballistic missiles . . . and China is flexing its muscles with them in the Taiwan Straits. We know that there are at least a half dozen nuclear "wannabees" in addition to the eight countries that already possess nuclear weapons.

We know that modern high technology weapons are available worldwide.

For example more than 400 MiG 29's—the equivalent of our front-line fighters—are in the service of 22 foreign countries.

We know that Russia recently sold four modern diesel submarines to Iran.

In a sense, the soviet arms threat is still there * * * it's just more geographically distributed.

This list goes to include terrorism which can be the spark for a major conflict in a region where we have vital interests.

All this and more just from the public press.

If newspaper reports don't fully convey the picture of a world laced with threats, a map and a compass help.

Take a compass, a world globe, and strike arcs of 500 or 1,000 or 1,500 miles from countries possessing ballistic missiles to countries which could be the intended targets. It soon becomes apparent that much of the world falls under the sinister umbrella of potential missile attacks.

The threat also extends to the men and women from our services stationed in countries of threatened allies—as they were in the Gulf War.

We saw in Desert Storm that the single event which caused the greatest casualties among U.S. troops, was when a Scud impacted barracks housing our soldiers.

Do we need any more analyses to tell us that we need upgraded missile defenses to protect our troops and our allies now and not five or more years from now?

In discussing the pervasive nature of threats—a situation in many ways much worse than when we faced the monolithic Soviet threat—I'm reminded of another conversation during my mid-east trip.

A high ranking defense official explained his views this way:

Despite a situation which you and I would call reasonably clear, he said:

"We don't really know what the threat will be and when it will occur. Intelligence has failed us." He went on to say:

"We don't try to react to a narrowly defined threat, instead we look at the size and balance of the forces we want.

We use the most advanced technology because it gives us the qualitative edge.

When we have a qualitative edge, we don't coast. We try to add to it. This saves lives.

If we don't use our forces, we've succeeded through deterrence.

Besides, it's always good insurance, something we must have.

This clear view makes sense for us as well.

Now, despite the frustrations I've expressed and which many of you must share, I believe there is room for optimism.

Optimism that we may be on the threshold of arresting, if not reversing the protracted decline in defense budgets * * * and the downsizing and force reductions.

I point to recent remarks by two highly respected defense leaders—our Secretary of Defense, Bill Perry, and the Head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Bill Owens.

Recently Bill Perry took an unequivocal public stand that the basic strategic

underpinnings of the administration—the ability to fight two full-scale theater conflicts at once—isn't possible without increasing the defense procurement budget over the next five years to somewhere in the range of \$50-60 billion per year from today's level of \$39 billion.

Admiral Owens' remarks echo those of Secretary Perry's. He also rejected the thought of further cuts in combat forces and focussed on reducing fixed costs to improve the tooth-to-tail ratio of our forces.

In addition to Perry, Owens and other military leaders, there is also a substantial block in Congress who believe it is time to halt the decline in defense.

But I'm not sure it will happen unless we can help the American public understand the basics which are so obvious to us:

That we are in an era of "come-as-you-are" wars.

That the equipment which performed so well in the Gulf War was the technology of the 60's * * * the development of the 70's * * * the production of the 80's.

That this equipment won't do for the year 2010 and that the real debate is over the capability we want our military forces to have past the turn of the century.

That defense is different than fast foods—you can't just order it and get it because lead times are measured in years, and the systems for the year 2010 should be in development today.

That relations among nations rise and fall on a much shorter time scale than that required to equip and train an armed force.

That it is unacceptable to fight wars of parity—in effect winning by one point in double overtime. The fact that the last person left standing on the battlefield is an American does not constitute victory.

That because of our high regard for the lives of our men and women in service, we need sustained investments in advanced technologies to minimize casualties when conflict is unavoidable.

That we should not let the fact that the bright incandescent light of the Soviet threat has gone dim blind us to dozens of glowing embers which can ignite anywhere at any time.

I believe that the American public will accept these basics and that even in the face of other pressing issues, they will support a strong defense.

I also believe they do not want to disregard the lessons of history and have us make the grave error of undermining America's military capability—leaving it to future generations to pay the price not in dollars but in lives. . .

The columnist I referred to earlier also asked a profound question in connection with the observation that an enormous chemical weapons plant is nearing completion in Libya.

He observed that conventional wisdom is that Qaddafi would never be mad enough to use these weapons against the west or our allies in the mid-east.

Mr. Rosenthal then simply asked the rhetorical question, "He would not be mad enough to do that . . . would he? "Shall we wait and see?"

Whether it is Libya's chemical weapons or any one of dozens of potential threats to our national interests . . . shall we wait and see?

I'm on the side of Bill Perry, Admiral Owens, our service leaders, and those in Congress who say, no.

. . . That it is time to arrest and reverse the decline in defense . . . rather than wait and see.

I also believe that the time is now . . . in the fiscal year 1997 budget, rather than in future years.

Looking ahead there are several immediate things we can and must do:

First, we must make a better case to the American public on the global nature of threats and our current defense posture. On this note a recent poll shows that two-thirds of the American public believe that we are now protected by a ballistic missile system—despite the fact that no such system exists.

Second, we must take steps to see that defense becomes an issue in the current election cycle, with a focus on Fiscal Year 1997 defense budget.

Third, we must reestablish the firewalls around the defense budget so that it does not become a checkbook for the rest of the federal budget.

Fourth, we must continue to spend each dollar for defense more efficiently by continuing the DOD's excellent start on acquisition reform and by improving the tooth-to-tail ratio of our armed forces by shedding ourselves of excess depot capacity.

We can do this and arrest the protracted decline or we can wait and see.

Again . . . Forrestal's words ring true.

Advising President Truman in 1945 when Stalin began breaking the agreements reached at Yalta, Forrestal said:

"We might as well meet the issue now as later on."

For us, some fifty years later, we might as well meet the issue in our next cycle of defense budgets and not wait and see.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1561, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment in the conference report on H.R. 1561. I support many of the provisions in the bill and I had hoped that the conferees might fix H.R. 1561 so that I could support the conference report. For example: I believe that it is important to show, particularly at this time, our support for Taiwan; to support initiatives which require that organizations receiving United States assistance in Ireland abide by the MacBride principles; to continue to condemn China for its human rights record; and to prohibit assistance to any county that bars or obstructs delivery of United States humanitarian aid.

Despite these favorable provisions in H.R. 1561, I cannot support the conference report. This bill seeks to consolidate the State Department and its related agencies. However, the House leadership decided to impose its reconfiguration instead of working in conjunction with the administration. The result is legislation that is very poorly drafted as to how to achieve consolidation. In addition, this bill fails to authorize international family planning assistance spending which was required by the Foreign Operations appropriations bill. The appropriations bill stated that no monies for international family planning would be released unless authorized to do so in H.R. 1561. The failure to include such authorization is disastrous. Because of the lack of authorization language, it is projected that over 5,000 women will die over the next year from either self-induced abortions or unplanned pregnancies.

Mr. Speaker, I voted "no" on the foreign relations authorization conference report. I hope

that Congress will begin to work in cooperation with the administration regarding agency consolidation and pass on appropriate Foreign Relations Revitalization Act.

TRIBUTE TO HORACE RAYMOND GEORGE

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1996

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I pay tribute to the memory of a remarkable man from the city of Milwaukee, Horace Raymond George. I would like to extend my greatest sympathy to the George family by taking a moment to reflect on the rich life of this fine family man.

Mr. George was born in Chicago and raised in Louisiana. As a youth, he loved to play basketball which he matched with an even greater appetite for reading. Mr. George found employment at a local drugstore where he had access to scores of newspapers to satisfy his hunger for knowledge. He came to Wisconsin to study economics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison where he also attended law school, earning his degree in 1950. After serving as a judge advocate during the Korean war, he settled in Milwaukee with his wife Audrey.

Determined to establish his own law practice, Mr. George worked nights for the American Motor Co. while using his days to get the practice up and running. A skilled and diligent attorney, he also worked as a field attorney for the Department of Veterans Affairs, was a lecturer at Wisconsin Law School, and was a member of the Wisconsin, Illinois, Texas, and District of Columbia bars. Mr. George was admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1984, Wisconsin Law School honored Mr. George for his outstanding commitment and dedication to the legal profession, awarding him their special recognition award.

In addition to his professional endeavors, Mr. George will long be remembered for his selfless work on behalf of our community. He was active in the Knights of Columbus and the St. Thomas Moor Legal Society. Mr. George also served on the boards of St. Anthony's Hospital and the Wisconsin Center. He will also be long remembered for his vivid interest in Egyptian and African art, history, and culture.

Mr. George is survived by his beloved wife Audrey, his son Gary, a State senator and former classmate and colleague of mine from Milwaukee, his sons Mark, Michael, Gregory, and his daughter Janice. Indeed, this is a loss that will be felt throughout Milwaukee and the entire State of Wisconsin, for Horace Raymond George touched the lives of many during his rich 71 years.

I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the honorable and gracious memory of Horace Raymond George. I am certain that his legacy will endure for years to come.

NEIL SMITH, KANSAS CITY CHIEFS
HONORED

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1996

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of NFL's finest defensive players and one of Kansas City's finest citizens, Neil Smith of the Kansas City Chiefs. Mr. Smith is in Washington today to accept a prestigious award from the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce [JAYCEES] which has selected Neil Smith as a member of the Congress of Ten Outstanding Young Americans.

Neil Smith spent his childhood struggling in school with a learning disability. He was in junior high school before the education system acknowledged his special challenges and helped him discover ways in which he could learn and succeed. Neil Smith will never forget the cruel labels placed on children with dyslexia. That is why today he dedicates time and energy to help youngsters living with learning disabilities.

As a former educator, I personally appreciate Mr. Smith's selfless efforts to heighten public awareness and find solutions for individuals with disabilities. He is the national spokesperson for Foundation for Exceptional Children's "Yes I Can" Program which encourages disabled children to reach their goals and recognizes their many achievements. He recently partnered with the Learning Disabilities Association of Missouri to fund and produce a public service announcement aimed at dispelling the misconception that children with learning disabilities are "dumb" or "slow". He says they just need to be shown things in a different way.

Neil Smith's efforts remind the Congress that these youth need the support of an education system that works for them, not against them. All children have dreams and each and every one of them deserves the opportunity to achieve those dreams just as Neil Smith has. In Mr. Smith's words, "People with learning disabilities are not unfortunate. The unfortunate people are quarterbacks." Thank you, Neil, for your dedication to our children and your inspiring energy both on and off the field.

THE COMMON SENSE CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1996

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, because I am concerned about the hundreds of billions in taxpayer dollars spent every decade on Fortune 500 corporations and special interests, today I am introducing legislation that will cut \$39.575 billion in corporate welfare and end welfare for Ronald McDonald. The House has already passed the Personal Responsibility Act to reform welfare. It's time to pass the Commonsense Corporate Responsibility Act and get some of our richest corporations off the Government dole. This bill puts a balanced budget, jobs, education, and a clean environment ahead of handouts to Fortune 500 companies and special interests.