

struggle for independence from nearly four centuries of Ottoman Turkish rule. Against great odds, Greek patriots reestablished freedom and self-government in the country that gave birth to democracy.

This decade-long struggle attracted the attention of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world but enjoyed particularly strong support from the young American Republic. Americans held rallies in support of the Greek cause and sent both supplies and volunteers to aid the independence effort.

From that time, the American and Greek peoples forged an alliance for democracy which has stood the test of time and political change. In both World Wars and through the cold war period, America and Greece remained steadfast in their commitment to freedom and together fought successfully against the forces of modern tyranny and totalitarianism. In all of these struggles, the Greek people fought valiantly and at great sacrifice to their land and lives. It can be rightly said that no land so small gave so much to the modern cause of freedom.

As the challenges and opportunities of the post-cold-war world begin to emerge, the resourceful people of Greece are poised to join with America and other democracies in encouraging new hopes for freedom and democracy in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Greece, as one of the oldest continuing democracies of the modern period, has the experience in self-government to be of enormous assistance to nations struggling to develop open societies.

Greece is also the only country in the Balkans and Eastern Mediterranean region with membership in the European Union. This fact equips Greece to play a special role in the economic and political reconstruction of those regions. From the dawn of history, Greek travelers and traders have lived and worked in these areas developing relationships that can promote peace and prosperity in this new era.

Mr. President, the significance of the longstanding and close partnership between the United States and Greece is being reinforced by the exchange of official visits and by representatives of our two countries. As I speak, Hillary Clinton, our First Lady, is in Greece participating in the lighting of the Olympic Torch, which will eventually make its way to Atlanta, GA, for the centennial of the modern Olympics. Mrs. Clinton's presence at this important event reflects America's respect for and recognition of Greece's historic role in establishing these games and promoting friendly competition and cooperation among nations.

Within days, the Honorable Costas Simitis, newly installed Prime Minister of Greece, will visit Washington for a series of meetings with President Clinton and other administration officials. Prime Minister Simitis represents a new generation of Greek political leadership which promises to

build on the strength of the existing United States-Greek relationship while seeking new areas of cooperation. In early May, Greek President Costas Stephanopoulos will also visit Washington for an official state visit. This again will offer an opportunity for renewing and reinforcing the ties between the citizens of these two democratic countries. We look forward to these visits and express warm appreciation to President Clinton for extending these invitations.

These are occasions also for the leaders of both America and Greece to recognize the impressive contributions that Greek-Americans have made to the strength and progress of democracy in both nations. The ties between our two countries have been tangibly strengthened by the constructive involvement of Greek-Americans in virtually every sphere of American life.

As we celebrate the bravery of the heroes and heroines of March 25, 1821, we recall with pride their unshakeable devotion to freedom. It is a commitment they have honored with their blood and tears over two centuries and an undertaking which has always found them in alliance with the American people and all those who value democracy and the rule of law. As we enter this new post-war period, I am confident that America and Greece will work together in the great effort to build and expand democracy. That will be the highest tribute to the spirit of Greek Independence first proclaimed on March 25, 1821.●

BREAST CANCER

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise before you today to plea for the support of the world's wives, daughters, mother, and loved ones who prevail under a merciless dark shadow we've come to know as breast cancer. Over the past two decades, the risk of acquiring breast cancer has nearly tripled; from 1 in 20, to 1 in 8. Breast cancer alone is predicted to murder over 184,300 American women this year. To date, researchers have not been able to locate its cause or find a technique to eradicate it.

Paramount in our struggle to save our loved ones is the frequent inspection to detect possible irregularities. Caught early, measures can be undertaken to lower the risk of a further contamination of the body. However, the postponing of medical attention could result in the cancer expanding into the bloodstream, carrying tumor cells to the liver, lungs, and bones. Once diagnosed, the style of treatment is decided between the patient and the physician after considering the stage and type of cancer in question. Most often, a modified mastectomy—the removal of only the breast tissue—or a lumpectomy—the local removal of the tumor—followed by radiotherapy is the standard method. Unfortunately, the pain and suffering do not end after surgery. Once involved in therapy, the

real struggle to return to a life lost begins.

What is commonly overlooked in the rehabilitation of a breast cancer victim is the unrestrictive support by loved ones as a means of therapy, and in most cases, this is vital to their recovery. Families facing cancer are severely challenged as their lives become increasingly complex. Psychosocial research has shown that the stress of adopting new roles, relating to and communicating with others, self-care responsibilities, and the over all nature of the cancer experience can cause unrest in the family unit. This in turn, greatly influences and in most cases, hinders the complete healing process. On the other hand, families that have stood by and supported relatives by educating themselves and responding properly to the needs of the victim were able to significantly add to the recovery process. Therefore, I believe that as we work toward advancements in treatment, cure, and diagnosis of breast cancer, our programs must also stress involvement by family members in the care and support of loved ones.●

DAVID PACKARD

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of David Packard yesterday. My heartfelt thoughts and prayers go out to his family as people around the Nation pay tribute to his remarkable life and mourn his passing.

Untold numbers of people's lives were touched by David Packard or changed by the advent of his innovations. Not only will he be remembered for his pioneering work in the area of electronic and computer technology, but also his progressive management philosophy promises to remain fundamental in the high-tech industry in particular and American business in general.

Although his work at Hewlett-Packard was best known to the public, he found time to donate his valuable energy and resources to his country and many organizations and causes which are now an integral part of California's communities and elsewhere. The Monterey Bay Aquarium and the Lucile Salter Packard Children's Hospital at Stanford University are just two of his most visible contributions. His generosity, as most clearly manifest by the continuing work of the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, will long be remembered as the living legacy of a departed friend.●

TRIBUTE TO LOUISVILLE MALE HIGH SCHOOL

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on April 27 to April 29, 1996, more than 1,300 students from 50 States and the District of Columbia will be in Washington, DC to compete in the national finals of the We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution program. I am proud to announce that a class from Male High School in Louisville

will represent Kentucky. These young scholars have worked diligently to reach the national finals by winning local competitions in our home State.

The distinguished member of the team representing Kentucky are: Abby Alster, Jil Beyerle, Lori Buchter, Adam Burns, Melissa Chandler, Sienna Greenwell, Patrick Hallahan, Nicole Hardin, Tony Heun, Michelle Hill, Patricia Holloway, Cammie Kramer, Kevin Laugherty, Anne-Marie Lucchese, Astrud Masterson, Kimberly Merritt, Tiffany Miller, Matthew Parish, Angela Rankin, Dana Smith, Danielle Vereen, Maleka Williams, Jamie Zeller.

I would also like to recognize their teacher, Sandra Hoover, who deserves a lot of credit for the success of the team. The district coordinator, Diane Meredith, and the State coordinators, Deborah Williamson and Jennifer Van Hoose, also contributed a significant amount of time and effort to help the team reach the national finals.

The We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution program is the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The 3-day national competition simulates a congressional hearing in which students' oral presentations are judged on the basis of their knowledge of constitutional principles and their ability to apply them to historical and contemporary issues.

Administered by the Center for Civic Education, the We the People . . . program, now in its 9th academic year, has reached more than 70,400 teachers and 22,600,000 students nationwide at the upper elementary, middle, and high school levels. Members of Congress and their staff enhance the program by discussing current constitutional issues with students and teachers.

The We the People . . . program provides an excellent opportunity for students to gain an informed perspective on the significance of the U.S. Constitution and its place in our history and our lives. I wish these students the best of luck in the national finals and look forward to their continued success in the years ahead.●

CONFIRMATION OF FEDERAL JUDGES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I take our advice and consent function very seriously and especially so when it comes to the confirmation of Federal judges who are given lifetime appointments. In our system of Government, with coordinate branches and separation of powers, that is our responsibility in the Senate. But once a Federal judge is confirmed, our role is concluded.

I have voted to confirm some judges who rendered decisions with which I strongly disagreed and have voted against a few who have surprised me by turning out to be better judges than I

predicted. Whenever I disagreed with a particular ruling in a particular case, after a Federal judge was nominated, examined and confirmed, I have not attacked that judge or tried to influence that judge's consideration of an ongoing matter.

If we disagree with the result in a case, we can determine whether the law needs to be amended or new law needs to be enacted. If a judge decides a case incorrectly, the remedy in our system is through judicial appeal. Indeed, the reason the Framers included the protections of a lifetime appointment for Federal judges was to insulate them from politics and political influence.

I ask that a statement from a group of distinguished judges from the U.S. Court of Appeals from the Second Circuit and an editorial from the Washington Post on this subject be made part of the RECORD.

The material follows:

JOINT STATEMENT

The following is a joint statement of Jon O. Newman, J. Edward Lumbard, Wilfred Feinberg, and James L. Oakes, who are respectively, the current and former chief judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit:

The recent attacks on a trial judge of our Circuit have gone too far. They threaten to weaken the constitutional structure of this Nation, which has well served our citizens for more than 200 years.

Last Friday, the White House press secretary announced that the President would await the judge's decision on a pending motion to reconsider a prior ruling before deciding whether to call for the judge's resignation. The plain implication is that the judge should resign if his decision is contrary to the President's preference. That attack is an extraordinary intimidation.

Last Saturday, the Senator Majority leader escalated the attack by stating that if the judge does not resign, he should be impeached. The Constitution limits impeachment to those who have committed "high crimes and misdemeanors." A ruling in a contested case cannot remotely be considered a ground for impeachment.

These attacks do a grave disservice to the principle of an independent judiciary, and, more significantly, mislead the public as to the role of judges in a constitutional democracy.

The Framers of our Constitution gave federal judges life tenure, after nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate. They did not provide for resignation or impeachment whenever a judge makes a decision with which elected officials disagree.

Judges are called upon to make hundreds of decisions each year. These decisions are made after consideration of opposing contentions, both of which are often based on reasonable interpretations of the laws of the United States and the Constitution. Most rulings are subject to appeal, as is the one that has occasioned these attacks.

When a judge is threatened with a call for resignation or impeachment because of disagreement with a ruling, the entire process of orderly resolution of legal disputes is undermined.

We have no quarrel with criticism of any decision rendered by any judge. Informed comment and disagreement from lawyers, academics, and public officials have been hallmarks of the American legal tradition.

But there is an important line between legitimate criticism of a decision and illegitimate

attack upon a judge. Criticism of a decision can illuminate issues and sometimes point the way toward better decisions. Attacks on a judge risk inhibition of all judges as they conscientiously endeavor to discharge their constitutional responsibilities.

In most circumstances, we would be constrained from making this statement by the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, which precludes public comment about a pending case. However, the Code also places on judges an affirmative duty to uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary. In this instance, we believe our duty under this latter provision overrides whatever indirect comment on a pending case might be inferred from this statement (and we intend none).

We urge reconsideration of this rhetoric. We do so not because we doubt the courage of the federal judges of this Circuit, or of this Nation. They have endured attacks, both verbal and physical, and they have established a tradition of judicial independence and faithful regard for the Constitution that is the envy of the world. We are confident they will remain steadfast to that tradition.

Rather, we urge that attacks on a judge of our Circuit cease because of the disservice they do to the Constitution and the danger they create of seriously misleading the American public as to the proper functioning of the federal judiciary.

Each of us has important responsibilities in a constitutional democracy. All of the judges of this Circuit will continue to discharge theirs. We implore the leaders of the Executive and Legislative Branches to abide by theirs.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 26, 1996]

LIFE TENURE FOR A REASON

In an angry and misguided response to an unpopular judicial ruling in New York last month, the White House let it be known that it was considering asking for the resignation of the federal judge in question. Within days of this thinly veiled and constitutionally empty threat, however, cooler heads prevailed. In a letter to a member of Congress who had called for resignation, the president's counsel, Jack Quinn, took the right tack, declaring that "the proper way for the executive branch to contest judicial decisions with which it disagrees is to challenge them in the courts, exactly as the Clinton administration is doing in this case."

At issue is a decision by Judge Harold Baer, a Clinton appointee, to suppress evidence in a multimillion-dollar drug case because the police did not, in his opinion, have probable cause to stop and search the car being used to transport the drugs. Such a ruling is always unpopular, especially in a case like this, in which a defendant at risk of a life sentence will go free if the evidence is inadmissible. But Judge Baer unfortunately used this opportunity to take a gratuitous swipe at the police. It was reasonable, he wrote, for the men involved in this crime to run from the police, because in their neighborhood officers have a reputation for corruption and violence.

The public uproar has caused Judge Baer to reconsider his ruling. But whether he is correct on the law is of secondary interest. Because this evidence is crucial to the case, the government can appeal an adverse decision and get a ruling from a higher court before the trial proceeds.

What is notable about the case is the eagerness of elected officials to demand the ouster of the judge, not because of corruption but because they did not agree with his ruling in one case. It is exactly this kind of situation that the Framers of the Constitution sought to avoid by providing life tenure