

Colonel Loper began his career more than 24 years ago when he pinned on the gold bars of a second lieutenant and the crossed muskets of the infantry. A product of Washington, DC's Georgetown University and the Reserve Officer Training Corps, Bill Loper was well educated, prepared, and trained for his ensuing career as an Army officer. His tours of duty included stints as an adjutant and Chief of Records for the 25th Infantry Division; as a personnel adviser in Pennsylvania; as the Secretary of the General Staff for the 19th Support Command, located in Korea; and ultimately, back to the District of Columbia where he was an assignments officer at the Army Personnel Center, and executive officer in the Army Legislative Liaison Office, where most of us have come to know him.

During his tenure in the Legislative Liaison Office, Colonel Loper has worked hard to represent the interests of the Army to Members of Congress, as well as tirelessly working to assist Senators, Representatives, and their staffs, in dealing with defense matters as well as constituent concerns and issues. I do not think any of my colleagues would disagree with my assessment of Colonel Roper, he is an individual who has always been prompt, responsive, and sensitive to the needs and requests of Members of Congress, and he has presented a positive and impressive image of the Army during the course of his duties here.

Mr. President, service and dedication to duty have been two hallmarks of Colonel Loper's career. He has served our Nation and the Army well during his years of service, and we are grateful for all his efforts and sacrifices in the defense of the United States. I am sure that everyone who has worked with Colonel Loper would want to join me in wishing him health, happiness, and success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO THE U.S. ARMY ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 221ST BIRTHDAY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the U.S. Army was born 221 years ago today on a village square in Cambridge, MA when a group of colonials mustered together to form an army under the authority of the Continental Congress. As this force went on to confront the Redcoats at Lexington, and to ultimately defeat the British in 1783, it is no exaggeration to say that the birth of the Continental Army resulted in the birth of our Nation. More than 2 centuries later, both the United States and its Army are recognized throughout the world as being unequalled, and I rise today to salute the Army on its birthday.

The history of our Nation and our Army are intertwined, and the battle streamers of that service stand not only as testament to the courage, fortitude, and abilities of those who served in the Army, but chronicle the

evolution of the United States. The Army was present when the shot heard around the world was fired, and in Yorktown when the British surrendered, not only admitting defeat to the Americans, but validating that we were a free and separate nation. It was Lewis and Clark, two Army officers, who explored the unknown west before that region became territories and states. It was the Army that entered Mexico City, and our victory in the war with Mexico helped to expand our southwestern borders. At Bull Run, Antietam, Gettysburg, and dozens of other blood stained battlefields, it was the soldiers of one American army fighting the soldiers of another American army for the very future of this Nation. In Havana and the Philippines, the American Army fought Spanish imperialism, and at Verdun, Doughboys battled German imperialism. Army Air Corpsmen lost their lives on that Day of Infamy that began World War II, and dogfaced GI's battled the Nazis, the Fascists, and the Imperial Japanese in North Africa, Sicily, Normandy, Arnhem, and throughout the Pacific. In the early days of the cold war, American soldiers dug in on the southern tip of Korea, creating the Pusan perimeter and holding the line against the advancing North Koreans, and it was American soldiers who stormed the walls at Inchon to turn the tide of the Korean conflict in favor of the United Nations. In the Ia Drang Valley, and in countless firefights in nameless locations throughout the jungles, mountains, and rice paddies of Vietnam, American soldiers valiantly fought to help the fledgling nation of South Vietnam become a democracy; and in Grenada, Panama, and Kuwait, the American Army deposed tyrants and brought terror-filled regimes of dictators to an end.

In its 221 years of history, the U.S. Army has distinguished itself time and time again, and though many things have changed about the Army, the quality and dedication of its soldiers has remained unwavering. The men and women who wear the Army green are individuals who willingly bear many sacrifices so that their countrymen may remain safe, secure, and free. Too few of us ever take the time to think of the soldiers patrolling the demilitarized zone of the Korean Peninsula where there is always the chance that hostilities may break out; or of the soldiers stationed on the Sinai, where they help to ensure the peace between Egypt and Israel remains strong; or of the young paratrooper at Fort Bragg who is ready to deploy to anyplace in the world at a moment's notice. To these soldiers the phrase "Duty, Honor, Country" is more than a collection of mere words, it is the creed by which they live their lives, and we are indeed fortunate for their dedication and selflessness.

For more than 30 years, it was American soldiers who faced down the Soviets across the Iron Curtain, and when

democracy and individual rights ultimately triumphed over communism and collective subjugation, it was thanks in large part to the vigilance of the thousands of soldiers who served on the front lines of the cold war. With the fall of the Communist bloc, the threats to the United States have changed, and the Army is redefining its mission. The Army must now be prepared to respond to regional crises, carry out humanitarian missions, and peacekeeping roles, as well as to be prepared to deal with terrorists and rogue nations. Rest assured, however, that with whatever task that the Army of the United States of America is charged, it will complete its assignment successfully, and it will remain the best trained and best equipped force in the world.

Mr. President, if the soldiers of the Continental Army could see their late 20th century brothers and sisters in arms, they would be amazed at the differences between the Minuteman and the soldier of Force XXI. Rifled muskets have given way to selective fire, magazine-fed weapons systems that allow soldiers to see in the dark and fire a multitude of munitions. The horse cavalry has been replaced by the Bradley fighting vehicle, a weapons platform that has the firepower of the divisions of old; and Army helicopters that comprise one of the largest air forces in the world, now transport and support with supplies and firepower the infantry. Combined, all these elements guarantee the success and superiority of the American Army and that wherever it goes, our soldiers will persevere over any foe. I am pleased to have this opportunity to celebrate the history of the U.S. Army, to thank those soldiers who have served in the past and who serve today, and to assure my colleagues that our Army will always stand ready to defend our citizens and our Nation from all who threaten us, just as they have for the past 220 years.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Thursday, June 13, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,139,481,774,943.05.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,389.23 as his or her share of that debt.

SOUTH DAKOTANS LEAD EFFORT TO GET TO THE BOTTOM OF LOW CATTLE PRICES

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the Advisory Committee on Agricultural Concentration has submitted its final report to Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman. The committee has been investigating the relationship between concentration in the livestock processing and packing industry and the record low prices in the cattle market. It did a tremendous job identifying the problems facing our Nation's livestock

producers, and its recommendations have been widely praised within the agricultural community.

The success of the advisory committee was in no small measure attributable to its membership. The panel consisted of 21 individuals from across the country who represent a cross section of the livestock industry. It included farmers, ranchers, meat packers, processors, poultry growers, retailers, and economists.

While all committee members should be commended for their determination to get to the bottom of the livestock concentration issue, I want to single out for special mention the two members from South Dakota: Herman Schumacher and Tyrone Moos.

Herman Schumacher, who served as vice-chair of the advisory committee, lives in Herried, SD. He owns and operates the Herried Livestock Auction, is past president of the South Dakota Livestock Auction Markets Association, and is part owner of a cattle feedlot.

Without question, Herman is one of the most tenacious and persuasive advocates for cattle producers I have ever met. He understands American agriculture and never stops looking for ways to address problems facing farmers and ranchers. Herman's expertise and leadership were instrumental to the development of the committee's consensus findings and recommendations. In addition, he helped craft additional minority views that are more prescriptive than the consensus views in outlining responses to problems identified in the report.

Tyrone Moos is a grain and livestock producer from Philip, SD, who also serves as director of the Harvest States Cooperative. Tyrone's expertise in both grain and livestock issues were invaluable to the committee's deliberations.

One focus of the committee's review was the impact of concentration in the agricultural transportation industry. The century-old problem of insufficient access to rail cars contributes to the determination of the final price a producer receives for his or her commodities, and Tyrone's experience helped shape the committee's findings in this area. Additionally, Tyrone's influence was evident in the tone and substance of the final recommendations for both the consensus and minority views sections of the report.

When Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman called to solicit Herman's and Tyrone's service on this important committee, it would have been easy for them to decline the invitation. The commitment and sacrifice asked of them was significant.

The Department of Agriculture did not offer compensation, not even for travel expenses. But it did ask for a significant commitment of time. Herman, Tyrone and their colleagues served countless hours on the panel's work—time that could have been spent looking after their own business interests or with their families.

The advisory committee's inquiry directed needed attention to the serious

problem of stagnating cattle prices, provided insights on the nature of that problem and offered recommendations for what might be done about it. Farmers and ranchers in South Dakota and elsewhere should be thankful for that effort.

The work of the Advisory Committee on Agricultural Concentration is done. It is now up to our Nation's policymakers to evaluate the panel's findings and act on its recommendations. I look forward to taking the baton passed on by Herman Schumacher and Tyrone Moos, and I thank them for pointing the way to a solution to the problem of concentration in agriculture.

ISRAELI ELECTION ABOUT DEFINITION OF PEACE

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, the campaign for Israel's first directly elected Prime Minister not only brought a victory for Benjamin Netanyahu but a defeat for the mistaken idea that peace can only be defined from a liberal perspective.

While two well-qualified candidates with different ideologies each articulated their vision for the country, many in the American media—those who reported on the campaign and the experts journalists chose to interview—hid behind stereotypes and missed the real point of the election. At its very core, the campaign was not about whether there should be peace but how to define it.

The American media told us the issue was simply this: Shimon Peres, the liberal, wanted peace. Benjamin Netanyahu, the conservative, didn't. Implied in this ridiculous statement is the wrong assumption that only liberals understand peace.

In the days since the election, the American media aren't quite certain how to characterize Mr. Netanyahu. When Mr. Netanyahu recently expressed his desire for Israel to continue to seek peace with its Arab neighbors—a position he has advocated all along—a Washington Post story identified him as "kinder and gentler."

The media's failure to understand Benjamin Netanyahu and his conservative principles of real peace—real security underscores the differences in how liberals and conservatives view foreign policy.

The left believes peace is simply the absence of conflict. To achieve peace, the left will do whatever is necessary and in many cases give up whatever is necessary simply to maintain the peace.

Conservatives believe peace without freedom is false. Only through the guiding principle that freedom is the core of all human progress can a nation build a lasting peace. After all, what is peace without freedom? What is peace if it means living in constant fear? In Cuba and China today, there is peace, but certainly no freedom.

When any nation builds its foreign policy on a foundation of freedom, democracy, justice, and human rights, true peace and hope will inevitably prevail.

During the 1980's, the left and the media soundly criticized Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher when their policies boldly stated that negotiations with the Soviet Union must be carried out from a position of strength and security . . . not appeasement.

History proved them right. Freedom won. The Berlin Wall—a symbol of tyranny and oppression—crumbled and communism was replaced by capitalism.

Even if many in the American media apparently believe in the ludicrous claim that appeasement leads to peace, Israeli Jews—a majority of whom voted for Netanyahu—correctly understand that protecting freedom is essential to preserving peace.

In his analysis of the election, A.M. Rosenthal of the New York Times said it best when he wrote: "the majority was not voting against peace—the very idea is idiocy—but for the hope that Mr. Netanyahu and a Likud-led coalition might create a peace they could trust while they slept, not just while they stood at arms."

In a region where Israel's neighbors have vowed its destruction, where thousands of missiles in other countries are pointed at Israel's cities, where well-financed terrorists threaten to murder and frighten Israel's citizens, appeasement through weakness will only invite more violence, more bloodshed and inevitably a loss of freedom and peace.

We all want peace for Israel—a shining jewel of democracy in a region where freedom is often unwelcome. Choosing the best road for achieving that peace is the task that awaits Benjamin Netanyahu. He understands—as well as the overwhelming majority of Israeli Jews who voted for him—that only when Israel is secure, can Israel truly be free and at peace.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at this time when the fiscal year 1997 appropriations level for the National Endowment for the Arts is being determined, I would like to illustrate the importance of the arts to the education of our children and to the growth of the local economy through two examples from my home State of Rhode Island.

The May 23 issue of *Nature* describes the Starting With the Arts [SWAP] Program for 96 first-graders in four Pawtucket, RI, classrooms. The program is based on the internationally recognized Kodaly curriculum that emphasizes musical and visual arts skills. After 7 months, the SWAP children scored better in math than their counterparts who had standard classes—and equally well in reading—even though their kindergarten scores indicated that they were behind. At the end of second grade, math comprehension and