

provide mutual support. We must continue to uphold this spirit and sentiment, so that democracy ultimately becomes the common way of life of all humanity. May people living in every corner of the global village enjoy democracy!

Thus, we cherish the young buds of democracy on the Chinese mainland. Certain forms of election in rural townships and villages have spread on the mainland in recent years. We are happy to see it succeed and call on the Chinese mainland authorities to show the courage and determination to boldly take the grand route to democracy. Join with us and bring democracy to all of Chinese society, seeking everlasting well-being and peace for the Chinese people!

Unquestionably, if Taiwan can achieve democracy, then Hong Kong should be able to maintain democracy, and there is no reason why the Chinese mainland cannot do everything possible to head in that direction. This is the true way to solve the China problem.

In the 21st century, mankind will certainly prove that "All roads lead to Democracy!"

TRIBUTE TO LT. GOV. HENRY E.
HOWELL

HON. OWEN B. PICKETT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1997

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, he was dubbed a radical, a political gadfly, even a liberal Democrat, but to others who knew him, former Virginia Lt. Gov. Henry E. Howell, who died July 7, 1997, was a political visionary and a champion for justice. Even his closest friends would say he was a man who marched to a different drummer. He backed up his convictions with hard work and a pesky ability to reverse inequitable political policies of long standing.

He thumbed his political nose at the established Democratic party at a time when it was not popular, even though it meant he would never achieve the political plum he so dearly coveted—the governorship of Virginia. Sticking to his convictions in the face of political adversity cost him the governorship. Henry Howell loved Virginia, its institutions, and its people. Many credit him with changing the face of the Commonwealth's politics during his six major campaigns for State office between 1969 and 1977. Former Gov. Colgate W. Darden, Jr. has been quoted as saying, "He stirred Virginia politics only like dynamite could have done in a pond," adding, "He gave greater impetus to mass voting in Virginia and stirred people more than anybody in my lifetime."

That was Henry Howell. He intended his work, not to destroy, but to improve the State and its government by making them accessible to all the people. He never allowed political differences, however, to taint his social or personal relationship with adversaries. His quick, warm, and winning smile served him both as a politician and a person.

Henry Howell leaves his indelible and pervasive mark on the political history of Virginia. Those who knew and loved him best will miss his mischievous smile, warm counsel, commonsense perspective, and keen political insight.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2016) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes:

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the Appropriations Military Construction Subcommittee for not funding additional rounds of the Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] process. Several of my colleagues from Texas and I have been advocating zero-funding for BRAC and I am pleased the committee agrees with me.

The fact is, the last 4 rounds of the BRAC process have resulted in the closing of 97 defense installations in the United States. And yet today, we are still unable to fully assess the impact of the closures. We have not seen a report or complete assessment of how the closures affect military preparedness. We do not know the amount of actual savings, if any, generated from the closures. And yet we do know that we have spent a lot of money to close these bases. According to the Department of Defense, by the year 2000, we will have spent approximately \$23 billion in clean-up and other costs associated with closing these bases.

Members, not funding additional rounds of BRAC makes sense. By not funding additional rounds of BRAC, we are saying "let's look before we leap." Congress does not need to continue to spend the taxpayer's money on BRAC until we know if we have actually saved money by closing these bases; how much of the taxpayer's money has been spent closing these bases; and how the closure of bases has affected our country's military preparedness. This bill will allow us to make those assessments in a responsible and effective manner.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in support of the rule to the Interior appropriations bill.

Though I am disappointed that the rule fails to protect an amendment for full NEA funding I must support the rule due to the Interior appropriations bill's inclusion of \$8.5 million for Sterling Forest. I support continued funding for the NEA.

Funding for the arts has not only produced \$3.4 billion in revenue, but supports local economies by way of increased sales in local establishments.

The arts are an integral part of education. Children with an arts background have shown increased ability in math, and a heightened capability for analytical and creative thinking. Funding for the National Endowment for the Arts has also created many literacy programs and children's educational activities.

In my own 20th District of New York, I understand the necessity of continued funding for the arts. The local theater and arts groups, orchestras, and dance troupes, will suffer greatly. These groups represent thousands of jobs that are supported by the arts.

Moreover, I strongly support the agreement between New York and the Sterling Forest Corp. designed to purchase Sterling Forest. This has been a long and hard battle for many years as Chairman Rugula and my New Jersey colleagues know.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and Senate in fully funding the NEA during the House-Senate conference.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DR. CHARLES L. DRAKE

HON. CHARLES F. BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1997

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, as a 1974 graduate of Dartmouth College, it is with great sadness that I bring to the attention of the House the passing of Dr. Charles (Chuck) Drake on Tuesday, July 8, 1997. Let me convey my personal sympathies to his friends and family. Furthermore, I would like to submit to the RECORD the text of an obituary that appeared in the New York Times so that the American people can reflect upon the accomplishments of a great American and a true scholar.

[From the New York Times, July 11, 1997]

CHARLES L. DRAKE, 72, DINOSAUR-THEORY
COMBATANT

(By Lawrence Van Gelder)

Dr. Charles L. Drake, emeritus professor of earth science at Dartmouth College and a leading advocate of the theory that it was volcanic eruptions that killed off the dinosaurs, died Tuesday at his home in Norwich, Vt. He was 72.

The cause was a heart attack, said his wife, Martha.

In a protracted, often rancorous debate, Drake stood opposed to the school of thought that attributed the disappearance of the dinosaurs to the impact of a large meteorite 65 million years ago. In this theory, the meteorite kicked up a worldwide pall of dust that blotted out the sun and killed off many plants and animals.

With Charles B. Officer, another Dartmouth geologist, Drake theorized that instead it was huge volcanic eruptions, spewing lava over 200,000 square miles of what is now India and disrupting the atmosphere with chlorine, sulfur dioxide and carbon dioxide, and that led to the end of the dinosaurs' 160-million-year reign on earth.

But Drake's prominence in his profession rested on far more than his role in the debate over the dinosaurs. His leadership among geologists, marked by an ability to bring together colleagues from various nations and disciplines, brought him to high positions in scientific organizations.

He served from 1990 to 1992 as a member of President George Bush's Council of Advisers

on Science and Technology and was also a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; president of the 18th International Geological Congress, held in Washington in 1993; a president of the Geological Society of America and of the American Geophysical Union, and a member of committees of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council and the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere.

At both Columbia University and Dartmouth, Drake became chairman of his department. While at Columbia, where he spent 16 years before joining the Dartmouth faculty in 1969, he conducted pioneering research on the geologic evolution of the continental margin of the Eastern United States.

Since 1970, he had conducted research at the reservoir at Lake Powell in Utah on the ecological effects of man's efforts to impound the otherwise wild Colorado River and manage water resources in an arid area.

The dinosaur dispute between the volcano theorists and the meteorite-impact theorists raged through the late 1970s and the 1980s, with the meteorite side led by Nobel laureate physicist Luis W. Alvarez; his son, Walter, a geologist, and their colleagues at the University of California at Berkeley.

Then, in 1994, a new theory combining the conflicting ideas was proposed: antipodal volcanism. In this theory, a speeding rock from outer space, exploding on impact with the force of millions of hydrogen bombs, would have blasted enormous shock waves through the earth. These shock waves would have coalesced at the antipode, the side of the planet opposite the impact crater, to fracture the ground, heat it and bring on volcanic outpourings.

In the new theory, then, both the meteorite and its volcanic repercussions in the opposite hemisphere would have contributed to the decline of the dinosaurs. But Drake never embraced that notion, his colleague Officer said Wednesday.

Charles Lum Drake was born on July 13, 1924, in Ridgewood, N.J. He received a bachelor's degree in geologic engineering from Princeton in 1948 and a doctorate in geology from Columbia in 1958. He began his teaching career in 1953 as a lecturer at Columbia, where he became a professor and, in 1967, chairman of the department of geology.

In 1969, he went to Dartmouth as a professor of geology. There he served at various times as chairman of the department, dean of graduate studies and associate dean of the faculty for sciences. He retired in 1994.

He is survived by his wife of 46 years, the former Martha Churchill; three daughters, Mary Layton, also of Norwich; Pace Mehling of Corinth, Vt., and Susannah Culhane of Manhattan; a brother, Thayer, of Avon, Conn., and four grandchildren.

AMERICA'S VETERANS URGE RESTRAINT

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1997

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Affairs Committee held a hearing this week on S. 923 and H.R. 2040, measures which would deny certain veterans' benefits to veterans convicted of certain capital crimes. Seven of the major veterans' service organizations testified as one voice, and I urge my colleagues to review their excellent statement which

thoughtfully examines a very difficult and complex issue. Their testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF RICK SURRATT, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, JULY 9, 1997

I am pleased to present the collective views of the American Legion, AMVETS, the Blinded Veterans Association (BVA), the Disabled American Veterans (DAV), the Jewish War Veterans of the USA, the Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA), the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States (VFW), and the Vietnam Veterans of America (VVA) on two bills to amend the law pertaining to benefits eligibility in the case of veterans committing capital crimes. The national veterans organizations comprising this group, which for the sake of convenience I will refer to as the "veterans group," have come together to speak as one, united voice because of the views and concerns they hold in common on the subject matter of these bills.

The veterans group appreciates your invitation to explain its position on whether and to what extent the commission of capital offenses by veterans should affect their, or their dependents', benefit eligibility status. Without question, this raises a serious public policy question for our Nation's citizens. It is also certainly appropriate that the millions of veterans the group represents have a voice on this issue because, after all, these veterans are some of America's most patriotic and civic-minded citizens, and these matters, of course, also involve highly valued and honored rights veterans earned by virtue of their reviewed service to the Nation. On the other hand, because veterans are among our most responsible citizens, they must not and will not view their interests as veterans as separate from or in conflict with the greater interests of the Nation as a whole. However, as appropriate with many such difficult issues, they counsel a balancing between the immediate human desire for and the attractiveness of societal retribution for crimes and the countervailing rational concerns about the maintenance of stable measured, and equitable principles of law—and thus the best interests of our society as a whole—over the long-term. It is that sense of prudence and equity that guides the veterans group in their position of these bills.

The veterans group has no quarrel with a view that veterans are without privilege to disobey society's rules, and that, absent special circumstances, the consequences for crimes should be the same for veterans and nonveterans. Fairness dictates that veterans be treated the same as other citizens on matters unrelated to their status as veterans per se, however. Thus, the veteran should not suffer greater or harsher penalties merely because he or she is a veteran than a similarly situated nonveteran. To impose greater punishment on the veteran goes beyond punishment on account of a crime to punishment on account of being a veteran. That is not to argue that we should continue to hold veterans who commit crimes in the same high esteem that we do veterans who conduct themselves properly. Thus, we do not have to bestow the same honors upon veterans who bring dishonor to themselves as we would upon veterans who continue to conduct themselves in an upright manner during their civilian lives following completion of military service.

Of concern to the veterans group here, however, is the treatment to be accorded veteran status once earned through satisfactory fulfillment of service to the Nation. Veteran status is a legal status which, as a practical matter, is realized through the special rights created for veterans to enjoy as a restitution for the sacrifices of military

service. Almost without exception, this status, once accrued, is considered indefeasible. It is conferred by the completion and honorable character of the recipient's military service and is not conditioned upon subsequent conduct in civilian life. Logically, that is as it should be. Just as a former servicemember without honorable service should not be awarded veterans' rights on the basis of post-service accomplishments, no matter how commendable, conversely, veteran status should not be exposed to rescission as a result of civilian conduct following, or for other reasons unrelated to, the performance of military service. Veterans should be secure in the knowledge that their veteran status is vested and will not be held hostage to irrelevant, post-service factors. If veterans' rights are intended to remunerate for disabilities incurred, opportunities lost, extraordinary rigors suffered, or contributions made in connection with and during the time of military service, such rights should, like wages earned, not be withheld or recalled because of subsequent performance or unconnected actions or events, even when such actions or events are of a character that evoke very negative public sentiments. The special value of service to one's country and the integrity of veteran status would be defeated by departure from that tradition. Fidelity to this principle admits exceptions for only the most highly exceptional circumstances.

Currently, the law provides for forfeiture of veterans' rights only under circumstances of crimes against the government which jeopardize or seriously threaten our national security. Section 6104 of title 38, United States Code, provides that veterans shown to be guilty of mutiny, treason, or sabotage forfeit all future VA benefits, and section 6105 of title 38 similarly provides that veterans convicted of a variety of subversive activities forfeit VA benefits, including eligibility for burial in a national cemetery. These circumstances justify nullification of veterans' entitlements because individuals should not receive support from a government they actively seek to destroy.

This Committee now has before it S. 923 which the Senate passed recently. This bill would essentially void the veteran status of any veteran convicted of a Federal capital offense. Forfeiture would result from the commission of any Federal offense punishable by death (regardless of whether the death penalty was deemed warranted or actually imposed). Obviously, that would go well beyond the nature of the offenses which are now deemed to justify voidance of veteran status. While the veterans of this Nation understand and, indeed, share in the public indignation at such detestable acts, they believe that persons committing such crimes should be punished as criminals, not veterans. As noted previously, when the laws impose the criminal penalty and also void veteran status, they punish veterans both for the crime and because they are veterans. Unquestionably, persons committing capital offenses, as well as many lesser but also repulsive or unsavory crimes such as child molestation or even drunken driving, are justifiably not viewed very sympathetically by the public, but emotions should not obscure or overcome the more judicious considerations appropriate in these matters. An integral part of our national values and the qualities that set us apart from other nations is our refusal to compromise justice and fairness even for the most reprehensible within our society.

Therefore, in addition to opposing S. 923 because it operates to impose greater punishment on veterans merely because they are veterans, the veterans group also opposes it