

fire chief. Marlan succeeded his father as fire chief in 1975 and has witnessed the growth of the fire department with the addition of two new fire stations and nine new fire trucks.

In Springfield Township, the name Hillman has become synonymous with firefighting. Chief Hillman's brother Elwyn, who is assistant fire chief, and his son-in-laws Charles Oaks and Earl Colloto are all members of the fire department. Chief Hillman is a hero not only for his lengthy and diligent service as a firefighter, but for the sacrifices he has made. He has missed only a few fire department meetings in 50 years, he has been called to the scene in the middle of the night, and he has missed a number of hot meals. Chief Hillman did this with a humble disposition and sense of duty. One of the legacies he has left is the sense of camaraderie which helped mold the firefighters into the close-knit group they remain today.

We owe Chief Hillman a debt of gratitude for the protection and stability he has provided for half a century. Without a doubt, our community is a much better place in which to live because of him. The people of Springfield Township have truly been blessed to have a man of Chief Hillman's caliber working on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in wishing Chief Hillman and his lovely wife Norma much joy in their retirement.

OBSERVING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1997

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1974, Turkish troops landed on the island of Cyprus. The ensuing 23-year occupation has been a tragedy for the people of Cyprus and an embarrassment to the NATO alliance.

The United States has a special responsibility to play a role in the resolution of the Cyprus dilemma. Twenty-three years ago, as Washington was paralyzed by the Watergate scandal, the administration turned a blind eye to the crisis that was mounting in the Eastern Mediterranean. For many years prior to 1974, Washington had ignored Turkey's overt threats against Cyprus. In 1974, we watched with cold indifference as Turkish troops invaded the island. Our failure to avert the Cyprus conflict and to achieve a diplomatic solution to the standoff helped seal the fate of the island for the next 23 years. It is for this reason that the United States has a duty to help achieve peace on Cyprus.

I commend President Clinton and my colleagues here in the House for turning the spotlight on the tragedy of Cyprus. Recent United States diplomatic initiatives and the appointment of Richard Holbrooke as Special Emissary for Cyprus give new hope that an old struggle may be resolved. The United Nations-sponsored talks between President Clerides and Mr. Denktash in New York City are another promising step. Congress must continue to support the President and the international community in this long-overdue effort.

We may not be able to bring back the Greek-Cypriots who perished and disappeared at the hands of Turkish troops. But we can take occasions such as this to remember those who have suffered, and we can continue to search for answers to the cases of missing persons. And we can honor them by working to help today's Cypriots realize their dreams of a free, unified Cyprus. In doing so, we may be able to secure lasting peace and economic security for a people who are so richly deserving of it.

TRIBUTE TO REV. CHARLES BROOKS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1997

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share in the thanks and praise being bestowed on Rev. Charles Brooks for his invaluable service to St. Paul African Methodist Episcopal Church and the community of San Bernardino. His 8-year dedication to this congregation as pastor will be fondly remembered and greatly missed. Since 1959, Reverend Brooks has undeniably touched the lives of hundreds with his positive and effective leadership.

The many awards and honors that have been bestowed on Reverend Brooks, including Life Time Achievement Awards for his dedication to civic affairs in the black community and for his diligent commitment to community service, do not begin to capsuleize the contribution he has made to San Bernardino and communities abroad. Reverend Brooks is not only recognized for his contributions to a number of congregations, but in his capacity as teacher, administrator, and civic leader. His groundbreaking career, as the first black elected as president of the San Bernardino Clergy Association and the La Jolla Ministerial Association, will continue to serve as a leading example of excellence.

It is my honor to offer my congratulations and appreciation to such an outstanding pastor and leader at the arrival of his retirement. As he has given so greatly to San Bernardino and various other communities, it is my pleasure to wish him and his family the best in the years to come.

LINLITHGO REFORMED CHURCH OF LIVINGSTON, NY, CELEBRATES ITS 275TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, when French traveler Alexis de Tocqueville visited these shores in 1830 he noted something very special about the then-young United States. He noticed the importance of religion to Americans.

And he was right, Mr. Speaker. This is a religious Nation. And from the beginning, churches were among the first structures built, and they remain the center of American community life. I'd like to speak about a very special one today.

The Linlithgo Reformed Church of Livingston, NY, is celebrating its 275th anniversary this year, making it older than the Nation itself.

Mr. Speaker, this church can trace its existence to a July 4, 1722, organizational meeting. Robert Livingston, Jacob Vosburgh, and Cornelis Martensen were appointed elders, and Tobias Ten Broeck, Robert Van Deusen, and Willem Hallenbeck were named deacons.

Records are unclear, but we think the church building was completed on or about September 22, 1722. One interesting historical fact emerges from the records. The first pastor to be paid in money instead of corn or wheat was Jeremiah Romeyn in 1788.

Three years later, members of the consistory of the church voted to make it a corporate body. Finally, in 1813, the consistory voted to plan a new church, which was dedicated in 1815. The new church, still in operation today, was completed in 1855.

A reported low state of piety resulted in a January 3, 1840, day of fasting and prayer.

The 20th century history of the church resembled that of many others during this time. By 1921, the practice of renting pews was discontinued. During the World War II, many of the men of the congregation answered the call to service, as did many of the women on the home front.

Since then, the church has continued to grow and prosper, serving the spiritual and even the social needs of its people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and other Members to join me in expressing our best wishes to a very special institution, the Linlithgo Reformed Church of Livingston, NY, as it celebrates its 275th year of service to the community.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MORMON PIONEERS ENTERING THE SALT LAKE VALLEY

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1997

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago today, Brigham Young and the first Mormon pioneers descended into the Salt Lake Valley. They found a desolate, hostile land, covered by sagebrush and a vast lake of water with a salinity seven times greater than the ocean. Naysayer Jim Bridger offered \$1,000 for the first bushel of corn raised in the Salt Lake Valley. But these stout-hearted souls were undaunted. Making "the desert blossom as the rose" was certainly not the first or greatest challenge these pioneers had faced.

The Mormon pioneers were no strangers to adversity. Their trek had begun long before their handcarts and wagons were nailed together in Nebraska. From the time the Church was organized in 1830, they had faced persecution and were driven out of Kirtland, OH; they had fled Independence, MO, in the face of an exterminator order; and they had been driven by angry mobs from the fair city of Nauvoo, IL, which they had built up out of the swamps of the Mississippi River. At last, their only choice was to move west, to a land no one else wanted, where they could worship God after the manner they desired.

Along the trail, they faced numerous hardships. While over 70,000 people made the

journey to the Salt Lake Valley prior to the coming of the railroad, hundreds died on the journey west. Men, women, and children rode in covered wagons or walked pulling their scant belongings in handcarts along the thousand mile trail from Nebraska to Utah. Disease, starvation, fatigue, exposure to cold, took their toll on the lives of young and old alike. Many young children completed the journey orphaned.

It took great courage, faith, and commitment to make the trek west. These faithful pioneers have left a great legacy for our Nation. Their legacy is one of hard work; making the desert blossom as the rose. It is a legacy of commitment to religious freedom; although the U.S. Constitution did not protect them, the Mormons were willing to send a battalion to the Mexican-American War to fight for the freedoms it affords. And it is a legacy of American settlement of the West; over 500 communities were settled by early Mormons, from Canada to San Bernardino, CA, to Mexico.

I salute my own pioneer ancestors today, and honor all those who created this legacy of faith in every footstep.

THE CASE FOR MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1997

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, I discovered a speech made in 1923 by then Army Maj. George C. Marshall, that warned against a troubling pattern of failure in American history—a pattern which I fear we may be repeating today. Marshall, of course, later became one of the most distinguished American leaders of the century, serving as Chief of Staff of the Army in World War II, Secretary of State in the early years of the cold war, and Secretary of Defense during the war in Korea. “[F]rom the earliest days of this country,” said Marshall in 1923, “[the Regular Army] was materially increased in strength and drastically reduced with somewhat monotonous regularity.” Immediately following a war, he said, “every American’s thoughts were centered on the tragedies involved in the lessons just learned,” and the size of the standing Army was increased in an effort to prepare for future conflicts. But within a few months, Marshall lamented, “the public mind ran away from the tragedies of the War . . . and became obsessed with the magnitude of the public debt. . . . Forgetting almost immediately the bitter lesson of unpreparedness, [the public] demanded and secured the reduction of the Army.”

The bitter lesson of unpreparedness, unfortunately, had to be relearned repeatedly through much of the rest of the 20th century. Each time the price was paid in the lives of young Americans ill-prepared for the missions thrust upon them—at Kasserine Pass in North Africa, where United States forces were decimated in their first large tank battle of World War II; at the start of the Korean war, where a poorly equipped United States holding force, called Task Force Smith, was almost destroyed; and at Desert One in Iran, where equipment failures and poor coordination doomed the hostage rescue mission.

Today, in contrast, America has built a military force that sets the standard for the rest of the world. It is equipped with modern weapons. It is well led and well trained. The military services are more able than ever to work cooperatively. It is, above all, a high quality force, made up of well-educated, carefully selected, disciplined volunteers. They have carried out an extraordinarily broad range of responsibilities in recent years in a fashion that has demonstrated their professionalism and their dedication to duty. The former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, often characterized the troops he led as an exquisite force—he was not exaggerating.

I am afraid, however, that we may once again be forgetting the costs of unpreparedness. A return to the unfortunate pattern of the past is reflected in several ways. First, now that the cold war is over, the rationale for maintaining U.S. military strength is being questioned even by many who ought to know better. Second, because of budget pressures, defense spending appears unlikely to rise in the foreseeable future, but budgets must grow modestly over time to maintain a capable force. Third, the quality of our Armed Forces depends on keeping quality people in the services, but the extraordinarily high pace of operations is putting too much pressure on military families and may lead many good people to leave. Consider each of these issues in turn.

Why we should remain strong: Today, a number of my congressional colleagues challenge me with a question that surely echoed through the halls of Congress in 1923 or in 1946—“What is the enemy?” I am asked. And with that question, there are many others. Why continue to support more spending for defense when the cold war is over? Why continue to pursue expensive, new, advanced weapons when U.S. technology was so dominant in Operation Desert Storm, and when no other nation is spending nearly what we do on military hardware?

If we look to the past, however, we have never been able to predict what military threats would arise in the future. In 1903, no one envisioned World War I. In 1923 we did not foresee World War II. In 1946, we did not anticipate the Korean war. In 1989, we did not expect the Persian Gulf war. So a major reason for maintaining military strength is to hedge against the appearance of unexpected regional or global threats in the future.

But that is not the only reason. Today, our military strength is the foundation of a relatively secure international order in which small conflicts, though endemic and inevitable, will not decisively erode global stability. And as such our military strength is also a means of discouraging the growth of a new power that could, in time, constitute a threat to peace and evolve into the enemy we do not now foresee. Because of this, the very limited investment required to maintain our military strength—though somewhat larger than we are making right now—is disproportionately small compared to the benefits we, and the rest of the world, derive from it. My fellow Missourian, Harry S. Truman, stated the issue clearly: “We must be prepared to pay the price for peace, or assuredly we will pay the price of war.”

Defense spending: As so often in the past, the United States again appears unwilling to pay the price of peace. Since the mid-1980’s,

the Department of Defense budget has declined by 40 percent in real, inflation-adjusted dollars, and the size of the force has been reduced by a third. Funding for weapons procurement has fallen even further—today we are spending just one-third as much on new weapons as we did in the mid-1980’s. I do not believe that these levels of spending can be tolerated without critically weakening our military capabilities. And yet, there is all too little support for restoring even modest rates of growth in military spending. On the contrary, for long-term planning purposes, the Pentagon assumes that Defense budgets will be frozen at about \$250 billion per year, in constant prices, as far as the eye can see.

We cannot, however, maintain a force of a stable size without at least modest growth in spending. For one thing, in order to keep quality people in the force, the quality of life in the military has to keep pace with the quality of life in the civilian sector. So pay, housing expenditures, facility maintenance accounts, and other related activities have to increase with the overall growth of the economy. Second, modern, advanced weapons grow in cost from one generation to the next, so budgets must grow to take advantage of evolving technology. Finally, sophisticated new weapons are more expensive to maintain, and they allow a higher, more costly pace of operations. Flat defense budgets, therefore, will entail further, strategically unwarranted cuts in the size of the force, declining military readiness, and a failure to exploit the rapid evolution of military technology. This is a prescription for the slow, steady, debilitating erosion of our military capabilities.

Pressures on people: Perhaps most importantly, even as the size of the force has declined in recent years, the pace of military operations—from Somalia, to Haiti, to Bosnia, to the Persian Gulf—has accelerated dramatically. Senior officers in all of the services worry that the pace of operations will sooner or later drive good people out of the military. To operate the modern U.S. military requires professional personnel with advanced skills that take years to learn. As a result, the services have to retain quality people after their initial enlistment run out. Older, skilled service members will get married, have children, struggle to make ends meet, worry about education, just like other citizens. Military personnel managers, therefore, often say that they enlist soldiers, but they retain families.

By its very nature, military life puts pressure on families. Service members are away from home for extended periods. Moves are frequent. Jobs are often very demanding, and job pressures grow as careers advance. Military personnel, of course, understand and accept these pressures, including regular deployments abroad, as part of the job. The pressures on military families have been greatly aggravated in recent years, however, by force reductions and by unplanned, irregular, temporary assignments to support military operations. If we are to keep skilled people in the service, we cannot afford to keep asking them to do more and more with less and less.

Were he here today, Major Marshall, I am afraid, would recognize all of this—a failure to appreciate the need for military strength, reluctance to pay the price of peace, asking too much of those who serve in the military—as familiar symptoms of our Nation’s traditional attitude toward national defense. If we are to