

process to continue to flower in New Haven. Jean is keenly aware that New Haven is nothing without a strong and active artistic community and she has done everything possible to allow that community to thrive. Her work reminds us all that we have an obligation to support the arts and to make art accessible to everyone. She has truly brought the world to New Haven and in doing so has enriched the lives of everyone who participates in or enjoys the arts.

SUPPORT OF ALEXIS HERMAN FOR SECRETARY OF LABOR

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1997

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of this Nation, a recent editorial I read in the largest Spanish-American newspaper in the Americas. *Diario Las Americas*, in their February 27, 1997, edition, called for the confirmation of Ms. Alexis Herman as our next Secretary of Labor. I must agree wholeheartedly with its endorsement, and call on the Senate to confirm her, expeditiously.

As the newspaper points out, Alexis Herman has a lifetime of positive public service, which highlights her efforts to improve the progress and lives of women, African-Americans, and Hispanic-Americans. As the President's Assistant and Director of the Office of Public Liaison, she has shown us her savvy, expertise, and experience. I am also proud to say that she is a native of one of the finest States in the Union, Alabama.

The Senate Republican leader, Senator TRENT LOTT has endorsed her nomination after a series of meetings with Ms. Herman. With this fact taken into consideration, I can't think of any legitimate reason why the Senate can't complete its committee process and bring Ms. Herman's nomination to the floor for a vote. I am confident, that once the whole Senate reviews the record of Alexis Herman, they will confirm her.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the whole text of the newspaper endorsement which I mentioned, be placed in the RECORD.

[From the *Diario Las Americas*, Feb. 27, 1997]
ALEXIS HERMAN FOR SECRETARY OF LABOR OF THE UNITED STATES

The nomination by President Clinton of Alexis Herman for Secretary of Labor of the United States is the recognition of her professional, humanitarian and civic merits, proven by her intense public service career which began as Coordinator of the crusade to train and find jobs for youths sponsored by the Catholic Church in Mobile, Alabama, and most recently as Director of the Office of Public Liaison of the White House and Special Assistant to the President.

Her life in public service has engaged her, after graduating from Xavier University, in a rich and varied number of activities devoted to the professional betterment of Afro-American women, succeeding in her efforts as Director of the Black Women's Employment Program to have companies such as Coca-Cola and Delta appoint Afro-American women to high ranking positions.

In her efforts to improve women's progress in the work and entrepreneurial ranks she has constantly maintained the principle that

the Hispanic minority must be recognized as a vital part of progress in the United States, offering her enthusiastic support to the programs sponsored by the Hispanic Catholic Centers of the Washington Archdiocese. Mrs. Herman has been the main line of communication between His Eminence James Cardinal Hickey and President Clinton for issues having to do with the development of vital social programs for Hispanic and Afro-American minorities.

At the time of the crisis brought about by the assassination of the four "Brothers to the Rescue" pilots by the totalitarian tyranny of Fidel Castro in February 1996, from her post in the Office of Public Liaison of the White House she collaborated with then UN Ambassador Madeleine K. Albright, and others, in the formulation of President Clinton's policy in reprisal to that attack.

Alexis Herman has enough merits as a woman, as a prominent member of the Afro-American minority and as a professional, to be confirmed by the Senate as Secretary of Labor. This would be good for the whole country. The Senate's Republican leader Trent Lott has said that he will support the nomination and *DIARIO LAS AMERICAS* considers that the Senate should approve it as soon as possible.

WILL AN AMERICAN "TOMMY" PLEASE STAND?

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1997

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, Tom Harney, an attorney in San Jose, CA, has written a thought-provoking article in a recent edition of *Stars and Stripes* which concerns the debt we owe our veterans and soldiers. For those who do not regularly receive *Stars and Stripes*, I wish to make this useful article available.

[From the *Stars and Stripes*, Jan. 26, 1997]

WILL AN AMERICAN "TOMMY" PLEASE STAND?
(By Thomas Roy Harney)

Rudyard Kipling's poem "Tommy" rose from the depths of my so-called brain recently, triggered and recalled from those depths by the print-media news.

Tommy, a lawyer's guide to veterans affairs, is the name of the quarterly newsletter published by the Veterans Law Section of the Federal Bar Association, but I had somehow previously failed to make the obvious connection between the poem and the newsletter.

The poem "Tommy" is from a different time, 1892; a different country, Great Britain; and almost a different language, English Cockney; yet it is right on point concerning American veterans and all Americans today.

"Tommy Atkins" or "Tommy" is the British equivalent of the American GI (e.g., Bill Mauldin's Willie and Joe in his popular cartoon series "Up Front"), and "Tommy Atkins" is the speaker in Kipling's poem.

The speaker is calling our attention to the gross disparity in the value that the citizenry places on its soldiers. The unjust disparity he observes is the miserable treatment accorded the soldier and ex-soldier in peacetime, contrasted with their treatment when the winds of war are blowing or, as Tommy puts it, when "there's trouble in the wind."

Kipling's tribute to Mr. Thomas Atkins is relevant today, because in 1996, more than 100 years after it was penned by him, an American "Tommy" wouldn't have to look too far for modern-day American examples to support his disparity contention.

Were he writing today, Kipling's Mr. Atkins could have cited the statement released by Pentagon officials recently that the military logs for an eight-day period during which thousands of American troops might have been exposed to nerve gas and other Iraqi chemical weapons shortly after the Persian Gulf war appear to have been removed or lost and cannot be located despite an exhaustive search.

There are several mysterious gaps in the otherwise meticulous combat logs. The gaps include the period in early March 1991 in which American combat engineers blew up the sprawling Kamisiyah ammunition depot in southern Iraq, an event that exposed thousands of American troops to nerve gas.

One wonders if "Mr. Tommy Atkins" would feel the need to point out that at one time the Defense Department had denied to Congress that such combat logs even existed, and the DoD released the logs last year only after a Georgia veterans group sought them under the Freedom of Information Act.

Only recently has the Pentagon acknowledged that the nerve gas sarin and other chemical weapons had definitely been stored in the Iraqi ammunition depot at Kamisiyah that was destroyed by U.S. troops in March 1991.

That event at the Kamisiyah ammunition depot exposing thousands of U.S. soldiers to a cloud of the nerve gas sarin and other deadly chemicals, poisoning from anti-nerve gas tablets, and poisoning from pesticides are the presumptive sources of the disabling physical health problems that have been plaguing veterans and children of veterans of the Persian Gulf War.

As an attorney, I respect the way Kipling's speaker, "Mister Atkins," makes his case; his supporting examples are clear and visual, his logic is straightforward and his closing line poses a clear point for all Americans to ponder.

The concerned but muted and fragmented chorus of American voices would do well to find a present-day point man like "Tommy Atkins" who, armed with fresh examples to support his disparity contention, could forcefully champion the rights of responsible Americans and blast his closing line to Pentagon officials, the Defense Department, the VA and others—shouting, with the last words of the poem, "Bloomin fools" we're not.

THE SCANDAL-A-DAY ADMINISTRATION

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as someone who has been looking into the dealings of the Clinton administration related to campaign fundraising, possible breaches of national and economic security and other indiscretions, this past week has been very interesting. It would appear that there is no end to the sheer arrogance and deliberate skirting of the law under which this administration has operated. No law, and certainly no ethical standard, appear to forestall any efforts by this President to further his personal and political interests and those of his associates. From dealings with a foreign company and officials with close ties to the People's Republic of China that likely jeopardized important economic and national secrets, to encouraging meetings at the White House with DNC political fundraisers, major

contributors, and even Federal regulators, this administration has shown a blatant disregard for ethical behavior and the public interest in a democracy.

It would be impossible for me to call attention to all the various scandals unfolding around this administration in a reasonable amount of time. I for one am most concerned with questions pertaining to economic and other forms of espionage on behalf of foreign interests by a host of acknowledged friends and associates of the President. I believe these to be the most serious and most disturbing of the allegations that will ultimately be the focus of the media and the main source of the American people's disgust. But in the case of this administration, it more resembles the old saying "Pick your poison," because there's no telling what may finally be most damaging.

In October 1996 when I started asking questions about Clinton administration policy toward China and Vietnam, I was one of a few who found their associations and behavior suspect. Now, every major newspaper this week has had two and three front-page stories about various indiscretions under President Clinton and by President Clinton. And why is that? It's because there is an unbelievable wealth of information regarding wrongdoing out there. Yet, Attorney General Reno continues to deny the need for an independent counsel. It's hard to believe she's applying the same law we in Congress wrote just for situations like this where it is necessary to remove politics from an investigation. Clearly there is credible evidence of illegal activity and information that links principal figures, that is, President Clinton and Vice President GORE, to these actions.

I urge you, Mr. Speaker, and everyone to take a look at two editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post on March 5, 1997, that outline another abuse at the hands of the Clinton administration. This one involving speeding up the citizenship process for potential political gain. As you can see from their tone, I'm not the only one who has grown tired of their insatiable political appetite and disrespect for honest government.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1997]
BURNED AGAIN

On subject after subject, this turns out to be a White House that you believe at your peril. Six months ago, Republicans were accusing it of trying to make political use of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The charge was that the White House had put the arm on the INS to speed up and cut corners in the naturalization process, the theory being that new citizens would more likely vote Democratic than Republican, and therefore the more of them, the merrier.

The administration responded that there was no way it would do a thing like that, manipulate the citizenship process for political gain, and folks believed it. We ourselves wrote sympathetically that, while "some congressional Republicans suspect a Democratic plan to load up the voter rolls . . . the administration replies that there are good and innocent reasons for [the] increase."

So now, guess what? It turns out the White House was in fact leaning on the INS to hasten the process, in part in hopes of creating new Democratic voters. There are documents that amply show as much. The attempt was described in a lengthy account in this newspaper by reporter William Branigin the other day. It was centered in the office of Vice President Gore, where they do reinventing

government projects. But it wasn't just another reinvention. "The president is sick of this and wants action," Elaine Kamarck, a domestic policy adviser to Mr. Gore wrote in an e-mail last March, the "this" being that the INS wasn't moving people along at the proper speed.

The Republican charge is that, in speeding up the process, the INS made citizens of some applicants with criminal records who should have been barred. The Democratic defense—the current version—is that some of this may indeed have occurred, but not because of political interference. Rather, it was the result of simple bungling. You are told now that you shouldn't take the political meddling in this process—essentially a law enforcement process—seriously not because it didn't happen but because it was ineffectual. Now there's a comfort.

The INS has long been an agency in disrepair. It had and still has a huge naturalization backlog, partly the result of increased applications after the grant of amnesty to certain illegal aliens in the immigration act of 1986, partly now the result as well of last year's welfare bill, which cuts off benefits to immigrants who fail to naturalize. The agency was already trying to cut the backlog, as well it should and if ever there were a candidate for reinvention, it's the INS. So you had a legitimate project until the folks with the hot hands in the White House decided it should be a political project as well, at which point it was compromised.

Some of the worst ideas ginned up in the White House never got anywhere, in part apparently because of stout INS resistance. Nor is it yet clear how many people with disqualifying records were made citizens, nor how much of that was due to political pressure and how much to just plain everyday incompetence. But in a way it doesn't matter. What matters is that once again the political people couldn't keep their distance from a process that should have been respected and left alone on decency-in-government grounds, and then they were untruthful about it. Who believes them and goes bail for them next time?

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1997]

THE LAW ACCORDING TO GORE

We salute Vice President Al Gore's decision to come forward and answer questions about his role in the Democrats' unrestrained fund-raising in 1996. But surely Mr. Gore and President Clinton know that the situation is too messy for the American public to accept Mr. Gore's relaxed reading of the Federal law against soliciting money on Federal property.

Mr. Gore argued that the law does not apply to his calls from the White House since he used a credit card supplied by the Democratic National Committee and was not soliciting Federal employees. The Republicans and some legal scholars seem to think the law actually means what it says, and that Mr. Gore broke it. Whatever the final resolution, Mr. Gore's forthright statement about his actions leaves no doubt that Attorney General Janet Reno has the "credible evidence" of possible law-breaking that she needs to appoint an independent counsel.

Of course, plenty more important evidence already exists, and the need for a thorough airing will only grow in the days ahead. Mr. Gore's undignified phone-athon, however demeaning to him and his office, is not the weightiest matter to be explored. What has to be determined is whether illegal foreign contributions were funneled into the President's re-election effort and whether staff members at the White House and the D.N.C. had knowledge or complicity in such an effort. The political and legislative energies of

this Administration will continue to drain away until those questions are answered.

The extent to which Mr. Gore's admission dented his own Presidential hopes cannot be known immediately. What is clear is the utter tackiness and lack of restraint that prevailed within the reelection councils at this White House. Mr. Gore now bids to be remembered as the Vice President who went a clear step beyond what previous Vice Presidents and Presidents were willing to do. Typically, the party's top officeholders appear at fund-raising events and thank contributors in a general way, but they do not do the arm-twisting themselves. It is demeaning and potentially corrupting for a Vice President to ask directly for money, especially from people with business before the government.

Senior business executives called by the Vice President felt they were being shaken down, and they had a right to think so. Such transgressions against propriety have become a recurrent theme with this Administration. Whatever the final adjudication of its conduct, this White House has time and again blurred lines that other Administrations have drawn between politics and government.

After the disclosures that Democratic National Committee officers and staff members were attending White House meetings and receptions, using White House phone logs and offering the Lincoln Bedroom and other perquisites to potential donors, it should perhaps not be surprising that Mr. Gore felt it was all right to sit in his office and call contributors.

Just once we would like to hear of someone within this Administration's inner financial circle who had the strength, self-discipline and taste to say no. Failing that, most people would settle for an independent counsel to check the Vice President's reading of the law and the legality of the entire Democratic fund-raising operation.

IN HONOR OF JAMES AZARIEL
AND SELINA ANASTASIA
BURNETTE

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1997

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, February 27, wife, Bonnie, and I were blessed with two new grandchildren. Their names are Selina Anastasia and James Azariel Burnett. They are the first children of my daughter, Elizabeth Burnett, and her husband, Fred Burnett.

Bonnie and I join James and Selina's other grandparents, Charles and Bonnie Burnette of Rustburg, VA, in welcoming them to the world.

Selina and James, like my other grandchildren, will have a tough time paying back all the money that the Federal Government is borrowing. If we don't change our ways, they will have to pay \$187,000 each over their lifetimes to cover their share of the interest on the national debt.

I ask all the parents and grandparents now in Congress to work with me to minimize the debt that James, Selina and all the other children and grandchildren will have to pay back. If we continue to overspend, their chances for a good job and a high standard of living will be substantially reduced.