

We have assured that the Amtrak reform bill will not jeopardize funding being made available to South Dakota and other non-Amtrak States. Furthermore, the groundwork has been laid for addressing use of the \$2.3 billion in subsequent legislation. I commend Congressman THUNE's dedication and leadership in both instances in addressing the transportation concerns of non-Amtrak States.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like just a few minutes to address concerns I have as the lone representative from the State of South Dakota. South Dakota is one of six States that do not have intercity rail passenger service. As a result, I drafted an amendment to H.R. 2247, the Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1997. I worked closely with the Gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, on the legislation that would have amended a provision contained in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. I worked with my colleagues from other States not served by Amtrak, including Alaska, Hawaii, Maine, Oklahoma, and Wyoming.

The amendment, though very narrow in scope, ran into jurisdictional concerns. Although it deals directly with transportation needs, the amendment actually makes a correction to the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 relating to tax refunds for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation [Amtrak].

Put simply, the tax provision would provide Amtrak with access to \$2.3 billion, contingent upon passage of the bill before us today. In addition to money for Amtrak, the law also would set aside a portion of the fund for non-Amtrak States. Unfortunately, the law apparently allows such States to use the funds for very limited purposes, such as intercity passenger rail service and for intercity bus services.

My State, the State of South Dakota, presently does not have intercity passenger rail service and has not for some time. And while I am certain the State would find a way to put available funds to use for intercity bus service that is privately financed and privately operated, it may not make for the best use for those funds. That is why I presented an amendment to the Rules Committee on October 21, 1997, that would give non-Amtrak States more flexibility to use those funds.

The amendment specifically would provide flexibility to non-Amtrak States to use the funds for transportation priorities such as state-owned rail operations, rural transit and transit services for the elderly and disabled, and highway rail grade crossings projects.

While I appreciate the cooperation and work of the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Gentleman from Texas, has concerns regarding authorizing jurisdiction of the amendment that could not be overcome. Those concerns and his willingness to work with me to address the non-Amtrak State issue in the context of a revenue measure were addressed in his letter to me dated October 21, 1997. I look forward to that opportunity.

For States that do not have rail passenger service, each of these transportation needs would be legitimate alternatives. The amendment represents sound, common sense policy that simply allows non-Amtrak States to make the best, most worthwhile use of the funds provided for transportation needs.

My colleagues in the House and the taxpayers of this Nation should have every assur-

ance that the funds provided to non-Amtrak States will address important transportation links in each state.

For instance, the State of South Dakota owns over 600 miles of rail lines. The State purchased these lines in the early 1980's in an effort to ensure our State would continue to have access to reliable freight rail services. It is absolutely vital to maintain the farm-to-market transportation system in my State and to other States.

Likewise, we have acute transit needs, particularly in the area of transit services for the disabled, and rural transit services. In South Dakota, the Section 5311 transit program, which helps fund rural transit services, connects our seniors, disabled individuals, and children, in 42 of the 66 counties from rural locations to nearby communities for day-to-day living needs. The 5310 program supplements these needs by targeting its assistance at seniors and disabled individuals.

The amendment finally addresses an important safety concern. As my colleagues know, constructing and maintaining rail grade crossings are an important but often expensive safety priority. At present, only 219 of 2025 crossings are signalized in the State of South Dakota. For the sake of the railroads and motorists alike, the State and those traveling through our State would benefit greatly from additional assistance to improve highway/rail grade safety crossing.

I should also mention that I explored aid to rural air facilities and service. Unfortunately, air service to South Dakota too often hangs precariously. There is little competition for commercial service but a significant demand. This situation unfortunately leads to high ticket prices and limited service. I hope to wrap aviation needs into the context of my amendment in the future. Doing so would be consistent with the spirit of the program, which is to give non-Amtrak States more options to address interstate transportation needs.

The amendment in sum helps non-Amtrak States maintain rail safety, transit for the elderly and disabled as well as the general public, and finally important freight rail needs. At the same time, it takes nothing from Amtrak, States served by Amtrak, or non-Amtrak States that would like to attract Amtrak service in the future.

Again, I thank the Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Committee on Ways and Means for their assistance and I look forward to continuing to work with them on this matter.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Snowbarger). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 738, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on S. 739, the Senate bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:15 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:15 p.m.

□ 1725

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BLUNT] at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2267, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998.

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-406) on the resolution (H. Res. 330) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2267) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CALLING FOR RESIGNATION OR REMOVAL FROM OFFICE OF SARA LISTER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 197) calling for the resignation or removal from office of Sara E. Lister, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 197

Whereas Sara E. Lister, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, on October 26, 1997, at a public conference held in Baltimore, Maryland, stated that "The Marines are extremists.":

Whereas such a characterization denigrates 222 years of sacrifice and dedication to the Nation by the Marine Corps and dishonors the hundreds of thousands of Marines whose blood has been shed in the name of freedom;

Whereas citizens from all walks of life have donned the Marine Corps uniform and gone to war to defend the Nation, many never to return;

Whereas the young people of America join the Marine Corps to be challenged, to be held to high standards, and to be part of something bigger than themselves;

Whereas a characterization of the Marines as "extremists", especially when made by a senior military department official with responsibility for military personnel policy, has the potential to have an extraordinarily detrimental effect on morale, recruitment, and retention not just for the Marine Corps but for all branches of the Armed Forces;

Whereas Marines and Army soldiers have fought and died side by side time and again in defense of the Nation;

Whereas the values of honor, courage, and commitment embodied by the Marine Corps are not extreme; and

Whereas to describe the Marines as "extremists" violates all rules of propriety and does not reflect the views of the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That (1) Sara E. Lister, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, should immediately resign from office, and (2) if she does not so resign, the President should remove her from office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of this resolution I have brought before the House along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] my very good friend and I am sorry to see retiring fellow Marine. He is a great American. He was a great Marine. He was a great Congressman.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, this is a very grim and unfortunate situation which has raised the ire of myself and countless others from all walks of life and particularly those who have served proudly in the military of all branches but particularly the Marine Corps. I am referring to comments made by a high-ranking official of our Defense Department who has been confirmed by the other body to support and defend the Constitution of the United States in her capacity as Assistant Secretary of the Army. Her comments have greatly insulted the United States Marine Corps and they have shattered her ability to effectively do her job as someone in charge of military personnel and reservists in the U.S. Army.

Ms. Lister's comments characterizing the Marine Corps as "extremists" is beneath contempt. I ask you to ask Captain O'Grady. Do you remember him? Who rescued him? The Marines. Ask him if he thinks they were extremists.

No amount of spin and dissembling can explain her comments. They are simply arrogant, they are wrong and entirely out of line. Attempts by Ms. Lister to try and explain away her blatant attack on this distinguished branch of the military by saying that her comments were taken out of context does not constitute an apology, Mr. Speaker. In fact, Mr. Speaker, such

quibbling and backpedaling is not an apology and is just a further insult to all of us who have worn the uniform of our country, especially those of us that served in the Marine Corps. To leave someone in this position within our Defense Department at this point would be nothing more than irresponsible.

As the United States continues to face potential combat actions in places like Iraq, and it could happen tomorrow, and have troops serving in dangerous deployments all around the world, Ms. Lister does not deserve to be in a position of special trust and of confidence within the Pentagon. The fact that she would make these comments publicly to a large group is just again irresponsible. Her statements are symptomatic, I believe, of a political correctness of the worst kind that is permeating the U.S. military. They were intemperate and if allowed to stand would constitute a major step down this slippery slope towards a military that is not prepared to do its job.

Mr. Speaker, take my word for it. We are treading on very dangerous territory here. If we do not take a strong stand now and demand the removal from office of Ms. Lister and those who share her opinions, we could seriously compromise our combat readiness and effectiveness. If the battle for the soul and the fighting spirit of all members of the Armed Forces is to be won, it has to be won by dismissing from leadership anyone who would make such irresponsible statements like this.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Missourian Mark Twain once said that a person should live so that if someone says something bad about him, no one would believe it. That is the way I think the U.S. Marine Corps finds themselves today. I do not think anyone can say anything bad about the Marine Corps that would be believed. It is an honorable, wonderful part of our national defense.

But I think we should pause and take a deep breath on this matter, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that this resolution will pass, but let us take a quick gander at the letter that Sara E. Lister, assistant secretary of the Army for manpower and reserve affairs, wrote to General C.C. Krulak, the Commandant of the Marine Corps. This is a letter of apology, and I will put it in toto in the RECORD, but let me read it and share with this body some words therefrom.

"Dear General Krulak: This letter is in reference to a quotation attributed to me during a panel discussion sponsored by the U.S. Military and Post-Cold War Society Project of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, Harvard University.

"I apologize to the Marine Corps and all current and former Marines for my remarks. It is unfortunate that my re-

marks were taken out of context. The issue under consideration was in relationship between civilian military segments of our society. In that context, we were asked to comment upon 14 scholarly papers discussing various aspects of that topic. I discussed several of the papers, including an interesting piece which was focused on the Marine Corps as an example of possible disconnects between society and the military. My point, ineptly put, was that all the services had different relationships with civilian society based in part on their culture, the size of their force, and their mission. My use of the word "extremism" was inappropriate and wrong.

"I regret that the use of this term during an academic discussion has generated a controversy that does not represent my views or those of the Army. I am well aware of the close and mutually supportive relationship between the Army and Marine Corps, both in war and in peace.

"Again, my remarks were not intended to denigrate the Marine Corps in any way. It is unfortunate that they were misplaced. The Marine Corps has a proud and honorable tradition of service to our country. Sincerely, Sara E. Lister, Assistant Secretary of the Army."

I will put this in the RECORD, and I read it for the purpose to show that Sara Lister has done her best in her position as an individual to express her regret and apologize, and I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that the Commandant of the Marine Corps will accept this apology and move on.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent a great deal of my efforts within the Armed Services Committee, now the Committee on National Security, working with the various services, urging them, through legislation and discussion, to create a joint atmosphere of working with each other so that the Marines work with the Army, the Navy works with the Air Force, and all of the different variations thereof.

This is a total force, and it is unfortunate that Ms. Lister's comments created this issue, and I hope that as a result of this discussion here on the floor we can put this behind us and be proud of our Marine Corps, be proud of our Army, be proud of our Navy, be proud of our Air Force, and urge them to continue to do the wonderful work that they do in protecting freedom and the interests of our country.

It is with this in mind that I make these comments, and hopefully we can, Mr. Speaker, put this issue behind us and let it be water going on down the river.

The letter in its entirety is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE
OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, November 13, 1997.

Gen. C. C. KRULAK,
Commandant of the Marine Corps,
Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL KRULAK: This letter is in reference to a quotation attributed to me

during a panel discussion sponsored by the U.S. Military and Post-Cold War Society Project of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies (Harvard University).

I apologize to the Marine Corps and all current and former Marines for my remarks. It is unfortunate that my remarks were taken out of context. The issue under consideration was the relationship between civilian and military segments of our society; in that context, we were asked to comment upon 14 scholarly papers discussing various aspects of that topic. I discussed several of the papers, including an interesting piece which was focused on the Marine Corps as an example of possible disconnects between society and the military. My point—ineptly put—was that all the services had different relationships with civilian society, based in part on their culture, the size of their force and their mission. My use of the word “extremism” was inappropriate and wrong.

I regret that the use of this term during an academic discussion has generated a controversy that does not represent my views or those of the Army. I am well aware of the close and mutually supportive relationship between the Army and the Marine Corps, both in war and in peace.

Again, my remarks were not intended to denigrate the Marine Corps in any way. It is unfortunate that they were misinterpreted. The Marine Corps has a proud and honorable tradition of service to our country.

Sincerely,

SARA E. LISTER,

Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McHALE].

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding this time to me.

I have to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that when I read the words of Assistant Secretary Lister in the Washington Times this morning, I was both stunned and dismayed. Her comments were needlessly embarrassing to one of our Nation's great military services, the United States Army.

As I read her comments, I realized that professional rivalry between the services is perhaps inevitable, even healthy. However, the comments that were attributed, I think accurately, to Assistant Secretary Lister were irresponsibly caustic. They were not taken out of context, they were not misinterpreted, they were simply wrong. Unfortunately for Assistant Secretary Lister, she was simultaneously articulate and foolish.

By contrast, Mr. Speaker, just the other day, on November 10, the United States Marine Corps celebrated its 222d birthday. At that celebration and by his presence, showing what I believe was the kind of respect that the services owed to one another, was the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Reimer. At that memorial service, where several thousand Marines had gathered, one Army general in uniform sat quietly in tribute to a brother service.

I would certainly hope that on all occasions senior officials in uniform and in civilian clothes from the United States Marine Corps would pay equal tribute to the United States Army. Assistant Secretary Lister is entitled to her opinion, and if she were a private

citizen and not the Assistant Secretary of the Army, I do not believe this issue would be brought before the House today. But she spoke in an official capacity and should be held responsible in that capacity.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, Assistant Secretary Lister should immediately and unequivocally, unlike the statement read by the gentleman from Missouri, unequivocally rescind her statements, apologizing appropriately, or she may, in the alternative, defend her judgment and then retire to private life. No senior official holding her views, absent a blunt apology, should remain in a policy-making position within the Department of Defense.

If I could deliver a bottom line, Mr. Speaker, it would be this: Contrary to the outrageous rhetoric inappropriately used by Assistant Secretary Lister, the very best people I have ever met have been called lance corporal in the United States Marine Corps. I rise therefore in strong support of the Solomon resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I correct the gentleman, it is the Solomon-McHale resolution.

Just to respond, Mr. Speaker, because my very good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], who is one of the most distinguished and respected Members of this body, mentioned that Ms. Sara Lister was speaking as an individual. Here is the program, and she is listed as the Honorable Sara Lister, Department of the Army. She spoke in an official capacity, and I am going to get a copy of the tape, and I want every one of my colleagues to listen to that tape, and then they will share my view completely.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for bringing this legislation and my good friend and colleague, lieutenant colonel in the Reserves, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McHALE].

I also have been a very good listener of my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], and I agree with him, it is always moments to take a deep breath and not act on emotion, and I always follow that advice of my colleague. But this is also a comment that was made in official capacity with a tongue-in-cheek apology.

These comments were not taken out of context. As a matter of fact, I would respect Sara Lister even more if she had stood her ground and said, I said it, I mean it, that is how I have always felt. That is not what she is saying.

Now let me share something else. Over the past year, in dealing with the issues on gender and race in the United States military, my colleagues, see, I do not separate slanderous comments from one versus the other. If someone makes a slanderous comment on race,

sure enough, whether it is their opinion, they will be called before immediately. Well, if someone makes a slanderous remark in gender or in reference to some other institutions, this is pretty insulting.

I strongly support this resolution and call for the immediate resignation of the Army Assistant Secretary Sara Lister. I believe it is imperative for our military leaders to fully respect and earn the respect of the men and women who are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice to protect and defend our country. How sad that, as the rest of the Department of Defense is working so diligently to advance the notion of joint operations, the Army's Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs would spew such a divisive statement in a public forum with regard to her demeaning comments of the Marine Corps. These comments show a total lack of understanding for the unique mission and tremendous value system of the Marine Corps as well as that of the United States Army of which she leads.

I fail to understand how the values of honor, courage, commitment can be considered extremist and a little dangerous. Our Nation should be proud of the commitment each of our military services makes in instilling a strong sense of values into men and women who serve, something that, unfortunately, is missing in society today.

How sad, when the uniformed leadership in the Army is leading initiatives to establish joint exercise forces to optimize the synergistic abilities of the Nation's forces, that the chief personnel official of the United States Army would make such a blatant, albeit sophomoric, attack on the Army's partner in land battle.

How sad, when the rest of the Pentagon struggles in concert to address the future challenges of a largely undefined world stage, that such a key figure in the Army's hierarchy would devote her time on a stage provided by Harvard's Olin Institute of Strategic Studies to make such an unjustified, demeaning statement against the honored component of the Nation's defense.

How sad that as a panel member in the forum dedicated to civil/military relations, Ms. Lister so completely justified in growing the perception of a widening schism between the military and the liberal element of the social elite.

The saddest of all is how sad anyone is reading the Washington Times headline, quote, “Top Army Woman: Marines extremist,” might think even for a moment that this was the top woman in the Army. That brings disservice upon many of the men and particularly the women who serve in the military today.

I strongly urge the President and the Secretary of Defense to fully review her comments to determine whether

they are consistent with the administration's views of the contributions to the military services. More importantly, before they consider Ms. Lister as a candidate for the Secretary of the Army, the President and the Secretary of Defense must decide whether her comments reflect the proper level of respect for our military members necessary to be an effective civilian leader and to achieve the credibility of the military leadership for our country to continue to field the best fighting force.

It is critical for the service secretaries and the service chiefs to be able to work together effectively. It is also critical that the civilian leaders in the military understand and respect the unique missions and contributions of each of the military services.

I urge my colleague to support the Solomon-McHale resolution and to send a strong signal that this country's Marine Corps as well as each of the other services, that Congress does appreciate and respect their dedicated service despite Sarah Lister's demeaning remarks.

Mr. SKELTON. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me join the Members with their concern about what the Assistant Secretary said, but let me also say I just talked to her, and she says that she was taken completely out of context. I think we should give her an opportunity to appear before the committee and let her have her say.

Now she is in the process. She has already resigned. She is in the process of leaving the job. She resigned several months ago, and it just seems to me that, as terrible as what was reported that she said, she should have an opportunity to say to a committee what she said, and give her an opportunity to explain.

For instance, it was recorded in the press that she is for women in combat. She says she denies that, she is not for women in combat, and many of the things that she says have been reported are inaccurate.

□ 1745

So it just seems that for us to take precipitous action on something like this, without giving her an opportunity, is unfair to her, whether you agree with her philosophically or not. I certainly do not know enough about what she said or what her position is to be able to judge whether she is right or not, but it seems before we rush to condemnation, that we should give her an opportunity to appear before a committee and have her say about these comments she has made.

She is shattered by what has happened. She has the highest regard for the Marine Corps. She says she started her career working closely with the Marine Corps, and everything she told me personally, just a few minutes ago on the phone, was that she has the

highest regard, and she feels absolutely devastated that these comments she made were, as she says, taken out of context.

Now, whether they were or not, I do not know. But I do know I think that we should give her an opportunity to come before a committee and explain what she said, what the circumstances were, and exactly what she meant by these comments.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Chairman, who I have such a high regard for, and he and I have served on so many committees, and he is a recipient of the Iron Mike Award, but if he would not consider allowing, perhaps allowing this go to committee, and allow the committee to take this up and discuss it with her before we rush to a vote on this very delicate situation, which could chastise the woman who is serving in this position, maybe prematurely and unfairly, possibly.

I do not know. I am not judging. I am just asking that we might be able to do something here that would be a little less onerous and perhaps give her an opportunity to have her say.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA]. He is one of the finest Members of this body. I want him to go and listen to the tape, and then make the same speech he just made. He will change his mind.

This is what she said: "The Marines are extremists. Wherever you have extremists, you have got some risk of total disconnection with society, and that is a little dangerous."

Then she goes on and she cites, "The Marine Corps is, you know, they have all these checkerboard fancy uniforms and stuff."

What does she mean by that "checkerboard," my good friend? You know what she means. She means the medals the Marines are wearing. It is the only checkerboard on a uniform.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a comment on the uniform?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. She says that she was not the one that made the comment about the uniform. She says absolutely it was the woman who was on the panel, and she did not say one word about the uniform.

That is what I am saying, there was some confusion. That is what she said. Now, I can only tell you what her comments were.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will have a copy of the tape on the gentleman's desk tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there are not two more Members I respect more than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] and the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

I have not heard the tape. I will listen to it tonight, if I can. If that is the case, then, yes, she should have her day. But the problem is the day will be 2 or 3 months from now, when all this issue is dead.

Joe Paterno, one of my favorite coaches at Penn State, told a story when I was in a football clinic. He said his dad was in the Army and hated the Marine Corps. He said they were a bunch of peacocks.

You can imagine Joe Paterno's amazement and the father's amazement and this old Italian family when his oldest brother came up and said he was going to join the Marine Corps. The father in his old way said, "Go off, my son, and become a peacock." And he did. This is a son that never spoke back to his father a day in his life in that old Italian family.

The day he came back after boot camp in his finery, his father said, "Look, here is that peacock." And a man that had never spoken an ill word to his Italian father in his life put his finger in his chest and says, "Don't you ever say anything bad about the United States Marine Corps. It can lick any 10 Army regiments." The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] would disagree with that.

But his whole idea was how do you collectively take a mind and mold it into a fighting machine with respect, and he took that same esprit de corps and turned it into the Penn State football team. And he talks about tradition.

What this gentledady has just done is violate that tradition, and we cannot accept that kind of character, or lack of character, in the leadership of the Department of Defense. We can neither accept nor tolerate it. And, in my opinion, if the allegations are true, this gentledady has no place, because the position of leadership in the military is not just a position, it is a guidepost for men and women in all the services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that when the dust settles out of all of this, that wonderful United States Marine Corps, that great Army that we have, as well as the outstanding Navy and the Air Force that we have, will continue to work together in a joint atmosphere without rancor, without grudges, and let this be water that goes down the river.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], a very distinguished former Marine. He is a very quiet guy, but I think you will like what he has to say. He is a very serious Member of this body.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. I would like to echo the words of my good friend and colleague,

the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], that we need to release our feeling of anger and rancor and let this go down the stream and flow out into the gentle waters.

We are all Americans, whether it is the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, the Merchant Marine. Whoever it is, we all serve this country in a way that we feel is right.

We are reacting now to some words that we do not agree with. But the positive part of those words, which I think were ill-spoken, the positive part of those words, which I think we all should not agree with, is that we are here to discuss that we as Americans in the military that serve our country do so in the proudest condition that we can. We believe in this country and we believe in freedom, so those in the military service are going to lay down their lives, which is the best gift that they can give, for their country. We consistently give words of encouragement to those soldiers, sailors and marines in lonely areas around the country.

I would just like to relay a very short story when I was in the service as a young marine with other young Marines, to give some sense about the military service.

Whenever we would cross this rice paddy in Vietnam, we would be shot at by a sniper. So we decided one day to send across this rice paddy some decoy marines, and then some of us would go around and find out where the sniper was.

We did that. The decoys went across the rice paddy. We went around, and from the "hootch" grass hut we could see some firing. We went into the grass hut, and we found a very old man with one leg, an old woman, about in their nineties, and a little girl about 10.

Well, we started to remove the old man. We were going to take him in because we assumed he was the sniper. The old woman sat on a little stump and started to cry. The little girl began screaming and pulling at our uniforms, desperate not to let this old man, maybe her great grandfather, go. She thought she would never see him again.

So we young marines, trained for combat, stopped. We looked into the eyes of the old man, and the woman stopped crying, in desperate fear, wondering what we were going to do next. We looked into the eyes of the old man, and I can still see his eyes. He had for an instant striking fear in his eyes, not knowing what we were going to do. And then the fear turned to curiosity, the curiosity turned to friendship, and we looked at this old man as a human being.

We simply let him go, and we walked away. We were never shot at again when we crossed that rice paddy. But we young marines, trained for desperate combat, found in this man a sense of common humanity, and that is what all the military services are about.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON], someone I think we can all certainly believe. He was a prisoner of war for 6 years and 10 months, and who in the world could ever live through that, but the gentleman from Texas did.

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], I appreciate his position, I really do. I just cannot believe that we as a country have sunk to this level, where we have a high-level Clinton administration official referring to a branch of our military, in this case the Marine Corps, as being "extremist" and "dangerous to society." The testimony you just heard is she does not say that. According to Mr. SOLOMON, this is all on tape. It is her words. It is not taken out of context.

These types of comments are not just unacceptable, but they are false, and a telling sign of disdain for the military by this administration. And no response, you might notice no response has been given by the Secretary of the Army, and this lady, even though it has been said she has resigned or is intending to resign, is being considered for the post of Secretary of the Army. It is unbelievable.

How many times have we seen in a country like ours bravery and ultimate sacrifice by one of our Armed Services?

I was in the Air Force, but the United States Marines showed their colors in the Pacific during World War II; in Korea, where I fought at the Chosin Reservoir; in Vietnam, where I was a POW in Khe Sahn; or the numerous evacuations of our citizens who have been endangered for no other reason than just being an American. Our Marines have been there.

The Secretary, it has been said, went on to mock the Marine uniform. "They have all got on these checkerboard fancy uniforms, but the Army is sort of muddy boots on the ground."

Do you know that the Marines are our ceremonial troops? Do you think that our Embassies around the world would love to have muddy boots guarding our Embassies in a ceremonial fashion? I do not think so.

I suggest the Secretary ask Captain Scott O'Grady what his opinion is of the Marine uniforms of those men who pulled him out of Bosnia, and what they were wearing. I think she would be enlightened, to say the least.

I am not here to enlighten the Secretary, or our Congress. I just think that that conduct is inexcusable and should result in immediate dismissal. The sacrifices that Marines, and, for that matter, all our Armed Forces, have made should not be subject to administration comments that are childish and dishonorable.

I believe Secretary Lister must go, and I hope, Mr. President, that you are listening.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

(Mr. BACHUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I do it on behalf of not only myself, but my oldest son, who I am proud to say serves in the U.S. Marines, and his family, my other four children and their mother.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my very good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH]. I wish I had more time to give him. We are just out of time.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, this is truly a very bad time for us. I wish Ms. Lister, instead of going to this Harvard symposium, would have been where I was a week ago and seen the 222nd birthday of the United States Marine Corps, and hear the commandant talk about the legend of Bella Wood in World War I, or talk about what happened at Iwo Jima in World War II, or talk about Khe Sahn or Inchon, or what the Marines did there, or look at what happened in Lebanon in 1980s.

What gets me is this same administration that has shown contempt for readiness in the name of political correctness in the 1990s may have contempt for the Marines, may be elitist and have elitist attitudes, but every time there is a problem halfway across the world, they have no problem picking up the phone and dialing their 911, and that continues to be and has always been, for 222 years, the United States Marine Corps.

□ 1800

Let us forget the spin control, let us forget the apologies. They are too late. She must resign and leave her position at once.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my very good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I am personally incensed at these comments. My father was a civilian and fought with the Marines on Wake Island and spent 4 and a half years in a Japanese prison camp with those Marines. I represent the largest Marine base in the United States, Camp Pendleton. It is in the heart of my district. Fifty-five thousand Marines are incensed at what this lady has said. Calling them dangerous, calling them extremists. That is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker, and she should be relieved of her responsibilities immediately.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], an outstanding member of this body.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I think the interesting point of this is that the very point of criticism that the Clinton administration official made about the Marine Corps is really in essence their strength. The Marine Corps is a service that did not bend to the winds of political correctness when this mixed gender training was requested by the Clinton administration. Today, my service, the U.S. Army, has representatives around the country in courts-martial trying to explain what happened to young women who were injected into basic training with young men in very close quarters, and all of the tragedies that resulted from that. The Marine Corps is one service that perhaps, more than all of the others, has kept its tradition of duty, honor and country, and Chuck Krulak, the Commandant, is one of the very, very best.

So I think we will come out of this with a stronger Marine Corps, more adherence to tradition, and a stronger America.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, to close for our side, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the Committee on National Security, an outstanding American.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a Navy veteran and the brother of a retired Marine, and on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of Marines, living and dead, who served this country over all these years, I am personally saddened to hear of the remarks attributed to Ms. Sara Lister relative to the Marine Corps.

I cannot go into detail, I do not have enough time to make a speech on behalf of the Corps and in defense of the Corps, but I would like to just submit as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the Washington Times today which this quote comes from. Kate O'Beirne, the Washington editor of National Review magazine, appeared with Ms. Lister on the panel, and here is what she said:

"It is actually a slander at both the Marine Corps and the Army," she said in an interview. "What attributes of the Marine Corps does she disrespect? Self-discipline? Courage? Patriotism? She believes these pose a danger to society and by implication she's grateful the Army doesn't share the Marine Corps attributes. Shocking."

TOP ARMY WOMAN: MARINES "EXTREMIST"
(By Rowan Scarborough)

Sara E. Lister, the Army's top personnel official and the Pentagon's most ardent advocate of women in combat, in a public forum called the Marines "extremists" and "a little dangerous."

Mrs. Lister, the assistant secretary of the Army for manpower and reserve affairs, also belittled the Marine Corps uniform.

"I think the Army is much more connected to society than the Marines are," Mrs. Lister told an Oct. 26 seminar. "The Marines are extremists. Wherever you have extremist, you've got some risks of total disconnection with society. And that's a little dangerous."

In response to a query by The Washington Times, the Army attempted last night to dampen a growing controversy that clearly ranked top officers:

"The statement attributed to Mrs. Lister was taken out of context. Her reference to the Marines and their relationship to society would be more aptly described as 'unique.'"

Gen. Charles Krulak, the Marine Corps commandant, issued a statement last night at his quarters vigorously defending a branch he has served 34 years.

"Assistant Secretary of the Army Sara Lister has been quoted as characterizing the Marine Corps as 'extremists,'" Gen. Krulak said. "Such a depiction would summarily dismiss 222 years of sacrifice and dedication to the nation. It would dishonor the hundreds of thousands of Marines whose blood has been shed in the name of freedom.

"Citizens from all walks of life have donned the Marine Corps uniform and gone to war to defend this nation, never to return. Honor, courage and commitment are not extreme."

Mrs. Lister, a close adviser to Army Secretary Togo West, made the remarks to a group of academics and military personnel at a conference in Baltimore.

According to a tape recording of the remarks, obtained by The Times, Mrs. Lister, who was appointed by President Clinton, also mocked the uniform of the Marine Corps.

"The Marine Corps is—you know they have all these checkerboard fancy uniforms and stuff," she said. "But the Army is sort of muddy boots on the ground."

Said Gen. Krulak, "I agree with Mrs. Lister's depiction of the U.S. Army as 'sort of muddy boots on the ground.' I need not recount the times where the muddy boots of soldiers fell alongside those of Marines as we fought side by side."

Kate O'Beirne, the Washington editor of National Review magazine, appeared with Mrs. Lister on the panel, along with retired Army Lt. Gen. Theodore Stroup. Mrs. O'Beirne, according to the tape recording, told the conference, sponsored by Harvard University's Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, that she was "shocked and incredulous" by Mrs. Lister's remarks.

"It is actually a slander at both the Marine Corps and the Army," she said in an interview later. "What attributes of the Marine Corps does she disrespect? Self-discipline? Courage? Patriotism? She believes these pose a danger to society and by implication she's grateful the Army doesn't share the Marine Corps attributes. Shocking."

"I just want to say something on behalf of the Marine Corps. Unlike Secretary Lister, I don't see them as an extremist organization nor do I fear them in any way. And I find myself grateful for them most of the time."

Mrs. Lister's caustic comments are sure to revive criticism within the military and among veterans groups that the Clinton administration is staffed at the highest levels with men and women with anti-military attitudes.

Mr. Clinton was sharply criticized by veterans groups in the 1992 campaign for remarks he made as young man trying to avoid the Vietnam War draft, saying that he and his friends held a "loathing" for the military, and shortly after taking office he offended military ranks with an attempt to lift long-standing policy barring known homosexuals in the military.

Mrs. Lister has said she will leave her post sometime this year and was honored re-

cently at a retirement party. Pentagon sources say she may be a candidate for secretary of the Army if Mr. West, as expected, is named to head the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Army's statement defending Mrs. Lister went on to say that "it is inappropriate try to create controversy around what was meant to be an honest, intellectual exchange of ideas. The U.S. Marines, like the Army, have served the nation with valor and fidelity since the forming of the nation. Mrs. Lister and the Army are proud to share a common heritage."

Mrs. Lister has accused others of extremism, recently in a press interview labeling military advocate Elaine Donnelly an "extremist." Mrs. Donnelly is chairman of the Center for Military Readiness, which supports women in the military and opposes combat roles for them.

"I don't like to see my name in the same sentence with that word," Mrs. Donnelly said yesterday. "It shows that this person is very much out of step with the majority of women, both civilian and military. . . . If she puts us in the same group as the Marine Corps, we're in very good shape."

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran, a member of the National Security Committee, and as an American, I am appalled at the callous disrespect that Sarah Lister, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower, displayed toward the U.S. Marine Corps when she referred to them as a "dangerous" and "extremist" group during a recent forum. This type of behavior is reprehensible from a high ranking official in the Department of Defense. This is not only an affront to the men and women serving in the Marine Corps, but it is offensive and demoralizing to the nearly 1.5 million men and women in uniform that go in harms way to defend the United States.

What type of message is sent to our young people serving in the military when they hear that a high ranking official in the Pentagon is quoted as saying that the Marines have a "disconnection with society." This administration has been less than fully supportive of Armed Forces, and comments like these will undoubtedly have a further negative impact on their morale.

While Secretary Lister has said she will be leaving her post shortly, that's not good enough. Army Secretary Togo West should fire her now—today. Doing less will disgrace those brave Americans who have served and given their lives for this country. And as far as any talk of Secretary Lister being a possible candidate for Army Secretary should Secretary West leave the post—forget it.

On behalf of the U.S. Marine Corps and the entire military, I urge the strong support of this resolution calling for Sara Lister to step down; we cannot and will not tolerate this lack of respect from civilian leaders.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Sara E. Lister, should step down from her position following her derogatory remarks yesterday about our U.S. Marine Corps.

Secretary Lister's remarks have enraged those of us who are proud of the men and women who have served as marines. However, knowing the organization as I do and the type of people who are marines, they are not going to be hurt by her words.

The 222 year history of the United States Marine Corps speaks for itself. From its first

battles of the Revolutionary War, through the bloody Pacific landings during World War II, and from the campaigns in the snowy mountains of Korea, to the steamy jungles of Vietnam, and the parched deserts of Kuwait, the Marine Corps has an unquestionable tradition of serving our Nation in the finest and bravest manner.

The U.S. Army, which was not well served by Secretary Lister's comments, has its own distinguished record of valor and service to our Nation. For those of us who just returned from Veterans Day programs back home, our words are still fresh in our minds. We reminded all Americans that if it were not for the brave service of the men and women of the U.S. Marine Corps, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, America would not be a free nation today.

Unfortunately, the comments of Secretary Lister are another example of the lack of respect with which our armed services and those who serve in uniform receive from some within this administration. As I have said time and again, our all volunteer force deserves far better. They at least deserve the respect of those who have been appointed by the President to provide civilian leadership over our services.

This is the same administration that has demonstrated a cavalier willingness to send our troops into harms way on a moments notice to make a bold statement or accentuate its foreign policy. These deployments throughout the world and with increasing regularity are ordered with little regard for our national interest or the cost of such deployments.

Mr. Speaker, there are many ironies about Secretary Lister's comments. It is ironic that she made them just 2 days after the Marines celebrated another birthday and just 1 day after we as a nation honored those who have served our Nation in the uniform of the U.S. Marine Corps and all the services. Perhaps most ironic, though, is that the battles the Marine Corps have fought and won have been those to protect our Nation's most treasured freedoms and liberties. And there is no more basic American freedom than the freedom of speech. Yet, the President and our civilian leadership at the Pentagon cannot allow an appointee to continue to serve after showing such grave disrespect for every marine who has ever served in uniform.

When the President gives the order to "Send in the Marines", no one questions their character then. History has established that they are the force we turn to as a nation to be first on the scene, first to fight, and first to win.

Some of our Nation's greatest Army generals, who unlike Secretary Lister have seen marines in action, have acknowledged the spirit of our marines who have fought shoulder to shoulder with their brothers in the Army. Gen. John Pershing, during World War I, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, during the Korean conflict, and Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, during Operation Desert Storm all agreed with MacArthur's comments from the outskirts of Seoul in 1950, that "there is not a finer fighting organization in the world" than the U.S. Marines.

Mr. Speaker, the marines who stand watch tonight on lonely outposts throughout the world, and those who are in training for their next mission wherever and whenever it may be, probably have not even heard about Secretary Lister's remarks. All they know is that they have chosen to wear the uniform of a

U.S. Marine to defend and protect our great Nation. May their service and sacrifice stand as the greatest testament, making all other words ring hollow.

Semper Fidelis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 197.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2267, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 330 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 330

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2267) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the fiscal year 1998 Commerce, Justice, and State conference report, the final appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998. This is the standard rule for conference reports, waiving points of order against the conference report and its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report be considered as read.

That is it. Another great rule from the Committee on Rules under the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding me this time.

As he has described, this resolution, House Resolution 330, is a rule that waives all points of order against the conference report on H.R. 2267. This is a bill that makes appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, and related agencies. It is with great relief that I address this House on this, the last of the 13 regular appropriation bills. It is the one measure standing between us and the conclusion of the session this year.

The conference report contains major increases in funding for law enforcement programs, especially those aimed at preventing juvenile and drug-related crimes. The measure provides about \$4 billion for the State Department, which is an increase above the levels in the House and Senate bills, but still less than the administration's request. This money is necessary to extend America's diplomatic presence abroad and assist with vital international peacekeeping efforts.

The conference contains a compromise which does not bar using statistical sampling in the Year 2000 Census. This will permit the Census Bureau to give statistical sampling a small-scale test. A commission will report on the results of the test. Unfortunately, this compromise also includes objectionable language calling on the House general counsel to file a civil suit to block sampling.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support everything in this bill, but we are already 6 weeks into the fiscal year. We should have wrapped up this process a long time ago. I urge adoption of the rule. Let us do our job and pass the bill, and let us go home.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. The rule is not controversial. We are prepared to yield back as soon as the gentleman is.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have 3 or 4 speakers that I know of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Commerce, Justice, and State bill is fatally flawed, and because of that, later today I will urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Earlier today we changed the House rules so that the Republican leadership could create a new subcommittee to investigate the census. Is the reason that we need this new subcommittee, is it because the current one is so overburdened that it cannot get all of its work done? No. There has been only one hearing in this Congress on the census, and that hearing had only two witnesses.

This new subcommittee is the latest effort by the leadership to politicize the census and make sure that millions