

Charles Randolph Uncles (1859-1933) of Baltimore, Maryland became the first African-American priest ordained in the United States on December 19, 1891, beginning a line of American ministers that has included Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Reverend Jesse Jackson.

Eubie Blake (1883-1983) of Baltimore, Maryland was a popular ragtime pianist and composer who first learned to play the piano at age six and went on to break color barriers on Broadway and theaters across the nation.

Mary Church Terrell (1864-1954) of Annapolis, Maryland was an outstanding educator and early civil rights leader.

Edward Franklin Frazier (1894-1962) of the Eastern Shore of Maryland was a teacher of mathematics, professor of sociology and author who created and furthered the academic knowledge and understanding of the African-American community.

Clifton Wharton (1899-1990) of Baltimore, Maryland became the first African-American foreign service officer named chief of an American mission overseas when he was appointed U.S. Minister to Romania in 1958.

Leon Day (1916-1995), a Hall of Fame baseball player from Baltimore, Maryland, was one of the most consistently outstanding pitchers in the Negro Leagues during the 1930's and 1940's. His consistency was interrupted only by two years of service in the Army during World War II where he distinguished himself on Utah Beach during the Allied invasion of France.

Reginald F. Lewis (1942-1993) of Baltimore, Maryland created first African-American law firm on Wall Street and led the first African-American owned company with annual revenue exceeding \$1 billion.

Thurgood Marshall (1908-1993) of Baltimore, Maryland served as chief counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Legal Defense and Educational Fund (NAACP-LDF) at a time when the NAACP brought, argued and won *Brown v. Board of Education*, the seminal 1954 civil rights Supreme Court case. He went on to serve his nation as a federal Appellate Court judge, Solicitor General, and the first African-American member of the United States Supreme Court.

I am also sorry to report that Maryland recently lost one of its legal and political leaders when Judge Harry A. Cole passed away earlier this month. Judge Harry A. Cole was both the first African-American to hold the office of an Assistant State Attorney General in Maryland, and the first African-American named to the Maryland Court of Appeals, which is my State's highest court. During his fourteen year tenure on the Court of Appeals, Judge Cole distinguished himself with his scholarly and independent opinions, and we will miss him dearly in Maryland.

Mr. President, as this short account makes evident, Maryland is and has

been proud to be the home of some of America's greatest African-Americans. These are people who did not let economic or racial barriers stop them from reaching their goals or achieving their dreams. These outstanding individuals, and many others from Maryland and across the United States, have opened doors and set high standards for later generations of African-Americans. Most importantly, however, these are people who continue to serve as role models for all Americans.

Indeed, the State of Maryland continues to be blessed and enriched with outstanding African-American leaders who have built on Maryland's rich African-American legacy. I speak here of such individuals as Baltimore Mayor Kurt Schmoke and NAACP President and CEO Kweisi Mfume.

I would like to observe that the State of Maryland is currently benefiting from a continued growth in our African-American population. Between 1990 and 1997, when the last set of complete figures were available from the Census Bureau, the number of African-Americans calling Maryland "home" grew to 1.4 million—an increase of 200,609 people. This makes Maryland the state with the eighth largest African-American population in the United States. Nearby Prince George's County was second in the nation in terms of growth during this seven-year period with 68,325 new African-American residents.

Mr. President, in closing, Maryland is fortunate to have such a rich legacy of African-American leadership as well as a growing population of young African-American men and women to whom this legacy will provide inspiration and examples. As I noted at the outset, Dr. Woodson believed in looking back in order to look forward. As I look back at the deeds and accomplishments of the Marylanders listed above, and of the many outstanding African-Americans who have contributed to American science, engineering, abolitionism, literature, religion, theater, education, civil rights, law, business, athletics, diplomacy and politics, I see much to inspire our forward march into the next century, during which I hope we will eradicate forever the scourge of prejudice and racial bias from our society.

DEATH OF LAUREN ALBERT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on February 18, 1999, Pennsylvania lost one of its finest citizens, with the death of Lauren Albert.

I had the pleasure to know Mrs. Albert. She was the mother of three wonderful children, Stuart, Elliot, and Emily and the husband of one of Pennsylvania's finest orthopedic surgeons, Todd J. Albert, M.D. For seventeen years, Lauren had served at the side of Richard I. Rothman at the Rothman Institute and Reconstructive Orthopedic Associates. She was a leader in our community.

As fate would have it, Lauren and her husband Todd were traveling with

eight other Pennsylvanians, including my son Shanin and his wife Tracey. Also on the trip were Barbara and Richard Barnhart, Leslie and Al Boris and Jaimie and David Field.

Lauren was killed when the Land Rover in which she was a passenger was caused to tumble down a mountainside of the High Atlas Mountains. Her husband and the Barnharts were passengers in the same vehicle.

I was notified of the accident as soon as the party had access to a telephone. Contemporaneously, the Department of State, our Ambassador in Rabat, Edward Gabriel and our Consul general in Morocco, Evan G. Reade, Casablanca, were notified.

Consul Reade, accompanied by other Embassy officials, immediately flew to meet the Americans in nearby Ouerzazate.

Although Consul Reade had been in Morocco for only 8 months, he immediately assumed control of the situation and worked to solve complex and pressing problems.

First, there was a significant question of the medical stability of the three surviving passengers. Consul Reade and I worked in tandem with the Department of Defense, particularly Colonel Joe Reynes, Executive Secretary to the Secretary of Defense. Over the next several hours, well through the night, local time, Colonel Reynes worked diligently to place a military medical aircraft in Europe on alert to fly to Morocco. An enormous amount of work was undertaken with our military's European command, the State Department, Moroccan officials, Consul Reade in Ouerzazate and Ambassador Gabriel in Rabat.

In the final analysis, a medical evacuation was not needed. Nonetheless, it was most reassuring to know that our military could be counted upon to assist.

Second, Consul Reade, working in connection with others in the State Department, were instrumental in accomplishing the rapid evacuation of the three injured passengers as well as the remainder of the party from Morocco. This was accomplished through detailed coordination and airport assistance for four commercial flights enabling all to return home safely by 5:30 p.m. on the following day.

Third, Consul Reade arranged for the return of the body of Lauren Albert to Pennsylvania. For numerous reasons, this process is highly complicated. Consul Reade arranged, with the assistance of the Morocco officials, to have Mrs. Albert's body returned to Pennsylvania on Sunday, February 21, 1999. This permitted a timely funeral and burial, which was very important to the Albert family.

Finally, I wish to recognize the superb assistance of Lt. Colonel Driss Ferar, Commandant of the Morocco Police in the Ouerzazate region. Colonel Ferar was notified of the accident within minutes. He sped to the scene in the High Atlas Mountains, an hour and

a half away from his headquarters. He immediately assumed control and effectuated the safe return of the party to Ouerzazate that night. Colonel Ferar made sure that the entire party was comfortable and led Dr. Albert, the tour director, and my son to his office which served as a center for all the operations that evening and well into the night. Colonel Ferar worked on the matter without interruption and without attending to any of his other important duties until 2:00 a.m. In addition to offering his valuable assistance in all aspects of this tragedy, Colonel Ferar was also unfailingly courteous and helpful. He had his family make dinner for all of the concerned, which was brought into the Police Headquarters. He offered his wisdom and counsel to Dr. Albert. Since the party has returned to the United States, Colonel Ferar has forwarded a gift to the Albert family. I am informed that Colonel Ferar has been of similar assistance to Americans who have suffered grievous injuries in this region of Morocco in the past. Colonel Ferar is to be highly commended for his commitment to duty and to the very personal human needs of all concerned.

The tragic death of Lauren Albert leaves an indelible mark on the fabric of our community. Our prayers are with Dr. Albert and his family. We are grateful to the American and Moroccan officials, who accomplished everything possible to help with this tragedy and assure the safe and speedy return of our citizens.

SOLDIERS', SAILORS', AIRMEN'S, AND MARINES' BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to make a few remarks concerning S. 4, the military pay and benefits bill. Senator WARNER, the esteemed new chairman of the Armed Service Committee, has begun what I'm sure will be a distinguished tenure by addressing an issue of critical importance. I don't know if there is a more vital resource in this nation than its men and women in uniform.

Without question, certain services have a recruiting and retention problem. For a variety of reasons, officers and enlisted members are leaving the Army, Navy, and Air Force in droves, and these services are having problems bringing new people on board. Serious questions remain unresolved about the cause of this problem, or its best solution, yet we will probably vote out the bill this week without those answers, and with little concern for its fiscal impact.

I am extremely concerned that this bill came out of the Armed Services Committee without the benefit of a single hearing and with little understanding of its effects on the budget. The rush to pass this bill is perplexing. We would normally address military pay raises, retirement reform, and the other bill provisions during consideration of the annual defense authoriza-

tion bill. This course only makes more sense given the uncertainty we face regarding the budget impact of this bill. It would give the Senate ample opportunity to answer the myriad questions surrounding the bill's cost and budget implications.

Mr. President, there are some significant budget concerns raised by this bill. It increases both discretionary spending and entitlement costs, and all of its costs are heavily back loaded.

According to CBO, S. 4 increases discretionary spending by \$40.8 billion over the next 10 years. In addition, the bill's costs rise each year, reaching \$6.5 billion by 2009, and would continue to rise for a number of years after that.

The bill increases entitlement costs by \$13.2 billion over the next 10 years. Again, this figure does not fully reflect the eventual price tag as costs rise over time. CBO estimates that when the provisions of S. 4 are fully phased in, the entitlement costs for pensions would result in increased costs of \$5 billion a year. Similarly, the additional costs for so-called readjustment benefits, essentially education benefits, would rise, and by 2009 would increase by \$2.5 billion per year.

According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, when fully in effect, the bill as a whole would cost at least \$15 billion per year, and possibly more. Most notably, none, let me repeat that, Mr. President, none of this is offset.

Due to these effects on the budget, the bill is subject to not one, but three 60-vote points of order: (1) It exceeds the Armed Services Committee's allocation for entitlement spending for fiscal years 1999 through fiscal year 2003; (2) It breaches the revenue floor by decreasing income tax revenues from the Thrift Savings Program provision; and (3) It has PAYGO problems because none of the new mandatory spending and tax revenue losses are offset.

Mr. President, strictly from a budget point of view, regardless of the pay and pension policies in the bill, this can be fairly characterized as a budget buster. An eventual cost of \$15 billion per year is large, and at the very least should be considered as part of an overall budget, not rushed through before we have passed a budget resolution.

There are other concerns, Mr. President. The biggest question is whether this bill will actually improve recruitment and retention. Just this week, the General Accounting Office offered preliminary data on a study showing that money has been overstated as a factor affecting decisions to stay in or leave the military. Instead, GAO found, in a survey of more than 700 service members, that issues like a lack of spare parts; concerns with the health care system; increased deployments; and dissatisfaction with military leaders have at least as much effect on retention, if not more, than money. GAO is expected to finish the report in June.

Not only that. The Defense Department and the Congressional Budget Of-

fice are expected to have their own reports in the coming weeks and months. Why not wait until then? Let's make sure we're doing the right things to maintain the world's best armed forces.

Mr. President, I'd like to address some specific provisions in the bill. As we are all now well aware, the military pension system was changed in 1986. At the time, many, including those in President Reagan's Defense Department, argued that the pension system encouraged many of our servicemembers to leave the services early. They had the benefit of several years of study and hearings to reach that conclusion.

My late colleague from Wisconsin, the former Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, devoted much of his career to shaping the world's best and most feared military. At the time we changed the military pension system, he voiced considerable concern that the pension benefits were so generous to those with 20 years of service, and still at a relatively young age, that they provided incentive to leave for the private sector, rather than stay in the service.

Our former Armed Services Committee Chairman, Sam Nunn, stated that "returning to the old system would reduce—not strengthen—the willingness of personnel to remain in the service." That is a heady statement from a colleague whose judgment on defense issues is still widely respected by those serving in this body today.

Just back in October, then-Chairman THURMOND and Senator LEVIN, the committee's ranking member, proclaimed that any change to the pension system should be subject to "careful analysis." As yet, I haven't seen one. And I would like to see that careful analysis before moving forward with this bill.

I have heard from the men and women out on the front lines. According to what I've heard, they are leaving because of ever-increasing deployments to uncertain destinations, ever-widening time away from their families, and dwindling advancement opportunities. Like anyone else, they want to see a better quality of life.

I won't disagree with the view that many servicemembers need a raise. And I firmly believe that they should receive one, especially the enlisted folks, many of whom could be getting more money by flipping burgers at the closest fast food joint. These men and women have chosen to represent our country. They deserve to be paid adequately.

Ultimately, though, Mr. President, too many questions about this bill remain unanswered. I, and I hope many of my colleagues, would like to know how this bill will affect our budget now and in the future. We just extricated ourselves from a budget quagmire. Shouldn't we have all the answers about a bill that will cost \$55 billion over the next 10 years before we vote on it? I just seems like common sense