

Two of these Sioux code talkers are still alive today: Clarence Wolf Guts of the Oglala Sioux Tribe and Charles Whitepipe, Sr., of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe.

Unfortunately, the nine other known Sioux code talkers, John Bear King of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Simon Broken Leg and Iver Crow Eagle, Sr., of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Eddie Eagle Boy and Philip LaBlanc of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Baptiste Pumpkinseed of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, Edmund St. John of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, and Walter C. John of the Sioux Tribe of Nebraska, have passed away.

In a time in which we fully understand the meaning of the word "hero," I believe we can all agree that these 11 men are truly heroes of our country.

Clarence Wolf Guts and Charles Whitepipe can tell us the stories of the trials and tribulations that they faced as they served our country. Families of the other Sioux code talkers can pass on the stories told them by their husband, father or uncle. These code talkers provided safety to fellow Americans who were fighting so hard for our Nation. They did so by using their culture and their native language which had been passed down to them through the generations.

Last year we rightly honored and recognized the Navajo code talkers for the important role that they played and their heroism during World War II. It is now time to honor and to recognize the Sioux code talkers for their contributions.

Madam Speaker, I was proud to introduce H.R. 3250, The Code Talkers Recognition Act, to honor the men who had risked their lives to save others. Congress should recognize these courageous men for their bravery and heroism in the face of adversity. Tomorrow we will consider this important bill and finally recognize these men for their heroic efforts. I encourage Members to support this legislation to give honor to these brave men.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I heard the gentleman's discussion on the floor about the code talkers and their value to the U.S. military efforts, and I just wanted to add my voice in support for the gentleman's bill.

We knew one of the great code talkers, Carl Gorman, who was a Navajo who fought in major campaigns in the South Pacific. Later while he was recovering from wounds in the war, he became an artist. Part of the rehab was to learn art at the rehab center in Los Angeles, and he became one of the Native American leaders in art, and his son, R.C. Gorman, is now one of the leading artists in the world. Carl was a wonderful guy. He told many great stories, which I know is now reflected in a film that is now playing across America.

I think it is long overdue that all of the code talkers, Navajos and the gen-

tleman's constituents, be given the recognition that they are due. I am happy to offer my full support for the gentleman's efforts.

Mr. THUNE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, who has been a strong advocate for America's military and recognizing the heroes, those in our veteran community who have fought and served.

I would simply add that as we look at the contributions that have been made by the Native American culture to our success in a lot of different conflicts throughout our Nation's history, that these particular men made an enormous contribution in helping America through very turbulent times in succeeding and winning a war that literally liberated the world from nazism.

As we consider this legislation tomorrow, I hope Members will support it and pay the tribute and recognition that is long overdue to the code talkers. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for being here.

□ 1930

AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT REVITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to discuss a very important issue for our Nation. I am most proud to introduce in a bipartisan fashion legislation entitled the Aeronautics Research and Development Revitalization Act, H.R. 4653, to which we are also continuing to seek cosponsors.

Since the historic flight of Mr. Lindbergh more than 75 years ago this past May, the United States has risen to commercial air dominance, so much so that in this fast-growing industry in 1985 we dominated the market, controlling more than 73 percent of the commercial aircraft industry. Since 1985, however, the United States has been on a perilous slip, so much so that today we control under 50 percent of the global market. The reason I have such great concern about this is because it impacts us not only from a commercial standpoint but also from a military standpoint.

I would draw my colleagues' attention to this first projected chart that we have here. This was a report issued that said "Buy European." Basically, it is saying that the Europeans have set out on a vision, a vision that they call Aeronautical Vision 2020, to capture the market by the year 2020. And so what we see going on in Europe these days is direct subsidization of their industry, direct subsidization by Air Bus, direct subsidization that leads both to the creation of jobs and the ability to take control of this market away from the Americans.

The depth of this concern and the strategy behind it is well thought out and well planned. Here in this country, and rightfully so, we are driven by quarterly returns, driven by the fact that our shareholders of our respective industries expect a good return on their dollar. In order to compete with us long term, what the European Union has recognized is the need to directly subsidize their industry. In the process, Americans continue to shed jobs. We only have to look at the reports of what has happened to Boeing, Lockheed, General Electric, and Pratt & Whitney and understand the concern of a number of Members in this House of ours about the loss of jobs that has occurred, while the European Union would suggest that they are more than willing to spend the kind of money that is necessitated to keep jobs in Europe, recognizing that as we continue our efforts here in this country adhering to quarterly returns that they will be able to augment their industry and make sure that they continue to employ people as we continue to shed jobs here in the United States.

This has long-term ramifications militarily for exactly that reason. Because if we continue to shed jobs here in the United States, we lose the critical mass of highly trained, highly skilled employees who have been the backbone of the aerospace industry here in our great Nation. They have also been the backbone of making sure that we have an unparalleled military and command of the airspace. But if we continue on this precipitous slide, we will soon find ourselves in the position where American-made when it comes to aerospace will no longer be the case.

If you look at these charts, what we have found is that the United States' share of aerospace markets has fallen dramatically. There is a direct correlation between what has happened since 1985 in terms of our share of the market and our willingness to invest in research and development. What we have witnessed is a precipitous dropoff, again where we have gone to more than 70 percent share of the market down to under 50 percent of the market. By the same token, we have seen our investment rise from greater than \$30 billion in research and development to under 15.

I thank the Speaker for the opportunity to point this out. I hope that Members will sign on to H.R. 4653. I look forward to further discussions.

JUNE 10, 2002.

Hon. JOHN B. LARSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LARSON: The Aviation Coalition endorses H.R. 4653, the "Aeronautics Research and Development Revitalization Act of 2002." The Aviation Coalition is comprised of professional societies and trade groups representing more than 1 million engineers, scientists and researchers.

In recent years, our Coalition has expressed concerns that reducing federal funding for aviation research and technology will jeopardize the nation's leadership in providing the technologies needed to develop

the next generation aircraft, improve aviation safety and security, and attract the next generation of aerospace scientists and engineers. Assuring the nation's ability to develop innovative technologies to inhibit future terrorist usurpation of the nation's air transportation system, as well as to develop advanced technologies for our air defense network is of paramount importance.

Over the last decade, funding for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA's) aeronautics research and development (R&D) program has fallen by approximately 50 percent, and unfortunately this trend is continuing. The Administration's Fiscal Year 2003 (FY03) budget request of \$541.4M for aeronautics is a reduction of \$58M from FY02 appropriated funding. We strongly support your efforts to counter the dramatic decline in U.S. research and development spending in aeronautics.

The "Aeronautics Research and Development Revitalization Act of 2002" will provide a funding basis for NASA to plan and implement a program to achieve the objectives of their "Aeronautics Blueprint—Toward a Bold New Era of Aviation," which we strongly support. We believe such a program is vital to U.S. Aviation and a necessary response to accelerated research and development by the European Union and other global competitors. By introducing this legislation, you have also taken the first step to address a recommendation of the President's Commission on the Future of the U.S. Aerospace Industry for "the Administration and Congress to work together to fund a new R&D initiative to develop a new 21st Century air transportation system for the nation."

We commend you for leadership in introducing this important legislation, and we look forward to working with you and other Members of Congress, in re-establishing the investment in aeronautics research and development as a national priority.

If you have any questions, please contact Kathryn Holmes at holmesk@asme.org or 202/785-3756, Ext. 390.

[From Defense News, June 10–16, 2002]

BUY EUROPEAN, SAYS REPORT

(By Martin Agüera)

European Union governments should rethink pledges to buy American arms—starting with the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF), Western European Union (WEU) officials say.

Picking the U.S.-led JSF over home-grown alternatives like the Eurofighter would hurt the European aerospace industry and the ability of EU member militaries to work together, they said at a June 5 meeting in Paris.

The countries should "reconsider their participation in the JSF [Joint Strike Fighter] program, bearing in mind European solutions now available and the fact that the effect on the future of the European aerospace industry of any choice in favor of JSF might be detrimental to strengthening European military capabilities," said the WEU report, "Equipping our forces for Europe's security and defense—priorities and shortcomings."

The only all-European self-defense organization, the WEU has traditionally been subordinate to the trans-Atlantic NATO, to which its 10 members all belong.

A London-based analyst defended the WEU's stance.

"Europe has excellent programs underway, such as the A400M, the Eurofighter, the Gripen or the Meteor medium-range [missile] program, that justify a widespread cooperation. However, Europe has not been able to get its act together," said Paul Beaver, a defense analyst with Ashbourne Beaver Associates.

Beaver noted that countries such as Norway and the Netherlands were supportive of U.S. products for industrial reasons.

"These countries don't have large defense industries and they are acting pragmatically. They have been introduced to the F-16 and the plane has served them well. Also, those countries have taken a close look at what Europe can offer them, and what they see is a European cooperation that is very much hampered by different national problems. Just take the A400M or Meteor, and Germany's parliamentary delays," he said. Germany has yet to formally sign on to either program.

But a member of the WEU's Technological and Aerospace Committee argued that continually seeking American solutions to requirements would starve Europe's industrial base and dull its technological edge.

"We have to be more aware of Europe and what our industry can do and is able to achieve. Otherwise, our stated goal of creating a consolidated defense effort can simply not be met," José Manuel Pedregosa said June 3.

JSF CONCERN

JSF lead contractor Lockheed Martin Corp., Bethesda, Md., has been gaining ground in attracting development partners—and likely future buyers—in Europe. Several countries have recently signed up to join the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Denmark to develop the JSF, which will be built in three versions: conventional, aircraft carrier, and short takeoff and vertical landing.

Norway joined the development effort on June 3, pledging 1.06 billion kroner (\$134 million) over a decade, a Norwegian defense official in Washington said. And Italy is poised to sign up as well. Its parliament's defense committee's recommendation to join the program as a second-tier partner now awaits approval by the full legislature, said Filippo Berselli, Italy's secretary of defense. And the Netherlands' new, conservative government signed a memorandum of understanding June 5 pledging about \$800 million toward the development phase of the \$200 billion next-generation fighter program. The Dutch plan to buy some 85 JSFs around 2017 to replace its 137 F-16 fighter aircraft at a cost of up to 7 billion euros (\$6.6 billion).

But not everyone thinks signing up for the JSF is the right move. Franz Timmermanns, Dutch parliamentarian and member of the defense committee for the Social Democratic Party, said the financial risk of participation is very high.

"We have committed ourselves to this program now in such a way that we can only benefit from it if we later on also buy the aircraft. If new priorities in European defense come up now, we will not be able to adjust to that," Timmermanns said in a telephone interview from The Hague on June 5. "This decision now had little to do with defense, but was based on industrial politics and satisfied the Air Force's needs for the next 50 years."

Timmermanns said there is a danger that Europeans may not be able to influence any decisions on JSF. "You have to see that the JSF is still under discussion in the U.S. itself. There may be less [U.S.] F-22s in the end, which could require more roles and missions for the JSF, which in turn could make the JSF costlier. Whatever decision the U.S. will take then, we are stuck with it."

But Lockheed Martin officials called JSF "an ideal example" of a program that promotes interoperability and trans-Atlantic industrial cooperation.

"We are promoting all ways with this program politically, and in industrial business links, to achieve the best interoperability

possible between the U.S. and Europe," Ivor Evans, JSF business development manager at Lockheed Martin's London office, said June 5.

JSF COMMITMENTS

All participants are involved in the system development and demonstration phase. Aircraft purchase decisions must be made in the 2012 time frame. International funding commitments:

United Kingdom: \$2 billion.

Netherlands: \$800 million.

Canada: \$150 million.

Denmark: \$125 million.

Norway: \$134 million.

Italy: Plan awaits legislative approval.

Turkey: In negotiation.

Sources: Lockheed Martin Corp. and Defense News research.

[From Aviation Week & Space Technology, Feb. 5, 2001]

EUROPE SEEKS GLOBAL LEADERSHIP IN AERONAUTICS

(By John D. Morrocco and Jens Flottau)

The European Commission and aerospace industry executives have unveiled "A Vision For 2020" report which outlines the ambitious goals of attaining "global leadership" in aeronautics and creating a "world class air transport system" for Europe.

The report was assembled by European aerospace industry leaders, including EADS Co-Chairmen Jean-Luc Lagardere and Manfred Bischoff and BAE Systems Chairman Sir Richard Evans, at the request of Philippe Busquin, EC commissioner for research. It outlines some lofty ideas for research and development activities and puts the spotlight on the need for increased public funding to turn the vision into a reality.

Implementing the Vision 2020 plan is expected to require more than 100 billion euros (\$93 billion) in the next 20 years, the report said. This takes into account continued public, as well as private funding for the industry. Roughly 30% of civil aeronautics research is now funded by the European Union.

However, German Economics Minister Werner Mueller stressed that there will not be "a competition of subsidies" with the U.S. Repayable state loans to industry for development of the Airbus A380 have already heightened simmering frictions between the U.S. and Europe on this score.

Busquin said the sector faces "stark challenges" in the coming 20 years, including a tripling of the volume of air traffic and increasing public concerns over environmental and safety issues. "The days of higher, further, faster" are definitely numbered and must be replaced by "more affordable, safer, cleaner and quieter."

Specific targets set in the report, which was unveiled at an aeronautics conference in Hamburg last week, include:

"A fivefold reduction in the average accident rate" for aircraft operators worldwide.

A 50% reduction in perceived aircraft noise.

A 50% cut in CO₂ emissions from aircraft per passenger km. and an 80% reduction in oxides of nitrogen emissions.

An air traffic control system capable of handling 16 million flights per year with round-the-clock airport operations.

The report was purposely intended to provide the industry with goals that in some cases will be difficult, if not impossible, to reach, said Busquin. He admitted that while some of the goals proposed were very optimistic, it was important to set ambitious guidelines to serve as incentives for industry.

Better coordination of Europe's research and development activities was highlighted

as a key requirement. The report said aeronautics research in Europe is “substantially behind that of the U.S. and scattered in various national programs and centers.” It recommended adopting different forms of cooperation between various programs and transnational partnerships.

Busquin said the EC would set up an Advisory Council for Aeronautics Research in Europe by mid-year to help coordinate activities. The EC will also look for ways to reinforce cooperation and deal with problems which can neither be solved on the national nor on the community level.

Walter Kroll, Chairman of the German aerospace research center DLR, said research in Europe is too fragmented and rife with unnecessary duplication and is also burdened with too much intro-European competition. More synergies would have to be found. Public funding was “the key to success” and should be consistently sustained in the years to come, he said.

The report acknowledged that despite current restructuring efforts European industry still “lagged behind” the U.S. in terms of consolidation. Nevertheless, consolidation is viewed as a “platform for maintaining and enhancing Europe’s competitiveness during the next two decades.”

European aeronautic experts believe that improved competitiveness will allow the industry to capture a majority of the world market in aircraft, engines and equipment. The industry maintains that this can be achieved through a high degree of innovation and a shorter time-to-market for its products. The goal is to cut development lead times in half.

Evans warned, however, that the process of constant innovation and technological improvement could not be sustained as readily as it would have been in the past due to decreasing defense spending in Europe. He stressed that “virtually all of aerospace technology” initially derived from research for military projects. “We took things out of the basket, but we didn’t put back in enough.”

Furthermore, the European aerospace industry is in a completely different position from several years ago, as virtually every major company has gone through privatization. He noted that the industry is now dependent on capital markets, good financial returns and investor confidence. As a result, European governments had to recognize that they were competing against other world regions in order to retain manufacturing sites within their own countries.

The European aerospace industry, in Evans’ view, will have to focus on high-end products. “Metal fabrication will be in serious decline.” In order to keep European businesses competitive and prevent companies from moving to other countries, the tax and regulatory environment would have to be improved, Evans said. “European governments will have to decide if they want a vibrant industry.”

Vision 2020 places a strong focus on the environmental impact of air travel. Not only does it plan to dramatically cut exhaust emissions, but also to employ more recyclable materials. Another goal is to eliminate aircraft noise as a “political and social issue.” To do so means that noise levels will have to be reduced to 50% of current average levels through new engines, better operational procedures and sensible land planning around airports.

The report noted that industry is exploring concepts for more competitive aircraft designs, including a “next generation of superliners” capable of carrying up to 1,200 passengers. Vision 2020 also includes a readiness to develop “niche markets for supersonic aircraft and freight-carrying airships.” Flying wing designs, as well as vertical take-off and

landing vehicles, could also emerge in the commercial world.

OPPOSING SOCIAL SECURITY PRIVATIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to highlight the importance of Social Security to millions of individuals and their families. Social Security is the Nation’s most successful anti-poverty program. It has lifted over 11 million seniors out of poverty. The program has been especially important for women. Sixty percent of all Social Security recipients are women. Nearly two-thirds of all women 65 and older get half or more of their income from Social Security. Nearly one-third of those receive 90 percent or more of their income from Social Security.

Without Social Security, the poverty rate for elderly women would be more than 50 percent. It is currently about 12 percent. While this statistic is still too high, it shows how important the program is. But the President and some Members of Congress want to fundamentally change Social Security, preventing Social Security from carrying out its important role. The President and other supporters of privatization are using the program’s long-term financial problems to advance their political agenda. The President suggests that by allowing individuals to divert part of their payroll taxes into private accounts, Social Security will return to firm financial footing and will still be able to continue helping recipients. However, this simply is not true. Privatization will harm Social Security, leaving the well-being of millions of people uncertain. Privatization will likely result in benefit cuts and increase the retirement age for individuals.

In early 2001, the President announced the formation of a commission to develop a plan to strengthen Social Security. The commission’s report advocated three plans, all of which would allow for some level of private accounts. What the report fails to mention, though, is that all three plans have significant drawbacks. For example, accounts would likely lose 20 to 40 percent of their value due to administrative charges and management fees. Therefore, senior citizens would have less money at retirement. I am also concerned that individuals would be exposed to significant risk under privatization. Under current law, an individual’s benefits are determined by their earnings and payroll tax contributions. He or she is guaranteed a monthly benefit, adjusted for inflation, for life.

Under the President’s plan, individuals would be required to play the stock market, exposing themselves to the whims of the market. A person would then have to pick the right time to retire. No matter how skilled an in-

dividual is in reading the market, he or she should not have to gamble with retirement savings. This is unfair. It leaves too much up to chance.

We are not trying to scare our senior citizens. Rather, we want to provide them with both sides of the argument. While Social Security’s financial outlook needs to be made more certain, we should not rush to embrace a particular solution that may end up being worse than the current system. As Congress proceeds with this very important debate, we should be providing our seniors with facts, not lofty promises about reforms. Our seniors deserve no less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SOCIAL SECURITY AND WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Social Security, the preservation of it for future generations, particularly with regard to women. As we know, there are more women in the United States than there are men; so it would be appropriate, then, to underscore the needs for women.

Women represent a majority of Social Security recipients in the United States. According to the Social Security Administration, women make up almost 60 percent of all Social Security beneficiaries and approximately 71 percent of beneficiaries 85 years of age and older.

Women rely heavily on Social Security because most do not receive private pensions; therefore, Social Security provides the foundation for most women’s retirement security. Recent surveys indicate, Mr. Speaker, that over half of nonmarried women 65 and older receive 80 percent or more of their income from Social Security.

Although Social Security is helpful for women, it still has many inequalities. Social Security tends to protect families consisting of a lifelong paid worker, who is typically the husband. However, women who often leave the workforce temporarily to have children do not receive the same benefits. Estimated predictions state that the Social Security benefits currently received