

similarities in service and sacrifice, that is one area where the Commandant of the Coast Guard is distinct from his peers.

Current law allows that the chiefs of the other services; Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, may provide personal considerations to members of Congress if requested to do so (10 U.S.C. 151(f)); however, the Coast Guard Commandant does not have this privilege. The advice received from the other service chiefs has been invaluable in ensuring that Congress provides the proper resources and legislative support. At a time when the Coast Guard is engaged a wide range of military operations abroad and homeland defense missions at home, that advice is even more important.

It is for that reason, that I am introducing this simple legislation. The bill, first brought to my attention by the Fleet Reserve Association, would give the Commandant of the Coast Guard the authority to make such recommendations to Congress relating to the Coast Guard as the Commandant considers appropriate. It does not mandate unsolicited recommendations, nor dictate the nature of those recommendations. Instead it simply provides the Commandant of the Coast Guard the same authority provided to the heads of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. I would encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to ensure that the Coast Guard remains true to its motto—Semper Paratus—or Always Ready.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 20, I was unable to vote on H. Res. 356, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the man-made famine that occurred in the Ukraine in 1932–33 (rollcall 563); H. Res. 400, honoring the 25th anniversary of Pope John Paul II's ascension to the papacy (rollcall 564); and H.R. 3288, to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to make technical corrections with respect to the definition of qualifying State (rollcall 565). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on all three measures.

APPROPRIATE APPROACH TO NORTH KOREA ENTAILS MULTILATERAL APPROACH, AVOIDING CYCLE OF EXTORTION

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to his colleagues two editorials on North Korea.

First, this Member hopes his colleagues will review the October 20, 2003, editorial from the New York Times in which the newspaper finally is willing to call the acts in which North Korea has been engaged "blackmail." Indeed, for many years, this term has accurately described the conduct of the previous Kim II Sung regime and now the Kim Jong II regime.

An agreement by the United States, Russia, China, South Korea, and Japan that there would be no attack on North Korea "in exchange for its commitment to dismantle its nuclear weapons programs" is a sufficient quid pro quo as long as North Korea's acceptance of this proposed agreement is not tied to economic aid. This Member feels very strongly that the United States cannot fall into a cycle of extortion again.

Second, this Member commends the editorial which was published in the October 21, 2003, Los Angeles Times. As the editorial correctly notes, North Korea poses a regional threat and therefore its neighbors—China, Russia, South Korea, and Japan—must be included in all efforts to craft and verify agreements whereby North Korea will dismantle its nuclear weapons program.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 2003]

TRYING DIPLOMACY ON NORTH KOREA

President Bush is now taking a wiser and more sophisticated approach to the crisis caused by North Korea's reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons. In a proposal whose details are still being refined, Washington and four other nations would guarantee not to attack the North in exchange for its commitment to dismantle its nuclear weapons program.

This proposal makes an eventual peaceful, diplomatic solution to this extremely dangerous problem somewhat more likely. Just how likely is impossible to tell because there is no assurance that North Korea's highly unpredictable leaders will agree to disarm. If the North does spurn this reasonable offer, Washington will find it easier to persuade Asian nations to support more coercive steps, like international economic sanctions.

North Korea's nuclear programs are particularly alarming because the nation has a long history of selling advanced weapons to all who will pay for them, including other rogue states and perhaps terrorists. Yet in the past year, as the North has raced ahead with reprocessing plutonium into bomb fuel, Washington has handicapped its own efforts to achieve a diplomatic solution by refusing to specify what America would be willing to do if the North firmly committed to giving up its nuclear weapons ambitions in ways outsiders could reliably verify.

The White House had insisted that specifying any such quid pro quo would be giving in to North Korean nuclear blackmail. Blackmail is a fair description of North Korea's behavior. But in a situation in which everyone agrees that military action against the North would have catastrophic consequences for hundreds of thousands of innocent South Koreans and Japanese, Washington's principled stand poorly served American interests.

With this proposal, Mr. Bush is now making a serious effort to revive negotiations and is personally seeking the support of his fellow leaders at the Asia-Pacific summit meeting in Bangkok. All four of the nations that would join Washington in the proposed security guarantee—China, Japan, Russia and South Korea—are represented there. Washington's new approach deserves strong support from each of them.

In offering security guarantees to the North, Mr. Bush wisely overruled hawkish administration officials who preferred moving directly toward coercive economic and military steps. This initiative comes less than a week after the administration's skilled diplomacy won unanimous backing for a United Nations Security Council resolution on Iraq that broadly endorsed Washington's policies there. Diplomacy is an important tool for advancing America's national security. It is good to see it.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 21, 2003]

CORRECT NUCLEAR STRATEGY

President Bush's announced willingness to take part in a joint guarantee not to attack North Korea is an important maneuver in getting Pyongyang to end its nuclear weapons program. Even if Kim Jong II's regime refuses to accept anything short of a full-fledged treaty, Bush's more conciliatory approach should win needed diplomatic support from China and South Korea.

Bush took advantage of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation summit in Bangkok to discuss North Korea's nuclear ambitions with Presidents Hu Jintao of China and Roh Moo Hyun of South Korea. In August, both countries joined the U.S., Japan and Russia to present a united front, urging North Korea to end its atomic weapons development. The U.S. is correct to enlist the assistance of North Korea's neighbors; nuclear proliferation is a regional threat, not an issue of concern only to Pyongyang and Washington.

When North Korea resisted further talks, China and South Korea urged Washington to try to woo the North back to the table by providing written, not just oral, assurance that it would not attack. Bush offered to take that extra step, although he correctly ruled out a formal treaty. Pyongyang's refusal to abide by its 1994 agreement with the U.S. to freeze its nuclear weapons program in exchange for energy supplies and economic aid raises doubts it would live up to a treaty. North Korea first should be required to show international inspectors that it is not reprocessing plutonium and enriching uranium.

One administration official said the U.S. was willing to sign an agreement saying it had no "hostile intent" if North Korea demonstrated that it was making "verifiable progress" in dismantling its weapons program. That's an important change from administration insistence that Pyongyang end the program before getting any economic help. The North considered such an ultimatum unacceptable, but it might end the program in stages if it saw rewards at each step.

North Korea withdrew from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty last year and keeps saying it is reprocessing plutonium from 8,000 fuel rods. That may be bluff and bluster, but if true it would produce enough fuel for perhaps 20 nuclear weapons. Monday, it fired a conventional missile into the Sea of Japan in a test timed to coincide with the Bangkok summit, though not with Bush's initiative. Pyongyang has sold missiles to other nations; because it is desperately poor and periodically racked by famine, there is no reason to believe it would refrain from selling weapons-grade nuclear material.

China provides most of North Korea's food and oil supplies and has been instrumental in arranging six-nation talks. It should point to Washington's flexibility as it pressures North Korea to resume talks and give up nuclear weapons in exchange for security and aid.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 21, I was unable to vote on H. Res. 407, the Rule to provide for consideration of H.J. Res. 73 (rollcall vote 566). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes." I was also

unable to vote on an Obey motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3289 (rollcall 567). Had I been present, I would have voted "no." Further, I was unable to vote on final passage of H.J. Res. 73, making further continuing appropriations for FY04 (rollcall 568). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber on July 14, 2003 and missed rollcall vote No. 357, the Ackerman-LaTourette amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations bill which would require that the USDA expend no funds to approve meat from downed animals—animals that are too sick to walk or stand—for food. I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FAMILY SERVICE AGENCY OF BURBANK'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate The Family Service Agency of Burbank for its 50 years of dedicated service to the Burbank community.

The Family Service Agency of Burbank was established as a non-profit, community based organization in 1953 to provide counseling and educational services for children and their families. These services are extremely pertinent to the health and well being of the community as a whole. The agency's exceptional support system is comprised of generous individuals, small businesses, corporations, the United Way, service clubs, community foundations, and the city of Burbank itself.

Since its creation, Burbank's leading citizens have faithfully served on the agency's board of directors to assure professional services be available. All these services are affordable and genuinely attempt to meet the needs of the Burbank community. Currently, individual and group counseling, specialized youth services, parenting classes, and anger management resources for victims of domestic violence and their families have been incorporated. The Family Service Agency of Burbank has successfully collaborated with the Burbank Unified School District, the faith community, and the City of Burbank to deliver life-changing services to those in dire need of them. Their determination and innumerable achievements have provided the residents of the City of Burbank with a valuable resource to address common societal problems.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in congratulating the Family Service Agency of Burbank for 50 years of unwavering service to the Burbank community.

EMPLOYMENT DOWNFALL IN OHIO

HON. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the dramatic downfall in Ohio employment since this current administration took office in January of 2001. This downfall is being felt by middle-class workers throughout Cleveland, throughout Ohio and throughout our Nation.

In January of 2001, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that Cleveland benefited from 1,147,700 jobs. By January 2003, that number plunged by 55,000 jobs. After two additional years of fiscally reckless policies from this administration, current preliminary estimates state less than 1,113,100 jobs now exist in the City of Cleveland.

In September of 2001, Cleveland had 183,100 manufacturing jobs. The current number of manufacturing jobs has dipped to 165,700. The amount of job losses in manufacturing for the State of Ohio since August 2001 now total 86,700.

A great many of these unemployed manufacturing employees are dependent on benefits provided under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation program. The total number of unemployed workers in Ohio who have exhausted these benefits amounts to 126,000.

Ohioans must have the means necessary to aid them through these troubling economic times. I would urge this administration to focus on initiatives to boost employment—not just tax cuts.

Ohioans deserve a resolution to this unemployment spell. The facts show that too many are still out of work. Ohioans deserve to know why.

IN HONOR OF COLONEL JACK JACOBS

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colonel Jack Jacobs for his years service and dedication to his country. Colonel Jacobs will be honored by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States at the Testimonial Dinner on Thursday, October 30, 2003, at the Newark Liberty Airport Wyndham in Elizabeth, New Jersey.

Colonel Jack Jacobs is a veteran of the Vietnam War, serving two tours of duty courageously. His heroism is exemplified by his numerous commendations, including two Purple Heart Medals, three Bronze Stars, two Silver Stars, and the Medal of Honor, the United States highest combat decoration. Colonel Jacobs risked his life and overcame personal injury to save the lives of 13 allied soldiers and one United States advisor. Colonel Jacobs retired from the United States Army in 1987.

Colonel Jack Jacobs serves on several boards of directors on numerous companies, and is the secretary of the Board of Directors for the Congressional Medal of Honor Foundation. Colonel Jacobs is a regular fixture on

CNBC and MSNBC as a military and foreign affairs analyst.

Colonel Jack Jacobs received his bachelor's degree from Rutgers University. During his military service, Colonel Jacobs served as a faculty member at the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York, and the National War College in Washington, DC.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Colonel Jack Jacobs for his outstanding leadership and courage, his 21 years of military service, and his commitment to his fellow man.

THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE STUDENT LOAN ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. VERNON J. EHLERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation ensures the federal government's deep commitment to a highly-trained and diverse workforce. But we should go even further. In order to best maximize federal government resources, we should consider allowing competition within other aspects of the student loan program, including consolidation loans.

In order to ensure that we instill such competition, we should safeguard and improve existing loan consolidation opportunities. The 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act has allowed Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) student loan borrowers who hold loans from more than one underlying lender to select from those lenders when consolidating their loans. This change has enabled many recent college graduates to refinance their loans at a lower fixed-interest rate. However, student loan borrowers who hold loans through a single lender must consolidate loans through their current lender. This rule, known as the "Single Holder Rule," fosters a situation analogous to requiring homeowners to refinance their mortgages only through their current mortgage holders. We should consider repealing the single holder rule during the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

As we progress through this reauthorization, I am hopeful that we will preserve the existing loan consolidation provisions and also improve this important program. Allowing competition in loan consolidation encourages student loan borrowers to consolidate their loans and to further reduce their debt burden by taking advantage of historically-low, fixed-interest rates, just as other borrowers are able to do every day.

HONORING MICHAEL BERRY ON THE DEDICATION OF THE MICHAEL BERRY AMPHITHEATER

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and to honor my dear friend, Michael Berry on the occasion of the dedication of the Michael Berry Amphitheater at Henry Ford Community College in Dearborn, Michigan.

The son of Lebanese immigrants, Michael Berry came of age in Depression Era South