

broadcast community. Beginning with the formation of Baldwin County's first radio station, WHEP, in Foley, Alabama, in 1953, Mr. Stewart has been the head of a growing broadcast family that has provided immeasurable joy and valuable information for thousands of listeners along Alabama's Gulf Coast. During his professional career, Mr. Stewart has been actively involved in the life of his community and has taken a leading role in many civic and professional organizations. Many groups including the South Baldwin Chamber of Commerce, the Alabama Council of Hospital Governing Boards, the Foley Rotary Club, and the South Baldwin Health Care Foundation have benefited from his experience, leadership and interest in promoting further growth in Baldwin County, and from his desire to ensure that his fellow residents received the best that life in South Alabama has to offer.

Moreover, Mr. Stewart has received on many occasions the most important recognition of all: the respect and admiration of his professional peers. From his service in the Alabama Radio-Television Broadcasters Association to membership on Legislative Liaison Committees of the National Association of Broadcasters, Jim Stewart has been honored for his outstanding professional and journalistic integrity and for his genuine concern for and love of his community and state.

Mr. Speaker, I don't feel there are a sufficient number of honors or awards to recognize the significant contributions Jim Stewart has made during the past five decades, nor are there enough words to express the thanks of the many people he has touched during that time. I can only express my deepest appreciation for his service to Baldwin County and to the entire State of Alabama. His many accomplishments during his life can be counted; the tremendous number of lives he has impacted cannot.

#### RECOGNIZING CRYTAL BANUELOS

#### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 25, 2003*

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Crystal Banuelos, a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of America, Troop 116, and in earning the most prestigious honor of the Gold Award.

The Girl Scout Gold Award is the highest achievement attainable in girl scouting. To earn the Gold Award, a scout must complete five requirements, all of which promote community service, personal and spiritual growth, positive values, and leadership skills. The requirements include, (1) earning four interest project patches, each of which requires seven activities that center on skill building, technology, service projects, and career exploration, (2) earning the career exploration pin, which involves researching careers, writing resumes, and planning a career fair or trip, (3) earning the Senior Girl Scout Leadership Award, which requires a minimum of 30 hours of work using leadership skills, (4) designing a selfdevelopment plan that requires assessment of ability to interact with others and prioritize values, participation for a minimum of

15 hours in a community service project, and development of a plan to promote girl scouting, and (5) spending a minimum of 50 hours planning and implementing a Girl Scout Gold Award project that has a positive lasting impact on the community.

For her Gold Award project, Crystal organized a poetry and writing appreciation program.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Crystal Banuelos for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of America and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of the Gold Award.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF CORRESPONDENTS WISHES A DEAR COLLEAGUE AND FRIEND, DAVID HOLMES, WELL IN HIS RETIREMENT

#### HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 25, 2003*

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The Executive Committee of Correspondents conveys its gratitude on behalf of the more than 250 publications and 1,800 reporters who benefited from your 28 years as director of the House Periodical Press Gallery.

Over the decades, you have helped the gallery grow and expand, ranging from the number of reporters served to the amount of information available. You have kept the gallery and its staff up to date with the latest technology and pushed for even greater technological advances.

Reporters have always found you a valuable resource. Your vast knowledge of Congressional rules and procedures will be sorely missed, as will your keen political insights and ability to steer reporters in the right direction.

You have always looked out for the best interests of reporters and fought for increased access to lawmakers and events. You deserve our thanks and gratitude for getting to know the right people throughout the years so that we could do our jobs with minimum of interference.

We also acknowledge your role in defending our interests in court when the need arose and for always being fair and impartial when it came to credentialing new organizations for admittance into the gallery.

For all these and so many more reasons, the Executive Committee thanks you for your many years of service and wishes you and Shauna a happy, long and well-deserved retirement.

Sincerely,

CHERYL BOLEN  
HEIDI GLENN  
RICHARD COHEN  
TIM CURRAN  
DOUGLAS WALLER  
TERENCE SAMUEL  
LORRAINE WOELLERT

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE FAMILY FARM TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2003

#### HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 25, 2003*

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Family Farm Tax Simplification Act of 2003, legislation that will allow married co-owners of family farms to significantly reduce the amount of time it takes to prepare a correct income tax return and to provide both spouses with Social Security and Medicare coverage.

As ranking member of the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee, I am pleased that we held a hearing on this issue earlier in the month and that, today, we are able to quickly move forward and act to simplify the tax law. I am honored to have the Oversight Subcommittee Chairman HOUGHTON join me in co-sponsoring this bill.

The National Taxpayer Advocate has reported that approximately 3,000 family farmers in North Dakota may not be eligible for Social Security and Medicare benefits because of the onerous partnership tax rules associated with preparing the return that allows both spouses to pay into the Social Security and Medicare systems. The IRS estimates that it takes the average partnership approximately 165–200 hours to prepare its return.

As a result, some family farms have chosen to file a sole proprietor return, attributing all income to, and paying self-employment taxes on, only one spouse. Unfortunately, when this occurs, the other spouse will not be covered under the Social Security and Medicare systems. Many, many hard-working couples are getting a bad deal under the current system, and they will not find out about it until it is too late.

For example, take a family farm run equally by husband and wife. If the business files a return with the husband as sole proprietor, he would be awarded Social Security disability benefits if he becomes disabled, alleviating some of the financial burden of his disability on the family. However, if the wife becomes disabled, she is unable to collect Social Security disability. By not collecting this benefit, the business is further financially disadvantaged.

Current law puts husband and wife businesses in a serious dilemma with a difficult choice under our current tax return filing rules. If they file a partnership return which is technically correct they face hundreds of hours in tax return preparation and/or very expensive charges from a tax attorney or accountant. If they file a sole proprietorship return, which is technically not correct, one of the spouses loses coverage for Social Security disability benefits, Social Security survivorship benefits, and Medicare benefits.

The IRS has been "winking" at letting couples file as a sole proprietorship since there generally is no tax liability difference between the two approaches to filing. In fact, these couples are subject to serious civil and criminal penalties for filing incorrect returns. This is just a plain, bad arrangement.

The solution is quite simple. The tax law needs to be changed to allow a couple to file a simple return with income attributed to both spouses and both spouses paying into the Social Security/Medicare system.

The Family Farm Tax Simplification Act of 2003 would allow a married couple to elect to file a joint Form 1040 tax return—through which each spouse is treated as a sole proprietor of the business, and each spouse is allocated part of the farm's business income, gain or loss. By offering this election, both spouses are able to pay self-employment taxes and, thus, can both be covered by the Social Security and Medicare systems. With very few exceptions, the proposal would not affect a couples' total income tax liability nor their total Social Security/Medicare tax contribution.

Finally, I have asked the Taxpayer Advocate to provide the Oversight Subcommittee with more information on how legislation, such as I am introducing today, might apply in the case of non-farm small businesses. I will be receiving a State-by-State analysis of such firms and a description of how the commonly-used Schedule C could be modified to simplify returns for these taxpayers. I would hope that tax simplification reforms provided in my bill could be expanded to other types of small family-owned firms.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to help family farmers receive Social Security and Medicare benefits. I hope my colleagues will join me in passing this important legislation.

## DEFENSE TRANSFORMATION

### HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 25, 2003*

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important challenges facing our Nation is to transform the most successful military in the world so that it is better able to meet the security needs to the years ahead. I would like to submit for the record and commend to my colleagues an outstanding speech entitled, "Transforming the Defense Establishment," by Dr. Stephen A. Cambone, Department of Defense Director of Program Analysis and Evaluation, which was delivered before Bear Stearns and Company on January 27, 2003. In my view, Dr. Cambone's emphasis on changing the culture of organizations is particularly important.

As we consider the President's 2004 defense budget request, we should give careful attention to the excellent insights offered by Dr. Cambone.

In his September 1999 speech at the Citadel, then-candidate George Bush declared that, if elected, he would seize on an opportunity created by what he called a "revolution in the technology of war." As a result of that revolution, he said, power "is increasingly defined not by mass or size but by mobility and swiftness. Influence is measured in information, safety is gained in stealth, and force is projected on the long arc of precision-guided weapons. This revolution perfectly matches the strength of our country, the skill of our people, and the superiority of our technology. The best way to keep the peace," he said, "is to redefine war on our terms."

The President went on to sketch his vision of the armed forces. He said, "Our forces in the next century must be agile, lethal, read-

ily deployable, and require a minimum of logistical support. We must be able to project our power over long distances, in days and weeks, rather than months. Our military must be able to identify targets by a variety of means, from a Marine patrol on the ground to a satellite in space, and then it must be able to destroy those targets almost instantly with an array of weapons from the submarine-launched cruise missile to mobile long-range artillery."

"Our land forces," he said, "must be lighter, our light forces must be more lethal, and all must be easier to deploy. And, these forces must be organized in smaller, more agile formations, than cumbersome divisions." "On the seas, we need to pursue promising ideas . . . to destroy targets from great distances." "In the air, we must be able to strike from across the world with pinpoint accuracy with long-range aircraft and perhaps with unmanned systems." "In space, we must be able to protect our network of satellites essential to our flow of commerce and defense of our country."

As a way of underscoring his determination to bring about the transformation of the military forces of the United States, the President reminded the audience of another time of what he called "rapid change and momentous choices." "In the late 1930s, as Britain refused to adapt to the new realities of war, Winston Churchill observed, 'The era of procrastination, of half-measures, of soothing and baffling expedience, of delays, is coming to a close. In its place we are entering a period of consequences.'"

Well, that period of consequences arrived here in this city just two years later, on September 11, 2001. The remainder of this talk will focus on how we have answered the call laid down by the President during his candidacy. Let me sum them up: He asked us to do three things. He asked us to assure the well-being of the men and women in uniform and the civilians who work for the Department. He asked us to provide the means to them to defeat today's threats. He asked us to take on the transformation of the defense establishment to meet the challenges of the future. Before I take on each in turn, that is to say, what we've done for our people, how we've met today's challenges, and what we are doing for the future, let me take a moment to tell you what we think transformation is, and what it is not.

What it is, we think, is a continuing effort over time. It is not a static objective in time. So, if you are looking to judge this transformational process or the progress that we have made, and you try to pin it to a certain place in a certain time and use a static measure, you will be disappointed and probably mislead yourself and others.

Secondly, it is a change in culture. A change in culture that is reflected in what we do, how we do it, and the means we choose to accomplish our objectives. I can't stress enough the importance of the change in culture that comes with the transformation. Those of you who have watched various companies merge and come apart over the last decade or so will understand just how important changes in culture are to a transformational effort.

It's also about balancing risk. We have identified risk in four categories. The first area of risk has to do, not surprisingly, with our people. Are we keeping them in proper trim, as it were? Do they have the means to do their training; are they able to see their families; do they live in decent housing? Second, are we able to conduct operations today at a minimum of risk not, mind you, without risk, but at a minimum of risk, by assuring

that our people are well positioned, well led, and have the proper means to conduct operations? Third, have we made the investments that are necessary to prepare for the future? and lastly, our business practices; have we gone any way toward reforming them? It is our belief that those four categories of risk need to be properly balanced. We cannot over-invest in any one and expect to succeed in all.

Now, let me say a word about what we think transformation is not. It is not change for its own sake. Nor is it measured as a success or a failure on the basis of programs that have been cancelled, programs that have been completed, or programs that have begun. It is easy to keep score that way, and we will, in a few minutes, talk about some of the programs that we have cancelled and programs that we have begun. But, again, that is not a very good scorecard of the progress of this transformational effort.

I call you back again to what transformation is. It's about culture, about what we do, how we do it, and the means we choose to accomplish those objectives. If you were going to develop a checklist to measure transformation, I offer you the following set of points. There are seven, and I'll give them to you in fairly quick order.

The first would be to look at the guidance that we have given both to our civilian and military personnel. Some of that guidance is available to you, for example, in the form of the National Security Strategy that has been published by the White House and the Quadrennial Defense Review that was published by the Department of Defense. Others are not available to you—except when they're leaked to the newspapers—for example:

The Nuclear Posture Review, which reconfigured our nuclear forces, and allowed the President to take the steps to reduce the size of our nuclear offensive arsenal and to incorporate into our future strategic force conventional weapons as well as nuclear weapons. The Contingency Planning Guidance, which is given to our combatant commanders and signed out by the President, and which directs combatant commanders to prepare plans for contingencies now and into the future that reflect the tenets of the strategy that was laid down in the National Security Strategy and the Quadrennial Defense Review. But guidance is fine going back to my point about culture, however: Are we changing the culture? It is often changed by changes in organizations. And I have to tell you, we have changed organizations quite extensively within the Department. We have done so with the aim of enabling what we call joint operations, i.e., the ability of our land, sea, air, and space forces to be combined under the control of a single combatant commander and used in ways that are most appropriate to achieving the objectives of the campaign that he has laid out.

We have changed the structure of our commands: We have added a combatant command for the United States called Northern Command. It "stood up" just recently. We have merged our Space Command and the old Strategic Command into a new command designed to make use of the new instruments of strategic power. We have changed the mission of our Special Operations Command. We have undertaken changes to our organization in the office of the Secretary of Defense. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force—each of them has restructured their staffs and their functions.

Third, I said we were interested in joint operations. Well, it turns out the Department