

provisions of the 1986 Goldwater-Nichols Act. The Act required a reassessment and re-vamping of professional military education to assure that it supported the new emphasis on joint military planning and operations. I suggested to Chairman Aspin that Rep. Skelton could provide a signal contribution to the improvement of the nation's armed forces if he could be persuaded to lead a congressional panel charged with bringing PME into line with the goals of the Goldwater-Nichols Act. Subsequently, Rep. Skelton seized on the opportunity and ultimately fathered the significant changes in Professional Military Education that have culminated in your presence here as JPME graduates at the Naval Postgraduate School.

My remarks today will be addressed to the leadership displayed by Rep. Skelton and two other individuals that eventually led to this gathering.

We usually think of a leader as someone who is in charge or who heads an organization. I for one barely qualify. My most extraordinary experience in that regard was leading aircraft on night combat missions in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War. But the aircrews I commanded came together for only one mission and very little "leadership", as we usually think of it, was involved. On the other hand, many of you in the audience have been, or will be, called upon to lead in the traditional sense. You may rightly ask what I could convey to you on the subject. I certainly asked that question of myself when I began to contemplate this address.

My answer is that I have had the privilege of observing others use their ability, their positions, and their prestige to exert leadership on matters of great importance to our country. Basically, a leader influences other people to behave as he or she wishes. The leaders I will discuss influenced the behavior of hundreds of thousands of members of the armed forces, including you in this audience. It is because of my experience with those men that I can discuss aspects of leadership.

At about the time you graduates were attending high school, I retired from the Air Force and joined the staff of the Armed Services Committee. In February 1982, General David Jones, the nation's most senior military officer, testified that there were fundamental flaws in the structure of the highest military body in our Armed Forces, the Joint Chiefs of Staff—or JCS, as it is often called. He proposed that Congress legislate far-reaching changes.

Gen. Jones was chairman of the JCS. At the time, he was in his late '50s. He was a tall, dark haired, distinguished looking man in his Air Force uniform with the 4 stars on each shoulder.

The general charged that the JCS, a committee consisting of the chiefs of each service, had difficulty making decisions and providing advice to the President from an overall national defense perspective because each chief aggressively pursued the interests of his own service. Moreover, he claimed, the service chiefs had used their positions on the JCS to weaken the field commanders—the CINCs—whose mission it is to plan and conduct military operations. Each service chief wanted to keep as much control of his soldiers, sailors, airmen, or marines as possible. Each chief also sought to maximize his service's budget for tanks, planes, or ships regardless of the needs of the other services. It is no wonder, then, that when the services were called on to work together in military operations, their joint performance was often unsatisfactory.

Most of you in this room are accustomed to hearing of nothing but an unbroken string of military successes during your lifetime. Those of us who are older remember a much

more uneven pattern of military performances. Jones could point to a whole string of flawed military operations to support his allegations.

In Vietnam, the JCS disregarded the principle of unity of command. There were two land chains of command and four air chains of command largely because of each service's sensitivity about placing its forces under the command of a general or admiral of another service.

In 1980, the services were unable to work together in an attempt to rescue American Embassy hostages in Iran. Two aircraft collided on the ground killing several servicemen and dooming the operation. The subsequent investigation revealed gaping disconnects among the services in training for the operation and, once again, flaws in the chain of command.

Going back to World War II, friendly fire from Navy ships shot down Army aircraft during the invasion of Sicily killing paratroopers and aircrews due to inadequate communications and coordination among the services.

Also, in World War II, the Army and the Navy divided the Pacific into two commands, one headed by Gen. MacArthur and the other by Admiral Nimitz, because they could not agree on a unified command structure. The result was a near disaster at Leyte Gulf that could have prolonged the war.

In 1983, a year after Gen. Jones first testified, 241 young servicemen were killed in a terrorist attack on a Marine barracks in Beirut. The investigation revealed glaring inadequacies in the military chain of command that wound its way from the Pentagon through Army, Air Force, and Navy flag officers to the Marine colonel and his unit on the ground.

In that same year, it took over 6000 U.S. troops to defeat 600 Cubans on Grenada. After action reports revealed that inadequate communications among the services hindered naval gunfire and air-to-ground support of the troops in combat.

These and other flawed military operations were not merely unfortunate incidents. As you well know, the price of substandard performance of our armed forces in war is paid in the lives of young Americans.

Obviously, General Jones was raising issues of fundamental importance to the American people. But why did the general voice his criticisms on Capitol Hill? Why did Jones not rely on his Commander-in-Chief to address the problems? One answer is that the administration was not interested. A more fundamental answer involves a fact many people do not realize. The Constitution makes the Congress, not the President, responsible for the organization of the nation's defense. The U. S. House of Representatives delegates oversight of that responsibility to the Committee on Armed Services, and further, to one of its subcommittees.

Representative Richard White, a Democrat from El Paso, was the chairman of the subcommittee responsible for overseeing defense organization in 1982. White was about 70. He was tall and slim. He was soft-spoken. His ruddy complexion reflected the time he had spent in the West Texas sun. His subcommittee focused primarily on investigations—defense contractor fraud, for example. Almost a quarter century had passed since Congress enacted major changes in defense organization. Understandably, Chairman White knew little about the subject. But he was acutely aware that he was responsible for that part of the Constitution that assigned defense organization to Congress.

In April, White convened hearings to determine whether Gen. Jones' criticisms were valid and to ascertain what action Congress should take. The hearings lasted until late

July and covered over 1000 pages. The Reagan Administration strongly opposed reorganization. With few exceptions, the Pentagon witnesses opposed change. On the other hand, many witnesses who had previously served in the Pentagon or White House in high civilian positions sided with Jones. They emphasized that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as constituted, simply did not and could not provide adequate military advice to the President due to the conflicting service interests that dominated the chiefs' thinking. A number of high-ranking retired military officers also agreed with Jones. Others strongly disagreed.

Mr. White presided over every hearing. Listening to the conflicting views of the witnesses soon provided him the education in defense organization issues that he lacked when the hearings began. He made himself an expert through his perseverance.

Only a few other congressmen, however, attended the hearings regularly. Focusing on defense organization is about as exciting as watching paint dry. Moreover, with the Pentagon leadership and the President adamantly opposed to changes, few legislators felt that the investment of their time would be worth the effort.

At the conclusion of the hearings, Chairman White introduced a bill to reorganize the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He had decided that Jones was right. White's subcommittee approved his bill with few changes. One Congressman stated that he did not know much about the complicated issues addressed in the bill. He could confidently support the bill, he said, because Chairman White had presided over the lengthy hearings and was an expert who knew what must be done.

White presented his bill to the full Committee on Armed Services in August. The Committee approved it and referred it to the House of Representatives. In the fall, with Chairman White leading the debate, the House passed the bill and referred it to the Senate. In December, Mr. White persuaded Senator Tower, a fellow Texan, to hold a hearing on his bill before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

That is the end of my story about Rep. White. Soon after the December hearing Congress adjourned and White's bill died, as do all bills that have not been enacted at the end of each Congress. There was no time for the Senate to consider the legislation. Moreover, Mr. White disappeared from Capitol Hill at the same time. You see, he had long ago decided to retire and did not run for reelection even though he would have had no trouble winning another term. Interestingly, by that time General Jones had also retired. He continued to push for reorganization, however.

## RECOGNIZING BETHANY SMITH

### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 24, 2004*

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Bethany Smith, a very dedicated and enthusiastic member of my Washington, D.C., congressional staff.

Bethany has served my office for 7 months, as well as serving as a staffer and intern for Congressman PETE SESSIONS. As our office scheduler, she has established a passion for working on the Hill. Bethany holds dear the people she has worked with as a Hill staffer.

My office and I greatly value Bethany's hard work and commitment. Constituents have

grown to know her attention to detail, knowledge of many issues, and personal touch that should not go unrecognized. Her dedication to the Sixth District of Missouri has shown through over the past few months, which is evident by the appreciation of all she works with.

It is unfortunate for countless people that Bethany will be leaving the House of Representatives, as she has left her unique stamp on many. I, as well as my office, wish Bethany the very best in her future career with Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHINSON.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Bethany Smith for her many important contributions to myself, my staff, all those she has worked with on the Hill, and for all those she has served. She will be missed by many.

#### REGARDING THE NEBRASKA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

#### HON. TOM OSBORNE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 24, 2004*

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the tremendously positive contributions of teachers across the state of Nebraska. Our teachers are hard-working, dedicated public servants who serve on the front lines of our society. I have worked extensively with the Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA) as well as the National Education Association (NEA). I have worked closely with the NSEA and its educator-members and the NEA here in Washington on many issues of mutual concern. Teaching is the most important job in the world. Our teachers deserve our appreciation and respect.

#### PENINSULA SINAI CONGREGA- TION'S 36TH ANNIVERSARY

#### HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 24, 2004*

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to the Peninsula Sinai Congregation on the occasion of its 36th Anniversary. From its humble beginnings the Peninsula Sinai Congregation has grown to include 252 member families in Foster City, California, located in my Congressional District and has become an integral part of the community's social and moral fabric.

In 1967, four pioneers organized the first meeting of the Peninsula Sinai Congregation in a San Mateo church. As the population of the congregation increased it was forced to move, first to the Peninsula JCC and later to its own facility in Foster City, California in 1979. At that time there was one small building that included an education wing comprised of four classrooms, a kitchen and the Col. David J. Reina Memorial Library. Five years later the facility was expanded to include a sanctuary/social hall and as well as administrative offices. Finally in May 2000, the Congregation completed a substantial remodeling, which included the creation of a dedicated sanctuary, a lounge, a full catering kitchen as

well as additional classrooms and an expansion of the library.

Mr. Speaker, from four pioneers the Sinai Peninsula Congregation is now a full service religious center, providing a Jewish education for its members from cradle to grave. In addition to Hebrew school programs for children in grades 3–10, the Congregation has a very active Adult education program. This program includes "How to" instruction about rituals and holidays, as well as Adult Bar and Bat Mitzvah opportunities for adult members who had not yet experienced this celebrated rite of passage.

Mr. Speaker, the Peninsula Sinai Congregation also hosts an annual Chen Shapira Memorial Concert as its major fundraiser for the Chen Shapira Jewish Culture Fund. This fund is named after the late Chen Hayim Shapira who was born in Israel but emigrated to San Francisco in 1965, and dedicated his life to broadening Jewish education and promoting Jewish and Israeli music and culture in the Bay Area. Although Mr. Shapira passed away in 2000, this fund continues his work by supporting positive Jewish cultural awareness.

Mr. Speaker, in the Jewish tradition the number 18, called "chai," is considered lucky, and since 36 is 18 doubled, the number 36 is known as "double chai" is also considered lucky. Therefore, on the celebration of the Peninsula Sinai Congregation's double chai anniversary, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Peninsula Sinai Congregation on its extraordinary growth and wish the congregation continued successes in the future.

#### IMPROVING THE COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

#### HON. CHET EDWARDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 4, 2004*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3030) to amend the Community Service Block Grant Act to provide for quality improvements:

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to further extend my remarks from the Debate on H.R. 3030 on February 4 2004. In my remarks on H.R. 3030, Mr. BOEHNER and I discussed portions of the 1972 debate addressing the 702 exemption of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The following provides more in-depth explanations of Senator Ervin and Senator Allen's comments in 1972 regarding this issue. Please insert these comments at the end of my remarks or appropriate place regarding this debate.

I believe it is important to consider the rest of the 1972 legislative history on the amendment to the 702 exemption of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and to discuss the comments of the lead proponents of the 1972 amendment to the 702 exemption of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Senators Sam Ervin (D-NC) and James Allen (D-AL). You will find that these senators rallied support for broadening this exemption by citing examples of religious institutions that they said did not receive federal financial aid, but were supported by private funds. It underscores my point

about the difference between discrimination with private funds and discrimination with taxpayer funds.

I recommend for the House's consideration an article that will be published soon entitled, Religion-based Employment Decisions and Federally Funded Jobs: Congressional Debate, Law and Policy, written by Melissa Rogers, Visiting Professor of Religion and Public Policy at Wake Forest University. Rogers is former executive director of the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life and former general counsel of the Baptist Joint Committee, and she has spent a lot of time working on this issue.

Rogers writes: "It is true . . . that [Senators Ervin and Allen, the prime proponents of the 1972 amendment to the 702 exemption of Title VII] considered an institution-wide exemption for religious organizations from Title VII to be crucial to religious autonomy and freedom. It is often recalled, for example, that Senator Ervin repeatedly said that his amendment was designed 'to take the political hands of Caesar off of the institutions of God, where they have no place to be.'

"But what has not been recalled," Rogers notes, "is that, in his argument for allowing religious organizations to make religion-based employment decisions institution-wide, Senator Ervin repeatedly used an example of a religious institution from his home state that, as he stressed, '[was] not supported in any respect by the Federal Government,' but by religious adherents."

Specifically, Senator Ervin said the following:

"We have a college in North Carolina known as Davidson College that is affiliated with the Southern Presbyterian Church. Davidson College is supported by the fees of its students and by the voluntary contributions of people interested in its activities. It is not supported in any respect by the Federal Government . . .

This college was founded and is controlled by people who believe in giving a Christian education to the students of the institution . . . [It has] a regulation, which says that any person who is chosen to be a full professor at the institution shall be a member of an Evangelical Christian Church . . ."

Senator Ervin then asked Senator Allen, his colleague and supporter: Is there "anything immoral or ought [there] to be anything illegal in people who support a college devoted to giving a Christian education taking steps to assure that the youth who attend it should be instructed on any subject, whether religious or nonreligious, by teachers who are members of a Christian church?" And, in response to a question later in the debate, Ervin emphasized again that Davidson College was "supported by fees of the students and voluntary gifts of people who believe in giving the kind of education this institution gives."

Senator Allen echoed this argument in his own statements. He commented: "Under our system of religious freedom, which would be violated by this EEOC bill, religious organizations have seen fit to use their own resources to establish church schools at every level of education—elementary, secondary, and institutions of higher education. They did so because they wanted youth taught in a religious atmosphere and by Christian instructors." Senator Allen also quoted Senator Ervin stating: "[I]f the members of the Presbyterian Church, or the members of the Catholic