

When we celebrate her life, we celebrate not only the history and edifices she worked so diligently to protect, but the stewardship and conservation of our common cultural heritage,

Barbara Hornby was born in Hawaii to U.S. Naval Commander Leo Welch and Barbara Petrikin Welch in 1925. She graduated from the University of Colorado in 1944 and during the remainder of the Second World War, she worked at Ft. Logan, Buckley Field and did research for the University of Denver. Six years later, she married Denver architect James Sudler II and while working in his architectural firm, developed the skills that would serve her well in future endeavors. Following the death of Mr. Sudler, she married former Denver Post senior editor Bill Hornby who shared both her life and her work.

Barbara Hornby served as the executive director of Historic Denver and later as both director and president of the Colorado Historical Society. She supervised the development of the four-million dollar Georgetown Loop Historic Mining and Railroad Park. She served on the Denver Landmark Commission, was vice chairwoman and trustee of the Colorado Historical Foundation and was Colorado's Historic Preservation Officer. In 1995, Colorado Preservation Inc. honored her with the Dana Crawford Award and in 2000, the University of Colorado honored her as Outstanding Alumnus of the Year.

Barbara's accomplishments affirm that she was indeed the keeper of our sense of place. Through Barbara, we learned to savor the richness, diversity and legacy of our forbearers. She knew that preserving our history gives us roots and an understanding of who we are as Coloradans. She raised awareness of our unique heritage and taught us to take responsibility for preservation. She reminded us to respect our historic edifices and recognize that they are living monuments for future generations. We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to Barbara for the care in which she protected and preserved our heritage. William Faulkner said, "The Past is never dead. It is not even past." When we consider the life and accomplishments of Barbara Hornby, we see that the past is not dead, that it enriches the present and gives foundation to the future.

Our thoughts and our prayers are with Barbara's children, James Sudler III and Eleanor Sudler and her husband Bill Hornby. Please join me in celebrating the life of Barbara Sudler Hornby, as distinguished citizen. The strong leadership she exhibited during her life continues to enrich our culture and sustain our heritage as Coloradans and Americans.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 14, 2006*

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, due to urgent personal matters I missed roll call votes nos. 5, 6, and 7. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on H. Res. 670, H. Res. 657, and the Rangel motion to instruct on H.R. 4297.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF GRENADA'S 32 YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 14, 2006*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Grenada's 32 years of independence and to enter into the RECORD an article published by Caribnews chronicling historic challenges faced by the country. I congratulate Grenadians in their native country, the United States and abroad on their perseverance to celebrate how far their great nation has come. Thirty-two years ago, on a momentous February 7, the beautiful country of Grenada achieved its independence from Great Britain.

Since its independence, Grenada—comprised of the islands of Grenada, Carriacou and Petit Marthas—has continued to flourish as a nation. As the first of the Windward and Leeward islands to declare its independence, Grenada obtained its autonomy under the Grenada United Labour Party government of late Prime Minister Sir Eric Matthew Gairy. Since the early days of independence, Grenada has struggled to find its voice. Despite violent power struggles and a U.S.-led invasion, the people of Grenada have overcome strife in order to forge ahead with their parliamentary democracy.

Today, Grenada stands as a spectacular island with lush mountains, crystal waterfalls, golden beaches and fragrant spice trees that give the island its epithet "Isle of Spice". It is also a vital trade partner, with significant global exports such as nutmeg, mace, cocoa, bananas, vegetables, and fish. But most importantly what is treasured most by Americans is not Grenada's landscape or exports but the Grenadians, who we regard with much esteem as our friends.

Thirty-two years ago this month, Grenada did not only put into motion independence, but national development and progress as well. Mr. Speaker, please join me in wishing Grenada continued political and social advancement on this very special day marking their 32nd anniversary of self-rule.

[From the Caribnews, Feb. 7, 2006]

#### GRENADA WILL RISE AGAIN

(By Michael D. Roberts)

For the Caribbean island nation of Grenada, Carriacou and Petite Martinique the devastation wrought by two powerful hurricanes has turned back what progress was being made under the Keith Mitchell Administration. And the undulating nature of activities of national development has also been a major challenge even before Hurricanes Ivan and Emily.

It has been like constantly taking three steps forward and one backwards in an eerie dance led by the caprices of the international global market and the negative effects of run-away capitalism. Indeed, the much touted benefits of market globalization have served up its own peculiar and erratic brand of progress now and stagnation then. Grenada, Carriacou and Petite Martinique now finds itself in serious economic straits brought on by brutal and devastating "acts of God."

Indeed, these past 32 years have been challenging ones for the 120 square mile tri-island Caribbean nation. And as the nation of some 90,000 people plunge into the uncertainties of a brand new and rapidly redefined

world stage, new challenges lie ahead in less than ideal socio-economic circumstances. For one thing the jury is still out on the gains and achievements of the Grenadian economy, since 1984, as it relates to the improvement of the quality of life of all the people. If the mainspring of Grenadian progress, since its independence from Britain on February 7, 1974, is the country's command over the forces of production, then its history to date is one of sporadic and uneven development mixed with episodes of retrogression.

From the dominance of British-imposed slavery and colonialism Grenada painfully moved towards full political independence during the militant epoch of the 1960s and 1970s. Granted independence under less than favorable conditions the country took charge of its own destiny replacing the colonial master with local elected officials whose experience in governance was learned from and at institutions set up by their former masters. In this context therefore Grenadian structural forms of today—government, parliament and judiciary—were and are a caricature of British Westminster democracy that has failed to adequately provide for institutions and instruments of equality within the society.

It was these spawned social, political and economic disparities that let to the rise and eventual fall of the regime of Sir Eric Matthew Gairy [from 1950 to 1979] and the subsequent triumph—and demise—of the Grenada Revolution (1979-1983). During the 29-year Gairy Regime, Grenada exhibited limited growth and development, with perhaps the sole measure of its progress being the newfound political consciousness of a hitherto cowed and oppressed people.

It was Gairy who bucked the ruling status quo of an alliance in the towns of a mulatto upper class, a growing merchant stratum, and a landed British gentry, oftentimes absent from the island. But what started as a populist movement and progressive anti-colonial struggle degenerated into home-gown depostism by the early 1970s as Sir Eric cemented a strangle hold on all parts of Grenadian society.

With each year since independence—granted during serious internal unrest and political turmoil—the Gairy Regime became more and more oppressive, and it was out of these socio-economic and political conditions that the Grenada Revolution of March 13, 1979 materialized. This break in the evolutionary chain of political and economic development ushered in a brief period of unprecedented economic growth and development. The basis for this was the ruling New Jewel Movement's suspension of the stultifying and archaic British-model constitution, an economic program of planned development based on three pillars—the public, private and cooperative sectors—a grass-roots type of participatory democracy, and an overall policy of national development based along non-capitalist lines.

But successful though the Revolution was, in economic and political terms, it quickly imploded, self-destructed due to a combination of immaturity, intolerance to dissenting view, and a failure to understand that the political and ideological direction of the Revolution did not sit well with a people long accustomed, or conditioned to accepting the flawed Westminster model of democratic development as the only way. The one-man one vote position was therefore central to the core of the Grenadian view of democratic rule.

Still, even the most strident detractors of the Grenada Revolution would agree that the period 1979-1983 saw unparalleled economic growth and development that has not been equaled or duplicated up to this day. In fact

it is safe to conclude that the reversal of the gains of the Grenada Revolution, that began with the interim Government of 1983, and continued with the election of the old Herbert Blaize New National Party (NNP) in 1984, ushered in the modern period of Grenadian retrogression.

Kathy McAfee in her celebrated book "Storm Signals—Structural Adjustment and Development Alternatives in the Caribbean" (Oxfam America 1991), in a chapter entitled "Grenada: Development by Conquest," argues that "by the fall of 1988, after five years of US stewardship, almost none of the developmental goals set by the US had been met. Grenada was deeper in debt than at any time in the nation's past. AID-sponsored efforts to balance the government's budget had failed. The country's tax system, after being thoroughly re-designed by US consultants, had largely collapsed. AID was withholding promised grants to Grenada's government in an effort to force it to comply with structural adjustment conditionalities." McAfee says that unemployment was at an all-time high, some 30 percent, and agricultural productivity continued its long-term decline, while Grenada's manufacturing sector remained small and stagnant.

In 2006 nobody disagrees that agriculture, Grenada's economic backbone, is in serious trouble and that production for export has taken a big hit. Moreover, the World Trade Organization (WTO) ruling removing the protected status for Caribbean bananas in the European market has caused more headaches for the country. Added to this by the year 2000 the task of completely destroying all the hard-won gains of the people during the Grenada Revolution was now completed.

Here are a few examples of some of the structures and other economic and social programs that are now extinct that have set Grenada back for many years. The National Transportation Service (NTS) is no more, the Marketing and National Importing Board (MNIB) is a shell of its former self. Post-Revolutionary governments allowed about six (6) fully equipped modern fishing trawlers to rot and sink to the bottom of the St. George's sea rather than utilize them. Grenada no longer exports eggplants and other crops to European markets; the country's agro-processing plant that canned fruit juices for export under the Revolution is no more, as is the fish processing plant that began to produce dry salted fish for export. The coffee processing plant in Grenville is now extinct. Only the Grenada International Airport remains because this structure, woefully under-utilized, cannot be easily physically dismantled.

But what solution did these post 1983 governments propose for Grenada's socio-economic development? The answer for many of them was privatization. This process continues today. According to a leading expert on privatization in the Caribbean, Jamaica's Richard L. Bernal, with the overthrow of the Maurice Bishop Government in 1983, the new Government in Grenada committed itself to privatization. "By 1992, in response to a weak fiscal situation, Grenada had begun a 'self-imposed' three-year structural adjustment program in which privatization of State Owned Enterprises was an integral component. In that year, 90 percent of the shares of the National Commercial Bank were sold, with the majority shares going to the Republic Bank of Trinidad and Tobago, and 10 percent to Grenadians and others from the Eastern Caribbean." ["Privatization in the English-speaking Caribbean: An Assessment"] (the Center for Strategic and International Studies) October 22, 1999].

In the same publication, Bernal noted that "... rapid and extensive divestment without a proper framework can lead to disas-

trous results . . . It is also important to ensure that there is a proper context in which privatization can take place. A competent executing agency with a qualified staff is needed, together with the appropriate regulatory framework and the necessary safety nets to protect displaced workers."

So me of these "disastrous results" have visited Grenada since the start of the program, in particular the perception by the public that governments have been just selling off, national assets to raise money. Indeed, there is little to show for privatization. There are also sound arguments that while privatization brings a bag of mixed blessings, in the Grenada context there was and is no competent and experienced monitoring authority to oversee the divestment of state assets. The upshot is that as a panacea for Grenada's economic ills the jury is still out on the privatization program.

And yet the ruling New National Party (NNP) government led by Dr. Keith Mitchell cannot be slighted for not demonstrating some measure of boldness when it comes to policy decisions and hard political issues. Buffeted and hindered by a hostile world economic climate the Government has tried to push the Grenadian economy forward with an admixture of privatization, international aid (hitherto to 2004 mostly from Taiwan), re-focussing on tourism, and physical infrastructural development. This program will be one of the key challenges to the government in the coming years as Hurricanes Ivan and Emily was almost responsible for putting the Grenada government into receivership.

Overall, if one was to characterize the progress and development of Grenada, Carriacou and Petite Martinique these past 32 years, one would have to conclude that it has been a period of turbulence mixed with brief periods of respite, tranquility and development. These past 32 years have seen every form of political upheaval and some of the ugliest forms of repression and brutality. It is a history that has divided Grenadians and continues to drive a fundamental wedge in any movement towards national unity and reconciliation.

For example: the events of October 19, 1983 that saw the execution of popular Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and some members of his Cabinet, that led to the subsequent invasion on Grenada on October 25, 1983, is still the salt in the wound for most Grenadians. There is no closure as yet and this will be yet another challenge going forward.

But if unity has been illusive thus far, and economic problems further aggravate and create political alliances and divisions, then any commentary on the merits, achievements, and future of Grenada's independence would lead one to the conclusion that independence is a pipe dream. Right? Wrong. While economic independence is not yet a reality, political independence is a fact of life in Grenada. Indeed, without wanting to sound cynical, the mistakes made during the 32 years of Grenadian independence were made by the, Grenadian people and their leaders. And nobody ever said that national development, progress and independence would be a cakewalk.

In fact, national development is painful, especially so for a small, agriculturally dependent nation that will never reach critical mass. But these pains are necessary if the country must move forward because the school of hard knocks is where experience is gained, and is perhaps the best teacher on the issue of progress and retrogression—the twin sisters of development. And Grenada's small size is both a blessing and a curse. Its size makes for presumably an easier and more efficient governmental structure and management. With fiscal prudence popular

shared services can reach the vast majority of the people and greatly improve the quality of life.

## RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF S. 1932, DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

**HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 14, 2006*

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to House Resolution 653, the Budget Reconciliation Spending Cuts Act. There are many reasons to vote against the bill today, including the massive cuts to critical programs, such as Medicare, Medicaid, and child support enforcement. But the unconscionable cuts to student aid are reason enough to vote against this bill.

Education has always been—and continues to be—the great equalizer in this country. Student loans in particular have helped to level the playing field for thousands of worthy students who cannot afford the high cost of a college education.

For that reason, it is shocking and disappointing that over 30 percent of the cuts in this bill are to student aid programs that help our kids afford a college education. To pass this bill, and cut funding for essential education programs, is to forsake our commitment to our children's future and to the future of our country.

Skyrocketing student loan interest rates and fees, including a new 1 percent "insurance fee" on college loans will make it even harder for many parents to send their children to college and on the road to a better and more prosperous life.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill will shatter the dreams of thousands of students whose only hope for a college education is through the support of federal financial aid.

And it will weaken our country's future, because we will be denied the talents and contributions of these students, whose skills we need to compete in our highly skilled global economy. If we are to remain the greatest and most powerful nation in the world, we must educate and develop the talents of all our children.

Adding to the tragic consequences of this bill is that the cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, child support enforcement, and student aid do nothing to reduce the shocking 3.4 trillion dollars deficit. The President's cuts to these critical programs are simply for the purpose of giving more tax cuts to the wealthiest 1 percent of our country.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 653 is an ill-conceived and misguided bill that endangers the future of our children and the future of our country. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.