center in the State of Illinois. With the CSAT demonstration grant, Haymarket intends to provide 22 chemically dependent women and up to 31 drug-exposed children with a continuum of care.

The goals of Haymarket House's recovery recovery program are to reduce the recidivism rate among chemically dependent women and to enhance the maternal-child attachment and promote independent living.

One of the greatest barriers that high-risk women currently face when seeking substance abuse treatment is lack of child care. CSAT's grant will enable Haymarket House to address this problem by establishing a model recovery home providing drug abuse prevention and treatment, health services, child care, parent training, vocational education, and job placement. This integration helps treatment centers like Haymarket improve their prevention and treatment services so that drug addictions can be treated more quickly.

I commend Haymarket House for their innovative approach to substance abuse and encourage my colleagues to visit this facility in my congressional district to see for yourselves what a remarkably successful drug treatment program Haymarket House has established.

REMEMBER THE NIXON DOCTRINE

HON. Y. TIM HUTCHINSON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1995

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, considering the high level of interest in the President's plan to deploy 20,000 American servicemen and servicewomen to Bosnia, I thought my colleagues might find the accompanying article of special interest.

It should be noted that Jim Webb, a former counsel on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, was a highly decorated marine in Vietnam, as Assistant Secretary of Defense, as well as Secretary of the Navy.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 28, 1995]

REMEMBER THE NIXON DOCTRINE

(By James Webb)

ARLINGTON, VA.—The Clinton Administration's insistence on putting 20,000 American troops into Bosnia should be seized on by national leaders, particularly those running for President, to force a long-overdue debate on the worldwide obligations of our military.

While the Balkan factions may be immersed in their struggle, and Europeans may feel threatened by it, for Americans it represents only one of many conflicts, real and potential, whose seriousness must be weighed, often against one another, before allowing a commitment of lives, resources and national energy.

Today, despite a few half-hearted attempts such as Gen. Colin Powell's ''superior force doctrine,'' no clear set of principles exists as a touchstone for debate on these tradeoffs. Nor have any leaders of either party offered terms which provide an understandable global logic as to when our military should be committed to action. In short, we still lack a national security strategy that fits the postcold war era.

More than ever before, the United States has become the nation of choice when crises occur, large and small. At the same time, the size and location of our military forces are in flux. It is important to make our interests known to our citizens, our allies and even our potential adversaries, not just in Bosnia but around the world, so that commitments can be measured by something other than the pressures of interest groups and manipulation by the press. Furthermore, with alliances increasingly justified by power relationships similar to those that dominated before World War I, our military must be assured that the stakes of its missions are worth dying for.

Failing to provide these assurances is to continue the unremitting case-by-case debates, hampering our foreign policy on the one hand and on the other treating our military forces in some cases as mere bargaining chips. As the past few years demonstrate, this also causes us to fritter away our national resolve while arguing about military backwaters like Somalia and Haiti.

Given the President's proposal and the failure to this point of defining American stakes in Bosnia as immediate or nation-threatening, the coming weeks will offer a new round of such debates. The President appears tempted to follow the constitutionally questionable (albeit effective) approach used by the Bush Administration in the Persian Gulf war: putting troops in an area where no American forces have been threatened and no treaties demand their presence, then gaining international agreement before placing the issue before Congress.

Mr. Clinton said their mission would be ''to supervise the separation of forces and to give them confidence that each side will live up to their agreements.'' This rationale reminds one of the ill-fated mission of the international force sent to Beirut in 1983. He has characterized the Bosnian mission as diplomatic in purpose, but promised, in his speech last night, to ''fight fire with fire and then some'' if American troops are threatened. This is a formula for confusion once a combat unit sent on a distinctly noncombat mission comes under repeated attack.

We are told that other NATO countries will decline to send their own military forces to Bosnia unless the United States assumes a dominant role, which includes sizable combat support and naval forces backing it up. This calls to mind the decades of over-reliance by NATO members on American resources, and President Eisenhower's warning in October 1963 that the size and permanence of our military presence in Europe would ''continue to discourage the development of the necessary military strength Western European countries should provide for themselves.''

The Administration speaks of a ''reasonable time for withdrawal,'' which if too short might tempt the parties to wait out the so-called peacekeepers and if too long might tempt certain elements to drive them out with attacks causing high casualties.

Sorting out the Administration's answers to such hesitations will take a great deal of time, attention and emotion. And doing so in the absence of a clearly stated global policy will encourage other nations, particularly the new power centers in Asia, to view the United States as becoming less committed to addressing their own security concerns. Many of these concerns are far more serious to long-term international stability and American interests. These include the continued threat of war on the Korean peninsula, the importance of the United States as a powerbroker where historical Chinese, Japanese and Russian interests collide, and the need for military security to accompany trade and diplomacy in a dramatically changing region.

Asian cynicism gained further grist in the wake of the Administration's recent snubs of Japan: the President's cancellation of his summit meeting because of the budget crisis, and Secretary of State Warren Christopher's early return from a Japanese visit to watch over the Bosnian peace talks.

Asian leaders are becoming uneasy over an economically and militarily resurgent China that in recent years has become increasing more aggressive. A perception that the United States is not paying attention to or is not worried about such long-term threats could in itself cause a major realignment in Asia. One cannot exclude even Japan, whose strong bilateral relationship with the United States has been severely tested of late, from this possibility.

Those who aspire to the Presidency in 1996 should use the coming debate to articulate a world view that would demonstrate to the world, as well as to Americans, an understanding of the uses and limitations—in a sense the human budgeting of our military assets.

Richard Nixon was the last President to clearly define how and when the United States would commit forces overseas. In 1969, he declared that our military policy should follow three basic tenets:

Honor all treaty commitments in responding to those who invade the lands of our allies.

Provide a nuclear umbrella to the world against the threats of other nuclear powers.

Finally, provide weapons and technical assistance to other countries where warranted, but do not commit American forces to local conflicts.

These tenets, with some modification, are still the best foundation of our world leadership. They remove the United States from local conflicts and civil wars. The use of the American military to fulfill treaty obligations requires ratification by Congress, providing a hedge against the kind of Presidential discretion that might send forces into conflicts not in the national interest. Yet they provide clear authority for immediate action required to carry out policies that have been agreed upon by the government as a whole.

Given the changes in the world, an additional tenet would also be desirable: The United States should respond vigorously against cases of nuclear proliferation and state-sponsored terrorism.

These tenets would prevent the use of United States forces on commitments more appropriate to lesser powers while preserving our unique capabilities. Only the United States among the world's democracies can field large-scale maneuver forces, replete with strategic airlift, carrier battle groups and amphibious power projection.

Our military has no equal in countering conventional attacks on extremely short notice wherever the national interest dictates. Our bases in Japan give American forces the ability to react almost anywhere in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, just as the continued presence in Europe allows American units to react in Europe and the Middle East.

In proper form, this capability provides reassurance to potentially threatened nations everywhere. But despite the ease with which the American military seemingly operates on a daily basis, its assets are limited, as is the national willingness to put them at risk.

As the world moves toward new power centers and different security needs, it is more vital than ever that we state clearly the conditions under which American forces will be sent into harm's way. And we should be ever more chary of commitments, like the looming one in Bosnia, where combat units invite attack but are by the very nature of their mission not supposed to fight.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JAMES T. MARTIN

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1995

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute one of our Capitol Police Officers, a decorated soldier and a constituent of mine.

James T. Martin of Catonsville died of cancer on November 27, 1995. He was born in Newberry, SC; the son of Ida L. Martin and the late Frank Martin. Mr. Martin left Newberry and enlisted in the U.S. Air Force in 1948 and retired as a master sergeant in 1969. While serving during the Korean war, Mr. Martin was decorated with the Soldiers Medal for Valor, the Korean Service Medal, the Good Conduct Medal and the United Nations Medal.

Upon his retirement from the U.S. Air Force, Mr. Martin joined the U.S. Capitol Police Force, a branch of the House of Representatives and completed his second career serving as a sergeant and retired after 22 years.

Mr. Martin was an active member of St. Josephs Monastery Paris and was engaged in a number of organizations, including the Glad Men of Song, the VFW and the American Legion.

Mr. Martin is survived by his wife Regina T. Martin, four daughters, Theresa, Bridghe, Eileen, and Patricia, one brother and three sisters. He is also survived by 3 granddaughters and 11 grandsons.

Because of his service and dedication to our country, to the House of Representatives and to his family, I stand today to pay tribute to James T. Martin.

TRIBUTE TO THE TRADE UNION LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1995

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Trade Union Leadership Council [TULC] which was organized nearly 40 years ago by a small but determined group of African-American trade unionists in Detroit. These men and women banded together to fight the blatant racism that existed in unions as well as in management.

From its modest beginnings in 1957, TULC developed into a powerful political and social force that was nationally recognized and praised. It attacked the racist policies in the unions and it literally changed the complexion of union leadership; it forced companies to desegregate their work forces; it operated skilled trades apprenticeship programs aimed primarily at young blacks who had been excluded from such programs, and it became a force to be reckoned with in the field of politics.

In its heyday in the 1960's and 1970's, TULC had some 10,000 members. The organization was applauded for its emphasis on self help and self development. It often was harshly criticized by union and management chiefs for its insistence on job equality, but it withstood the criticism and forced open the doors of opportunity.

Those gains did not come easily. In the decades of the forties, fifties, and sixties, discrimination was rampant across the Nation. As late as the mid-1940's, more than a dozen unions still had white-only policies. Through the 1950's and until the 1960's, the powerful executive board of the United Auto Workers was lily white.

It was in this atmosphere that TULC was forged. Its 19 founding members included the late labor activists Horace Sheffield and Robert (Buddy) Battle III, both of whom rose to key positions in the UAW. Also among that group was a local 600 activist and democratic State Central Committee member named Elizabeth Jackson who would later become one of the most powerful women in the UAW. Hubert Holley, head of Detroit's bus drivers and John Brown, the current TULC president, were founding members as was my late father, John Conyers, Sr. I was one of the lawyers who drafted TULC's articles of incorporation.

Initially, TULC planned to focus on unions and to restrict its membership to union members. But, as Robert Battle explained years ago in an interview:

> * * * we found that we could not separate the problems of the unions from the community because basically the union people are the community when they are at home. So we lifted the bar then and made it a community organization. We figured that the problem of job discrimination and discrimination within the unions were problems that should be dealt with within the community as well as within labor. We dropped the bar and said that all you had to believe in was the struggle, the fight of all mankind.

The TULC members knew the problems in the unions, and they tackled them head on. The organization's leaders repeatedly and publicly challenged the AFL–CIO to eliminate segregation from the locals and to remove the constitutional color bars that were part of the AFL–CIO philosophy. In its monthly publication entitled ''The Vanguard,'' the TULC wrote an open letter in 1962 to AFL–CIO president George Meany. The letter warned Meany that African-American trade unionists would no longer tolerate the discriminatory practices of the AFL–CIO. ''Discrimination, no matter how it is packaged or who does the wrapping, remains discrimination'' the letter said. ''Negroes insist on an end to job discrimination now. Not when Mr. Meany and his righteous followers get around to it, not when the so-called grievance 'machinery' is perfected, not when the NAACP (or any such organization) fills staff positions with people strictly suitable to AFL–CIO tastes—but now.''

At the same time TULC was relentlessly pushing the AFL–CIO to change, the group was running classes to teach young people how to apply for and prepare for a job. Over the years, TULC continued on that two-tiered track—pushing unions, management, and government to increase opportunities and teaching people how to avail themselves of those opportunities.

The AFL–CIO wasn't TULC's only target. For years, TULC members were furious because the United Auto Workers' all powerful executive board was also all white. In 1959, Sheffield, Battle, and union activist Willoughby Abner set the stage for change when they forced the issue at the UAW's 17th Constitutional Convention in Atlanta. Sheffield told the gathering that the union leadership had promised some 16 years earlier to put an African-American on the executive board. He said blacks were tired of waiting.

In 1962, the color barrier was broken with the election of Nelson ''Jack'' Edwards, a region 1A staff representative, to the executive board. Although many thought Sheffield should have had that post, his outspoken criticism of the UAW leadership kept him from it.

TULC remained busy on the social and political fronts. In 1960, TULC rallied more than 1,400 people to form the National Negro American Labor Council. The late A. Philip Randolph was the first president. Around the same time, TULC was flexing its political muscle. TULC was instrumental in the election of African-Americans to government office and it successfully campaigned for the ouster of Louis Miriani, Detroit's incumbent mayor who was openly hostile to blacks.

TULC also campaigned vigorously to increase the minimum wage to a level where people earning it could afford to buy the products they produced. The organization also traveled the Midwest explaining to working people the dangers of ''right to work'' legislation.

On the job front, TULC forced many companies, including United Parcel and Wolpin Distributors, to hire their first black drivers. Also during the 1960's, TULC and the Building Trades Council jointly initiated an apprenticeship training program that became a national model for such efforts. By the mid-1970's, the program had recruited thousands of minority youths, and the majority of them were employed in the Detroit area.

Recognizing the need for educational enrichment programs for deprived youth, TULC established the Educational Foundation of all races. The foundation offered classes ranging from remedial reading to typing to job-seeking skills.

TULC also offered enrichment classes for preschoolers and helped 10 Detroit high schools establish sections on African-Americans in their school libraries.

John Brown, current TULC president, said that the founding members took a risk in forming TULC. ''Quite a few people resented us for doing this,'' Brown said. The criticism did not deter the group from attacking gross discrimination wherever they found it.

Today, only four of the original members are still alive, Elizabeth Jackson, John Brown, former State Representative Daisy Elliott, and retired city of Detroit employee Mickey Welch. Membership stands at over 2,500. TULC works with the Detroit Board of Education, and it makes regular contributions to local charities. It also sponsors weekly programs for senior citizens, and it continues to sponsor cultural enrichment programs for local youths.

The bold efforts of the Trade Union Leadership Council have enabled thousands of African-American men and women to progress through the ranks of both unions and management.

That small group of people who gathered nearly 40 years ago today to demand equality deserve our praise and our respect. Their noble efforts must not be forgotten.