one-size-fits-all thinking and allow states and communities to decide what they want to do.

Eliminate the Department of Education. It sounds drastic—but with so many programs sent back to the states, there's no need for a cabinet-level agency. What remains could be housed in an independent agency with a White House adviser reporting to the President.

Washington, however, should continue support for some research and statistics activities, especially state, national and international comparisons of what students are learning so that information is available to report on the nation's progress in achieving its education goals.

The time has come for an arrogant and meddlesome Washington to divest itself and send education back to families, schools, communities and states. It's the will of the people. And our children will benefit immensely.

Mr. GOODLING. When I went with the Speaker to the town meeting downtown at one of the schools, my closing remarks to the audience were something like this: ''We have a golden opportunity to help the children get a part of the American dream in the District of Columbia, but my fear is that adults will act like children and nothing will happen.'' I hope I am not prophetic. I hope we can get beyond that, but unfortunately, that is the way it looks at this particular hour on this particular day.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think it is all of our vision. I am glad my colleague, the gentleman from California, brought up the District of Columbia. I think it is our vision that when educators from around the country come to Washington, they stop coming here trying to get their piece of the pie, their piece of the dollars, and they come here so they can learn about the District that we have some oversight on and say, ''Here is a district that we can learn from.''

Our vision is to have a school district that is turning out well-trained, well-educated kids, that is the envy of other school districts around the country, so they come here not for money but they come to learn from the school district we have in Washington here. We do not know whether those reforms are going to work, but we recognize that we have to do something, and we think these are constructive approaches that we can experiment with, that hopefully will make things better, and again, we will do the normal thing. We will build off of those things that work and eliminate those things that do not, but we are going to keep plugging at this.

I thank the chairman for having this special order. I think we have been able to dispel some myths tonight and hopefully educate and share some knowledge with people.

Mr. GOODLING. Let me close by saying that there are two major responsibilities as far as the Federal Government is concerned in relationship to public education, because, as we all know, that is guarded very jealously by local communities and by States. There are two major responsibilities. That is equal access to all for a good education, and the research that must be done.

I would appeal to the American public, please, encourage us, help us make the kind of reforms that have to be made if, as a matter of fact, quality is going to be the name of the game, rather than mediocrity. I appeal to all Americans, do not encourage us to continue the status quo, encourage us, as a matter of fact, as a body to bring about the necessary reforms so that quality in education, quality in job training, will be the goal that we reach and the goal that we attain.

I thank both of you very much for participating in this discussion.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN DINGELL ON HIS 40TH ANNIVERSARY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this evening to come to the floor to honor one of the truly great leaders that has served in this institution over the course of our noble history in this country.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud this evening to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to my good friend and mentor, the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL. All of us have favorite JOHN DINGELL stories, and let me just tell you quickly a story that I think just about says it all.

A few months ago when we were in the heat of the Medicare debate, I turned the TV on one morning on C-SPAN, and there was JOHN sitting in a committee meeting. He was reading our colleagues on this side of the aisle the riot act. A few hours later I looked again on C-SPAN and there was JOHN, standing up in front of a group of senior citizens at a press conference talking about Medicare. A few minutes later the House went into session and he was sitting here, in one of the front rows, and came up and gave a 1-minute speech on the Medicare plan. Later that day, during the debate, I looked up and there he was, giving a stirring speech in opposition to the nursing home cuts that were being proposed. At the end of the day I walked out of the House and there was the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, in front of the Capitol. He was talking to a group of constituents about this very same issue. This all happened in a period of one day.

The next morning we were in Michigan and we had this bus tour, and it was a Medicare bus tour. We went to all these different cities in southeastern Michigan, my district and his district, SANDY LEVIN'S district, DALE KILDEE'S district, we went into the city of Detroit, JOHN CONYERS' district, to talk about Medicare.

I remember the first stop was in Pontiac. I thought, ''Well, maybe I had better get there very early to make sure everything is going right.'' I got there, and I do not recall what time it was, but it was quite early in the morning. He was there before I was, and he was talking to some of the constituents in Pontiac about this issue. Not only did he speak at all six stops as we went throughout southeastern Michigan that day, he was the last one talking to the reporters when the day was over. I swear I expected to half see him driving the bus home at the end of the day.

I think that story says it all about JOHN DINGELL. After 40 years, my friend from the Dawn River area in Michigan is just as committed, he is just as passionate and just as dedicated to the working people that he represents as the day that he got here. I do not think I have seen a more energized and compassionate defense of working people from a Member of our party when we went into the minority this year, especially a senior Member, than I saw in JOHN DINGELL in the first 12 months of this new year. Minority status has not bothered him at all. He has been out there, he has been fighting, and I think that says a lot about his person, who he is, what he is about, and what he cares about.

For over 40 years, he has made a difference in more lives than I think virtually any other Member who has served in this great institution. I stand in awe of the legacy that he has for this great institution. If you look at what he has done, he was there for Medicare, he was there when Medicaid was established, he was there for the nursing home protection that we have in the institutions that house the elderly all over the country.

In the environmental area I had the good fortune to serve with JOHN on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when I first came to the Congress. We worked on many, many pieces of legislation back there to help clean up our environment. He has been there on the forefront of, of course, the Clean Air Act, the Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Alaskan lands bill, and in the environmental area he stands out as a giant in this country.

For those who have disabilities, he was there in championing, in leading the fight in his committee on the Americans with Disabilities Act; in his efforts to remove asbestos from our children's classrooms, to improve lab testing, to increase railroad safety, and to ensure that tax dollars are used

wisely. As the chairman of the subcommittee for so many years on the committee which he chaired that dealt with oversight, he has been vigilant to the abuses that have gone on in this government, and the abuses, frankly, that have gone on in the market as well, the free market as well. He has been there to crack down on waste, fraud and abuse, and so many others, other issues that he has championed over the years that this constituents in this country are indebted to him for.

People will give you a lot of reasons why JOHN DINGELL has been so successful, but those of us who are from Michigan know the real secret. He has been here for 40 years, but the truth is that JOHN DINGELL has never left his community, the people who work there, the people who work in the factories and the offices, the people he grew up with. He have never left his roots. That has been demonstrated to me personally so eloquently and so well in his fight this year when we, as a party, have needed a champion, and someone with savvy and experience. He has been here doing it, and it has meant a tremendous amount, JOHN, not only to me but to a lot of Members who noted it, who appreciated it, who respect your knowledge and your wisdom, and your tenacity for those people who have sent you here and who you have never forgotten. It has always been a source of strength and commitment to many of us, and we will always remember it.

When you come right down to it, nobody has done more for the people of the State of Michigan, nobody has done more for this institution, and nobody has done more for the working people of this country than my dear friend, JOHN DINGELL. JOHN, I am really proud to call you a mentor, I really mean that, a friend, and an inspiration for nearly 30 years. I am proud to have been able to have served at your side and to have learned from you, sometimes painfully, but to have learned from you lo these many years.

JOHN is part of a great team with his wife, Debbie, who has done tremendous work in this town, but especially back in Michigan with the charity work that she does, the work she does with our party, and the boost that she gives us to make this institution and the work JOHN, and I know and others do, so very, very important. We are delighted and honored that she is a part of one of the most dynamic and great teams in terms of helping people in this country.

□ 2100

I just want to conclude by saying that I look forward to working with the gentleman from Michigan in the months ahead to fight for the issues that we believe in.

I guess I also should say before I conclude that JOHN has one of the greatest staffs that you could ever want, not only in Government, but in the private sector. He hires the best. He has the best seek him out because he is the best. He has a fantastic staff; and if you talk to any of them, they will tell you that. Good people.

JOHN, I look forward to working with you. We have a lot of work to do yet over the next few years. The health care issue that your father championed and you have championed all of these years, we have a ways to go to get there yet, but we are going to get there. I never give up on the fact that that is such an important issue to the people of this country. We are going to get it done.

So I thank you for your outstanding service and your dedication, and we look forward to your continued service.

I yield to may friend from Pennsylvania, who has patiently waited, and I thank him for participating with us.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. If Dad were still living today, he would have been most upset if I had walked off the floor when they were having a special order for Congressman DINGELL. Even though on some issues, they were probably 100 percent opposites, on many issues they worked very, very closely together and had a great relationship, which again was carried over with JOHN and myself when I arrive here. So from both Dad and myself, we say, thank you for outstanding service.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend from the great State of Tennessee, Mr. BART GORDON.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you, DAVE BONIOR, for yielding, but more importantly I want to thank you for taking the initiative to have this well-deserved tribute tonight.

As you mentioned earlier in your remarks, everyone could tell a JOHN DINGELL story, but I think it would all come down to sort of the same theme that you pointed out earlier, and that is that, and I see it every day on the Committee on Energy, it is not just that JOHN DINGELL is the most senior Member that walks in the room, but he is also the most prepared Member that walks in the room, and he is the hardest working Member that walks in the room.

Most folks after 40 years in any career try to coast on their experience and their reputation, but not JOHN DINGELL, and I am amazed at how he continues to work, work, work and prepare so that us young whippersnappers never have a change to get a leg up on him, because he is always up a little later, working a little harder. So I am glad to share in this.

I guess the remembrance that I have of this is I was at a meeting with him one time and someone asked me to give a good reason why we should have Medicare and Social Security, and so I gave them that reason, and it was my mother. If someone were to ask me who my mother should thank for her Medicare and Social Security, I would answer, thank the DINGELLS.

Like your father, JOHN, before you, you have been more responsible for providing health care and income support to senior Americans like my mother than any other individual who has ever served in this Government. If your work on health care issues had been the total of your first 40 years, you would have a legacy of which every Member would be envious.

However, the truth is that your contribution has been far greater. When any of us see a bald eagle flying we can credit your work on the Endangered Species Act. When any of us breathe air that does not poison our lungs, we can credit your work on the Clean Air Act. When we are thankful that our children will be able to go into the oceans to see dolphin and whale populations growing, we can credit your work on the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

When we see disabled Americans show up for work and become full members in helping America grow, we can credit your work on the Americans With Disabilities Act. When any of us feel relieved that we live in a home that has been checked for radon and lead-based paint, we can credit your work on those important bills.

I think we are limited just to an hour, so I cannot go through all of the other bills that every day when we wake up, we know how thankful we are.

So now, I know that my mother has a lot to be thankful for to you, and so do other Americans, and I guess we should also be thankful for you bringing Debbie Dingell into our midst and being a part of what we do. We are all grateful for the contribution that she has made to all of us, and you and Debbie are a team that make our lives better, that make America better.

I want to thank you for your work, for your dedication. It has been an honor to serve with you, and I look forward to continuing to serve with you.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend from Tennessee for his eloquent remarks.

I now would recognize my colleague and neighbor from the State of Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I thank my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. To me, it is an honor, and it is very appropriate that I be here to join my colleagues in congratulating JOHN DINGELL on his 40th anniversary, 40 years, 4 decades. In fact, it spans in effect five decades from the 1950's through the 1990's.

I think of that, and I go back to the year that JOHN DINGELL came to this Congress after his father had been here for over 20 years, and I think about Elvis Presley who had not even come into being. I think about Sputnik, which was just around the corner, but still had not happened. Those were the Eisenhower years; and before John Kennedy became President, JOHN DINGELL was a veteran in this House.

I must tell you also that, coming from the opposite side of the aisle, JOHN DINGELL and I agree to disagree on a number of issues, but we agree on a great many issues too. I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the

accomplishments that he has made in this body. I have more respect and admiration for the man.

There is no doubt that JOHN DINGELL has left his mark on this body, and he will continue. His kindness, his courtesy is something that perhaps does not shine through, but as a junior Member of this body and having been here a short time, I have had the experience, or I have had the, call it delightful experience of gaining some of the courtesy, sharing some of the courtesy he has extended to me.

Many of the issues that he and I have agreed to agree upon are issues that obviously involve Michigan, but they also deal with matters that go beyond his district and my district and the State of Michigan to involve the country at large; and most notably, I know we have worked very hard, and with other Members of this body to provide access to foreign markets for the domestic auto manufacturers in our area. Again, this is a matter that we found common ground on, that has done remarkable things for our State, our locality, and our country.

JOHN DINGELL is an ardent defender of the governing philosophy of the Democratic Party, and he has worked with Republicans for years and years and years to find that common ground on many important bills. This year, more recently, his input on the House Committee on Commerce was instrumental in moving forward a telecommunications reform bill that would create millions of new jobs and provide better telecommunications services at lower prices to the American people.

So again, I just want to emphasize the common ground, and I think that is the mark of a true legislator, someone who may disagree philosophically on a matter here or there, but can find reasons to get together, to embark on the same course and come to a conclusion that benefits all of us.

I would never question JOHN DINGELL's patriotism. He never questions mine either. He might question my thinking and I might on occasion question his, but he is a gentleman, he is a man who believes very strongly that you have a right to your philosophy, but still, in fact, he has a right to disagree with you. I do not think there is any more that you can ask of any individual.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, JOHN DINGELL's character and integrity are his strongest attributes. One thing that I have learned in the short time that I have known him is that when he gives you his word, you know that you can count on him to keep it. That is a quality that many people search all of their lives for and can never accomplish. I can tell you that JOHN DINGELL accomplished that years ago. I see signs of that every time I talk to him.

An interesting comment: Just a short time ago I happened to be talking to JOHN, and I cannot even tell you what we were talking about, but it had to do with—we were paying, I guess, some mutual respect, praising each other in one of those moments, and I said something to him along the line of, I appreciate all of his advice, and he said, I do not recall ever giving you any advice, I said, well, maybe you have not by words, but you have by actions.

I would say also, JOHN, it has been words as well, but certainly by your actions, and I think those actions speak much, much louder than words. I respect what you have done and the character you have shown me.

In closing, I just want to again congratulate my colleague from Trenton, from down river, on this 40th anniversary in the House. JOHN DINGELL is the dean of the House. He is called Mr. Chairman, but I also want to go beyond JOHN and salute the lady who has already been called the best asset he has, and I believe that she is, his wife, Debbie. Debbie is his greatest asset.

I wish you both the very best, and I again salute you, JOHN DIGELL, in obtaining this milestone. Thank you.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend from Oakland County for his very kind remarks.

Let me just give you a little biographical sketch of JOHN. I will just do that very briefly and then I will yield to my friend from Michigan, JIM BARCIA. JOHN was born July 8, 1926, in Colorado Springs, CO; beautiful country. He was educated at Georgetown where he received his bachelor of science degree and then a law degree in 1952. He served in the U.S. Army from 1944 to 1946.

He is, indeed, a lawyer and was a Wayne County assistant prosecutor from 1953 to 1955, and Wayne County is the largest county in the State of Michigan.

As my friend, JOE KNOLLENBERG, has indicated, he is, indeed, the dean of the House and has served continuously the longest of any member of the House of Representatives.

I now yield to my friend from the Bay City area, JIM BARCIA.

Mr. BARCIA. Thank you very much, Congressman BONIOR. It is indeed a pleasure and a privilege to also rise and join my colleagues in paying tribute to the outstanding service that JOHN DINGELL has given this institution and the Nation.

Of course, I cannot go through the long list, just a few of them have been mentioned this evening, the long list of accomplishments of Congressman DINGELL spanning some 40 years of service, distinguished service in the House. But I know that sportsmen across this country, the men and women who love to fish or hunt, ought to certainly appreciate the efforts of Congressman DINGELL and the numerous public acts which he has shepherded through this body and seen signed into law during his distinguished career, that preserve and protect the bountiful natural resources that our country has.

I know that reference has been made this evening to clean air and clean water, but especially I would like to say, as also a fellow avid hunter, how much the sportsmen of this country have to appreciate the contributions that JOHN has made on behalf of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, few people have had the ability that JOHN DINGELL has had to make a lasting mark on the policies of our National Government. Perhaps some Presidents have left their mark and some Members of our leadership have succeeded over the years. But not many could ever hope to have had the record of achievement that has been proudly and deservedly earned by JOHN DINGELL.

He has worked long and hard on behalf of his constituents, and that is apparent if you look at the margins of victory by which he has been returned to this body through the election cycle over these past 20 elections. He has worked long and hard on behalf of our Democratic Party in this body. More importantly, he has worked long and hard on the matters to which he has a personal commitment which are too numerous to mention in the few moments that I have to share in this tribute toward our colleague.

No one here can talk about health care policy without recognizing the contributions and wisdom of JOHN DINGELL. No one can expect to have a responsible discussion about trade policy without understanding that a key player in trade policy since the 1970's has been JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Washington in 1993, JOHN DINGELL was among the first to come to me and offer his help and advice. I had other colleagues who offered some very important advice: Accept help from someone who remembers when he has been refused. This tenacity has been the hallmark of his success. JOHN DINGELL does not give up.

□ 2115

It is a lesson soon learned by those who are prepared enough to challenge him, either in committee or on the floor.

While some of my colleagues who have spoken already alluded to the tremendous carrier JOHN'S father had in this body, and also the dedication and the contributions of Mrs. John Dingell, our friend Debbie, I have also had the honor and privilege, as some of my other colleagues who are about to speak, of serving with yet another Dingell. Christopher Dingell, JOHN'S son, who I want to say, Congressman DINGELL, you can be very, very proud of, who is succeeding in the great and fine tradition of being a tremendous public servant back in the State Senate in Lansing, Michigan. I miss seeing Christopher, but I know that he will carry on in this next generation the fine tradition of public service that your father and you have provided.

JOHN DINGELL is now the senior member of the House in terms of seniority. He has spent his time here wisely, with

distinction and honor. I am sure that he will continue to conduct himself in a similar fashion for so long as his constituents exercise their good judgement to retain him as their very effective and capable Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and a privilege to know JOHN DINGELL and to serve with him both as a Member of this House of Representatives and as the dean of the Michigan delegation. I join all of our colleagues in thanking him for his years of devoted service, and in wishing him the very best for whatever the future may hold for someone who has even been talked about as a future Speaker of the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Thank you very much, JIM, for your very kind remarks.

If I could just go to my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER]. Then I will be happy to yield to my colleague SANDY LEVIN.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my fellow colleagues in paying tribute to Congressman JOHN DINGELL for the 40 years of public service to this Nation.

As a fellow native of the state of Michigan, I have seen the impact that JOHN has had both back home and nationally. JOHN has been a central figure in both Michigan and national politics for decades and will leave a lasting legacy as one who has dedicated his life to his fellow citizens.

Whether it be from his service in World War II, as a county prosecutor in Michigan, or his extensive legislative record here in Congress—JOHN has exemplified the qualities of leadership that have helped shape this Nation and helped educate our future leaders. And it is a great honor for me to now serve in this body with him.

I had known JOHN for many years before being elected to Congress. We have for years shared many common interests back home, most notably the auto industry. I have had the benefit of accompanying JOHN and his lovely wife Debbie at the Detroit Auto shows over the years.

And although I am new to the House of Representatives, and from the other side of the aisle of my good friend, I feel his years of service, his tenacity and persistence, and the conviction with which he has guided himself throughout the years are unparalleled.

JOHN, I, the people of Michigan, and the Nation salute you and thank you for all your dedicated service.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank you, DICK, for your kind remarks.

Let me just give you a little background about the Dingell family. We have heard references this evening about JOHN's father and son. They have represented the Congress since 1932. For 23 years JOHN's father was a New Deal champion in the health care area. Of course JOHN has specialized in that area as well as so many others.

One of the great things you can say about JOHN DINGELL is that his expertise is not necessarily narrow, it is broad. It is trade policy, it is health policy, it is transportation policy, it is regulatory concerns, environmental concerns. He has a deep and broad understanding of the workings of this country.

Of course, as JIM BARCIA mentioned, his son Christopher has served with distinction in the State Senate in Michigan. So the family has been an incredible attribute to the citizens of our State.

I now yield to another gentleman whose family has been a great attribute and who has championed some of these very same issues, SANDY LEVIN from the State of Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you, Congressman BONIOR, our distinguished minority whip. I applaud you for, in your very busy schedule, taking time at this late hour to do something that you care about so personally, and that is paying tribute to a friend. We do not do that enough around here, and surely it is warranted on this occasion.

If we were going to have a vote on the resolution tonight, I might have to vote ''present.'' I have a conflict of interest, in a sense. Our two families have been intertwined for a long time. I am not objective.

Indeed, my first recollection of direct involvement in politics relates to the Dingell family. It is a pretty vague memory, but I do remember it. In knickers—that dates me—carrying pamphlets for JOHN DINGELL's father in our precinct. It was my first direct involvement and it was not a very major one. I do not think JOHN's dad needed my help.

Mr. BONIOR. I am still trying to picture you in knickers.

Mr. LEVIN. I wore them. You maybe are not old enough to remember what knickers are.

Mr. BONIOR. No, I remember them.

Mr. LEVIN. I confess that I am.

We went door-to-door distributing these leaflets, and I do not quite remember the district number. But that was just part of our two families' interwovenness.

Some of my uncles knew JOHN's dad very well. My Uncle Bayre and my Aunt Lydia and my Uncle Theodore and my Aunt Rhoda, JOHN's dad was close to my uncle and with his help was elevated to the Federal bench. JOHN clerked for my uncle.

So our two families have had a long history together. And our family is so proud of our relationship with the Dingell family.

We might ask ourselves, what is the key to JOHN's success? We can point, and he would, to his own family. I think we would point to his intellect, his integrity, his perseverance, his guts, many other qualities. We also would mention as we have Debbie Dingell, a tower of strength. They have been a couple that have blessed Michigan and this city. But if I might, I just want to comment on one other aspect.

I had a chance to campaign throughout Michigan in the 1970's and see JOHN in action in his district. Then when I was elected to the Congress in the 1980's, the district I represented bordered JOHN's district.

One of JOHN's towering strengths is what I think is often overlooked. That is, no matter how powerful he became in Washington, he was still very much rooted back home.

Mr. BONIOR. Exactly.

Mr. LEVIN. No matter how much he rubbed elbows with the mighty here in Washington, he remembered those who were plying elbow grease back home to their own work.

No matter how much he was part of the famous here, JOHN remembered the humble families back home. That is where he came from, and he has never left them.

I think that has been such a source of strength and if I might say accomplishment. DAVID, you and I feel this so much. Industry, it is in JOHN's blood. Jobs. Good jobs. JOHN has been a leader in the fight to remind America that if the middle class does not grow and does not prosper, America sinks.

The auto industry and the steel industry have been such a critical part of that and JOHN has been identified: Jobs, health. Health. Even a good job is not meaningful without good health.

This goes back to JOHN's did and he has carried on this tradition, this fight, this tenacious battle to make sure that every American has an opportunity of good health.

Good environment. A job. Health. People also want to live in an environment and in a hospitable environment. JOHN has been a tenacious battler.

Safety. There is no use having a good job if you are likely to be injured there. JOHN has had a difficult balancing act representing a State with a strong auto industry and Representative BONIOR and I know. Everybody always is not a sync. I see Representative EHLERS here. There are conflicts, too. Representative CHRYSLER, who has been part of that.

You have to do some balancing. JOHN has been such a battler in terms of oversight.

Then lastly let me just mention, we all hope to grow old. JOHN DINGELL has remembered his roots.

I had a chance to travel through his district in the 1970's and, as I said, represent areas right next to him. JOHN has remembered the importance of the dignity that needs to come with old age.

In talking about age, I want to finish with this, and I think our distinguished minority whip will agree: JOHN DINGELL has made us feel young, and I say this to my colleagues in the majority, and it has been commented on. I do not think for anyone here the transition would have seemed more difficult from majority to minority status than JOHN DINGELL.

Just think of it. All of his years here. The position, the powerful position. We in Ways and Means sometimes thought his position was too powerful.

And all of a sudden, and it was a bit sudden. Maybe some of you knew it was coming.

Mr. BONIOR. It was too sudden.

Mr. LEVIN. All of a sudden he is in the minority.

Now I think some people thought JOHN DINGELL might disappear. But I think all of you admit, he has been very much on your radar screen. As the distinguished minority whip mentioned, he has been on the television screen, he has been on every screen. He has been working his heart out. He has made us feel young. He has shown that what he believes in, he fights for as hard in the minority as when he is in the majority. There is no better test of the real mettle of a human being than that he fights regardless of the circumstances.

So to JOHN DINGELL, I just say, with a completely subjective feeling, but I think there is some objectivity to it, too, that your 40th anniversary here is an important event for us to note. We are deeply proud, JOHN, of being your friend and of serving with JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend from Michigan. Well-said and beautifully said.

You reminded me in your remarks of another attribute that we have not mentioned this evening, one which I appreciate especially, and that is the great parliamentary skills of JOHN DINGELL. There are not very many people in this institution that understand the rules and can debate the rules and he is one of the best, and I think we have seen that as he has had time to do that in this the first year of our minority status.

I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania CURT WELDON.

□ 2130

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I want to join with my friends on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to an outstanding American leader, JOHN DINGELL, although I hate to say, JOHN, when you first started out in this body, I was in grade school, but, like many of us here, we knew you by reputation long before we got here, and, growing up in a State that has many similar problems to the State of Michigan, the State of Pennsylvania, a State that has had the problems associated with what we refer to as the Rust Belt, we in our State saw you fighting for jobs, and economic growth and development years ago. As a former mayor of a small town, an industrial town, and the county commissioner of that county, your reputation for being a fighter on behalf of working people was known throughout our Commonwealth as it has been known throughout the Nation.

There also was another reputation that you instilled in many of us on this side, but also on your side, and that is the word ''fear'' because before coming to Congress, as a local official and then getting here as a freshman and sophomore, I know many a bureaucrat who feared having JOHN DINGELL, and his committee, and his investigators come in to basically get the facts on a given issue or a given set of circumstances, especially where you had evidence that things perhaps were not operating as they should, and perhaps the taxpayers and the citizens were not being as well served as they should be served by this Government, and so that fear really was out of respect for you and the job that you have established a reputation in doing for the entire time you have been here, as someone who is willing to take on any fight, any battle that you believe in and which warrants the attention of this body.

But in the last 3 years I have come to know you in a different capacity, and it has been a very enjoyable one for me. I have had the pleasure of serving as the Republican along with our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], on the Migratory Bird Commission, a rather obscure commission that only has seven members, two Members of the Senate from each party, two Members of the House, one from each party, and the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and the head of the Environmental Protection Agency. The seven of us meet throughout the year three or four times and basically decide how to spend the moneys that are raised from the sale of duck stamps for hunting licenses and conservation practices and to implement the programs established under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act as well as those administered by the Migratory Bird Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it was the legacy of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] following his father to establish that whole effort in this country, and we talk about Federal programs that some would say have been boondoggles. Let me tell you one that is a shining example of something that both parties can point to, and conservatives and liberals can point to, that works amazingly well, the program that JOHN DINGELL has kind of like, I guess, been the grandfather of, if you will, because we honored him for 25 years of service in that capacity just this past year. He has protected millions of acres of wetlands in this country for ducks, and for hunting and for wetlands protection, not with a strong arm of Government, not with mandated actions, not with condemning properties, but with the voluntary acquisition of property that our Government has been able to enter into agreements with, all across America, to protect our vital wilderness area and our wetlands, and no one has done more in that regard than JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, for years he was associated with the late Silvio Conte, and the two of them were a dynamic team because they were the two that represented the House in fighting for the support for this very valuable, but oftentimes unheralded, program.

But, JOHN, you know people all over this country know that you have been there day in and day out fighting for not just the continuation of this very successful effort, but fighting to make sure, working with conservation groups, working with the Defenders of Wildlife and the Nature Conservancy, to not just espouse conservation concerns, but also to take a very aggressive—yet in some cases you can argue a very conservative approach to protecting the land of this country through these two commissions, and you have just been a hero in that regard.

And I can remember when I first joined the Commission and had the honor of sitting next to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] at the first meeting and said, you know, I am here to learn. He said, ''No, my friend, you are here as my partner,'' and that is a typical attitude of a JOHN DINGELL, to have someone who, still wet behind the ears, who is at that point in time a fourth-term Member of congress, sit down next to a veteran who has been through so many battles that I could never begin to name and to consider me an equal partner in the struggle to make sure we continue the fine work established with the tradition of excellence that the Migratory Bird Commission, the North American Wetlands Conservation Program represent.

So I join with my colleagues today in saying congratulations and thank you. You are a role model for me. We may not always agree on the issues, but you are always a role model, the way you handle yourself, the way you do your homework, the way you present your facts, the way you fight for your causes, the way that you work with every ounce of energy and body until you accomplish what you set out to achieve. Those are all the traits that all of us can and do admire and respect in you, and I am a better person for having known you and worked with you and look forward to many more years of being a colleague and associate of the Honorable JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], for having yielded to me.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his lovely remarks, and I yield now to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my colleagues in an honor today to really talk a little bit about JOHN DINGELL. As was pointed out, the times that we entered this Congress or first heard of JOHN DINGELL, JOHN DINGELL entered this Congress before I was born. I was elected in 1992, but obviously I had heard of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] before then. As somewhat considering myself a student of history and history of this Congress, in many ways JOHN DINGELL is the Babe Ruth of this Congress and really a legendary person, a person that, when you look back on 40 years of American history, had a role, had a piece, had a touch, on 40 years on American history, and, when we look back on 40 years of American history

in terms of the good things that happened, that same hand, that same touch, that same action was there, and for those of us who studied the legislative process over the last 40 years, there is no one who has probably attained the status of master of this process of being able to use public policy to positively influence people's lives, and really that is what this process is about, using this process, using Government, to make a difference in people's lives, to make a positive force, to use Government as a positive force, in people's lives.

And that really, I guess, is the legacy of JOHN DINGELL, really having done that over a 40-year period because none of our words here tonight can possibly do justice to what he has done in the last 40 years, but tens of millions, really hundreds of millions, of Americans whose lives are different because of his work are that legacy.

And we can go through, and some of the issues have been talked about tonight, but his integrity and his commitment—but his attitude about this process I think is an example that all of us really use as a paradigm of unbought and unbossed, whose only interests really have been that goal of representing his constituents and people of this country. Whether it is health care, whether it is the environment, those differences have occurred, and I can think of no greater tribute than I can say for myself that I can look to no one in this Congress whose career that I would seek to emulate, and I think many, if not most, of the younger Members of this Chamber who have had a chance to serve with him would say the same thing, than to have a career, after any number of years, of trying to influence this process and being successful as JOHN DINGELL has during the first 40 years of his career.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank you, the gentleman from Florida, for the lovely remarks.

I now yield to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank my colleague for yielding. I must say that there are not many things that the Democratic whip and I agree on, but I think one of them is the extraordinary historic role that our mutual friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], has played in this institution and the leadership he has given over the years.

I have known the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] as a tough partisan, and he has been as good as they get. I have seen him as a great bipartisan legislative craftsman, and he is as good as they get. He did more to build the then Energy and Commerce Committee into a powerhouse than any chairman in its history except, I guess, Sam Rayburn. He brings to the floor a level of knowledge, a level of enthusiasm, and at the same time a level of decency and concern for others that is remarkable. When you disagree, he will run over you, but he will do so in a gentlemanly way, and courteous, and on the other hand, when he was in the minority, I found that he was equally courteous and a gentleman, does not like it any more than I did when he ran over me. But on things like the Clean Air Act and clean water and a whole range of issues where Congressman DINGELL had a deep interest in the envrionment, an interest in the economy, we worked together on a number of issues that, I think, I think, have helped make America a better country.

And I think any student who wants to understand this House in the last generation has to look carefully at the role of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], has to understand the tremendous tradition that he embodied going back to his father, the commitment they both had to helping people, to making this a more humane country, and to doing what they could to make Government a more useful instrument of social purpose, and I think that there is an enormous investment in creating a better America and in extending democracy that is the personification of the career of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. Marianne and I regard JOHN and Debbie as close friends, and it is just a wonderful thing in this historic period, setting a record, to be able to be with him, and I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], for hosting this, and I thank you very much for taking this kind of time.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the Speaker for his comments and for honoring the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] this evening.

I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any prepared comments but would rather speak from the heart because I find I can do that much better without a prepared statement.

I have not known the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for very many years. I am probably the least senior of the Members from Michigan in that regard. But I have known him long enought to know what an outstanding person he is.

My first acquaintance with him was serving with his son, Christopher, in the Michigan Senate for several years, and Chris and I came to be good friends partly because we shared a technical background, partly because we have common interests, even though we are from opposite parties, and we worked on a number of issues together and got a considerable amount accomplished. But I decided, if JOHN DINGELL was anything like his son, Christopher, he was a fine person, and it was a pleasure when I arrived here to discover indeed that that impression was correct. I must confees I was always puzzled as an outsider at the power that JOHN DINGELL was reuputed to have. I recall an article in the Michigan newspapers when Mr. Foley was elected Speaker of the House. The article stated that JOHN DINGELL could have had the job, but did not want it, and the reason was that he had more power as chairman of the Committee on Commerce than he would have had as Speaker of the House.

When I arrived here I realized why everyone considered him such a powerful member of the House. He was not only the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, but he had also defined the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce to include virtually everything that came before the House of Representatives.

That reminds me of the comment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] a few moments ago about the exceedingly good knowledge of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] about the rules of the House, and that surprised me, because I assumed during his 40 years here he had probably managed to rewrite most of the rules of the House so that they would make more sense and could be used properly.

But what particularly impressed me when I arrived in the Congress was the kindness and courteous attitude displayed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] as the dean of our delegation. He introduced me to the House. He was extremely helpful to me, and I thought that was exceedingly gracious that the dean of the delegation, one of the wisest Members of the House of Representatives, certainly the most experienced, took the time to be considerate and thoughtful toward me as I made my maiden voyage, which is always a different thing when entering as a result of a special election, because you are thrown into the maelstrom. It is similar to sitting in a tree above the river waiting for a canoe to go by and trying to jump into the canoe without tipping it over.

☐ 2045

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] was very gracious and helpful in getting me established in the House, helping me learn its myriad ways. I certainly appreciated that.

Mr. Speaker, I am here not only to give tribute to Mr. DINGELL, but also to his wife Debbie, who I had the pleasure of meeting shortly after I arrived. What I have said of him is true, in many ways, of Mrs. DINGELL as well; being very thoughtful, very kind, very helpful to me in getting settled here, and also to my wife. I appreciate her thoughtfulness as well, and particularly the way she organized events for the Michigan delegation. I found that also to be a real asset.

Mr. DINGELL is a gentleman, a sportsman, a man of courage, a man of honesty, a man of integrity, all extremely valuable attributes in the House of Representatives. I wish that there were more Members of the House who had these characteristics, and we are here tonight to honor Mr. DINGELL, Congressman from Michigan for 40 years, for what he has taught us and for what he has shown us about being

not only a good representative, but a civil human being who is kind and helpful to all those around him. I thank you very much for your service to our State and our Nation, Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. BONIOR. Thank you, Vern, for your very lovely remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from the upper Peninsula and parts of the lower Peninsula of Michigan, BART STUPAK.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. BONIOR] but I am also honored tonight to be able to rise and pay tribute to my good friend, JOHN DINGELL, and celebrate his 40 years here and all the accomplishments and achievements he has accomplished over these last 40 years.

I came in when the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. WELDON] was talking. I could not help but overhear the comment that there is always a degree of fear associated with Mr. DINGELL, but it is a very respectful fear. This morning I was at a meeting and there were Democrats there and Republicans and Independents and business leaders from around town. We got to talking about the degree of animosity or the tensions that are on the floor as we are here during the holiday season, and how tempers grow short at times.

The people and the Members who have been here the longest said, ''You know,'' because I had the honor of serving with Mr. DINGELL on the Committee on Commerce, ''that there are one or two committees in this whole House where there is not the friction between the Democrats and the Republicans on the committee because of the way, when Mr. DINGELL was chairman, he treated the Republicans, and the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. BLILEY].''

They said the Committee on Commerce has set the example, and that example is truly, JOHN DINGELL, you always treat people in a professional, respectful, civilized manner, whether you are Democrat or Republican. We wish the other committees would take up from JOHN's leadership and copy his style, because I think things would run much smoother, especially right now when time is short and tempers are getting a little frayed right now. So, JOHN, you bring a degree of civility which is recognized not only within this body but also outside this body.

I had the pleasure of serving in the Michigan legislature with JOHN's son Christopher. Tonight we have touched upon John Dingell, Senior, JOHN DINGELL here present with us, his son Christopher, his wife Debbie. I think the DINGELL family has given so much to this country and to Michigan that it is only right that we honor the whole family, because without the whole family, JOHN DINGELL could not be the individual he is that we have come to love and respect in this body.

I appreciated it when I came here 3 years ago, the outward hand, and a big hand, I may add, was given to me by JOHN DINGELL. His wife, Debbie, befriended my wife, Laurie, and they have made our times out here when Laurie comes out so much more personable, so much more enjoyable to have them with us, to be our personal friends.

Professionally, he has helped me immensely, being a young Member, learning the ropes, helping me to get on the Committee on Commerce, where I learned underneath JOHN. He has become my mentor. I learn every time I have an opportunity to talk with him. He has helped me immensely. He has helped Michigan, he has helped northern Michigan, and he certainly has helped this country.

I hope those who are listening tonight take a special note to those who would advocate term limits, how term limits is really the wrong thing for this country when you have someone like JOHN DINGELL. I hope they stop and understand that we speak here very affectionately of JOHN DINGELL as the individual, but also very affectionately of JOHN DINGELL and his expertise, and the knowledge that he brings to this institution; that once he leaves this institution, for whatever reason, that knowledge is lost, that expertise is lost. We cannot bring it back. The advice, the leadership, the moral compass he has set for this House, that is something that would be lost. So those who advocate term limits, we rely upon JOHN DINGELL and others who have been here more than three terms or four terms for advice on the complex issues of the day.

Tonight I would like to say thank you. I consider it a high honor to know you, JOHN DINGELL, to have worked with you, to be a friend with you, to be a friend of yours, and I always appreciate it when that big paw of JOHN DINGELL gives me a slap on the shoulder or on the back. To a young Member like me, it means so much that Members who we respect and admire acknowledge us, give us some guidance, and always have a willing ear to help us in difficult times, and even when we are having some fun around this place.

We look forward to many more years of working with you, JOHN, and you have a fine family. Christopher and Debbie are great folks, and we really do appreciate your 40 years here. I have only been here for 3, but I have 37 more in me. I hope you do, too. I thank you very much.

Mr. BONIOR. Our time is just about up, so I want to close by saying to JOHN how much we admire, respect, and love you for your service to your district, your State, and the people of this great Nation. We look forward to working with you and Debbie and Christopher and your family in the years to come. We thank you so very much.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my dear friend, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. BONIOR] for his kind words, and tell him how much I cherish his friendship and how much I love him, and how grateful I am to him for having done this. It has been a singular honor, a somewhat uncomfortable moment, but nothing has been said tonight that I feel there is a strong need for me to deny.

I want to thank all of my colleagues who have stayed up so late to participate in this event and tell them how much I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. GORDON] the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. LEVIN] the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. GOODLING] with whose dad I served, and who was a great friend of mine in times past and with whom we wrote great legislation; my good friend, Mr. BARCIA, the gentlemen from Michigan, [Mr. CHRYSLER] Mr. SMITH, and Mr. EHLERS, who has provided some remarkable leadership in the area of the environment, and for which I am grateful, and my partner and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. WELDON] who worked with me on the Migratory Bird Commission. We have done great work in a small area which is so little known that it is able to be uniquely effective, and we are very proud. Also my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. STUPAK]. I am grateful to you and to Speaker GINGRICH, the gentleman from Georgia. I want to express my appreciation to him for his friendship and for his being here tonight. It means a great deal to me.

I am honored that you have mentioned my wife, Deborah, who is very dear to me and who is an extremely important part of this family and of whatever success I have had. Her wisdom and goodness and loyalty have been a shining light and a source of enormous strength to me. I am singularly blessed in having had a wonderful family, a great mother who lent strength and dignity to the family, and a dad who left a great tradition, of which I am very proud, and wonderful children.

We come from, as does my good friend, Mr. BONIOR a family of Polish immigrants, and that tradition is something of which I am enormously proud. I have served and represented a great district, the Sixteenth District. It is called the Down Rivers, and the people who live there are great people who work hard, raise great families, take pride in their communities, and are great Americans. They were the arsenal of democracy in time of war. They are people who are proud of and work hard on behalf of their communities.

I owe an enormous debt to a great staff, which has served me and this body, the committees and the people of the Sixteenth District for many years with great dedication and decency, and I have had the privilege of serving, as mentioned, on the wonderful Committee on Energy and Commerce, which is a great institution and was made so

under the leadership of Sam Rayburn, who I admired. I had the benefit of his wisdom and guidance and teaching, as I did of some other great speakers, like John McCormack, to whom I hope God will be very, very kind, and I know he will, and our great friend, Tip O'Neill, who was a wonderful and unique man.

I would just like to say that it has been a singular honor to serve here for 40 years. This is a great institution, a great body. Great human beings are here, wonderful people. Great friendships are generated across the aisles. In spite of the sometimes terrifying partisanship that exists in this institution, really strong and wonderful friendships exist here. They are the thing of which service in this place is really made to be meaningful, good, and it is something which contributes to the goodness and the strength of the country. I am proud that I have been here.

I seriously doubt if I will be able to ever express my full gratitude to my colleagues for the things they have said about me tonight. I note that I will not be denying them, and that, I will enjoy them always. I will say it may, perhaps, have gone a bit to my head, and perhaps some of my colleagues and I think the lovely Deborah will have to inform me that I perhaps should not take the events of the evening too seriously. I want to also mention the fact that she was sitting up there with her very special friend, Mary Anne Gingrich, who is a wonderful and a fine woman.

I want to just conclude by saying that it is always a privilege to serve as part of this institution. It is a great body, it is a wonderful place. It is the people's House, and in good times and bad, in differences and in friendship, we serve the public interest, and remarkably well. We may all take pride in that. We may all take pride in the fact that we have had the privilege of serving in perhaps the greatest and most democratic institution in the entirety of not only the free world but the rest of the world.

I thank my colleagues for what they have said about me. I am grateful to each of you, both for what you have said, and your friendship. Thank you very much.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and admiration that I rise today to pay tribute to my very good friend and mentor, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL on the occasion of his 40 years in Congress.

When I came to the Congress as a freshman in 1985, one of my primary goals was to become a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and to serve under the leadership of the legendary ''Chairman DINGELL.'' It took me a few years, but with JOHN's help and strong support, in 1989, I became one of only two new members of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

It was truly an honor and a privilege to watch Chairman DINGELL shepherd legislation through his Committee. In those days, almost forty percent of the legislation considered on the House Floor was reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

During the 101st Congress, the Energy and Commerce Committee tackled one the most controversial and comprehensive measures ever considered, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

As the author of our nation's most important and lasting environmental statutes, including the Clean Water Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, JOHN DINGELL's environmental record was then, and remains today, second to none. But his skills as a legislator and a deal maker would be put to the test like never before in the effort to reauthorize the Clean Air Act. It would clearly take a herculean effort to strike a balance between competing economic interests and the need to cleanup our nation's air. Yet that is exactly what JOHN DINGELL achieved. He pulled together disparate interests and presided over the passage of a landmark and historic measure to dramatically improve the quality of our air while preserving economic growth and job opportunities in every region of the nation. It is truly a legislative achievement that has touched the life of every American.

I served on the conference committee that developed the final version of this comprehensive legislation, and I was deeply honored that Chairman DINGELL chose a new member of his committee to play a role in this historic event. I will be forever grateful.

Of course, the Clean Air Act is just one of the many achievements of his storied 40 year career. He passed legislation to improve our energy efficiency, remove asbestos from our public schools, improve clinical laboratory standards, and establish strong federal nursing home care standards.

And during the 1980's when everyone was railing against waste, fraud and abuse in government, JOHN DINGELL was doing something about it. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Chairman DINGELL uncovered corrupt billing practices by defense contractors and major violations at nuclear weapons facilities. He also led the effort to revamp the Red Cross' blood collection system and exposed corruption in the generic drug industry. Chairman DINGELL found waste and he cleaned it up.

JOHN DINGELL has enjoyed four decades of unparalleled success as one of the greatest leaders and legislators who has ever graced this august body. The people of Michigan and this nation owe him a great debt of gratitude.

I am proud to call JOHN DINGELL my colleague, and more importantly, my friend.

Congratulations to you and Debbie on your 40 years of service. And I know, there is much, much more to come.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues tonight in honoring a friend and colleague, Representative JOHN DINGELL, on the occasion of his 40th anniversary serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. His 40 years of dedicated service in this House on behalf of the people of the 16th District of Michigan is unmatched by any of us here today and by few in the long history of this institution.

JOHN DINGELL, Mr. Chairman, as I still like to call him, is a true crusader in a form and fashion that we do not see too much of lately. Grounded in principle and integrity and skilled in legislative negotiating he is an undaunted leader who will always persevere.

There are few people who have made their mark on such a wide variety of policy issues ranging from clean air and clean water, to protection of our blood supply, removal of asbestos from our schools, protection from securities and telemarketing fraud, increased railroad safety, and promoting energy efficiency.

In tackling these often controversial issues he has a real knack for achieving that delicate balance between progress and productivity, and protection for the consumer and the environment. Through it all he has never compromised his principles working equally for improved job opportunities and worker protections for industrial workers, fighting for the preservation of our environment, and protecting our nation's consumers.

His achievements which have improved the lives of the residents of Michigan's 16th district and indeed the entire nation are too numerous to mention. But one that stands out for me is Medicare. As a new Member of Congress in 1965, I remember JOHN DINGELL and his role in shepherding the Medicare bill through the House. It was a difficult task for anyone and JOHN took on the challenge with the tenacity of a pit bull. It is because of JOHN DINGELL that we have a Medicare program today.

For a young, new Member of Congress watching JOHN DINGELL at work, fighting for health care for our seniors was inspiring and most of all educational. Today, 30 years later, I still learn from JOHN DINGELL and look highly upon his guidance and counsel.

Not serving on the same committees I don't often get the chance to socialize or spend time with JOHN, but this summer we both had a chance to attend the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Honolulu Hawaii, before his service in this House JOHN served as a soldier in World War II. And I think it appropriate that tonight we recognize not only his 40 years of service to this institution but his 50 plus years of public service.

From his military service to his tenure in the U.S. House, JOHN DINGELL exemplifies the true meaning of a public servant. Thank you JOHN for your dedication to making this world better for us and for future generations. It is an honor to call you my colleague and my friend.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to House minority whip, DAVID BONIOR, for reserving this special order. I am pleased to join my colleague and Members of the Michigan congressional delegation in saluting the dean of the delegation, Congressman JOHN DINGELL.

Forty years ago, JOHN DINGELL was elected to this legislative body. At the beginning of the 104th Congress, he marked 40 years of uninterrupted House service. This represents the longest record of continuous service in the House of Representatives. As he celebrates this important milestone in his legislative career, it is fitting that we pause to salute Congressman DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN DINGELL was elected to the United States Congress in 1955. He came to Washington armed with an insider's view of Capitol Hill. For 23 years JOHN's father, John D. Dingell, Sr., had represented the people of Michigan in the Congress. Thus, JOHN DINGELL arrived on Capitol Hill well versed in the

legislative process and parliamentary procedure.

Like his father, JOHN also brought to the Congress the highest level of commitment to public service. During his 40 year tenure in Congress, the residents of Michigan's 16th Congressional District, and indeed the Nation, has benefitted from his tireless efforts and unselfish dedication.

Mr. Speaker, as we review his legislative record, I note that Congressman DINGELL has compiled a distinguished record of legislative accomplishments that reflect highly upon this institution and the Nation. He has taken the lead on important issues which impact the lives of all Americans.

JOHN DINGELL led the fight on health care reform, greater environmental protections and the reshaping of the Nation's telecommunications industry. Congressman DINGELL has been instrumental in writing every major law to improve air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act of 1990. His efforts were also instrumental in the passage of the first ever Americans With Disabilities Act. Other legislative accomplishments include authoring the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act, just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to the U.S. Congress as a freshman lawmaker in 1969, Congressman DINGELL was one of the individuals to whom I turned for leadership and guidance. His knowledge of the legislative process is unsurpassed. More importantly, JOHN DINGELL was willing to give freely of his time and counsel. This is something that I will always remember about this great statesman.

Mr. Speaker, I take special pride in joining members of the Michigan congressional delegation in saluting Congressman JOHN DINGELL. His service in the Congress has been exemplary. He represents the best that this institution stands for, and he is held in high esteem throughout the Nation. I extend my best wishes and salute our distinguished colleague and friend, Congressman JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a longtime friend and colleague, JOHN DINGELL of Michigan. Last Wednesday marked the 40th anniversary of his election to the House of Representatives. JOHN DINGELL is the longest serving House Member of the 104th Congress, and I think we all should take a minute to reflect on the distinguished record of this distinguished gentleman.

JOHN DINGELL has spent his career fighting for the betterment of our country on a broad range of issues. As chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a post he held for 14 years, JOHN DINGELL was able to make a real difference for improving the lives of all Americans. He was instrumental in writing every major law to improve air quality standards, radon testing and lead paint removal and was the author of the Clean Air Act of 1990. He is the author of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and has been effective in protecting millions of acres of wetland and controlling pollution in the Great Lakes.

In 1987, JOHN DINGELL wrote strong Federal nursing home care standards in response to widespread abuse in our nation's nursing homes. He ushered through the Americans with Disabilities Act, the law which affords disabled Americans with the same rights and privileges other Americans enjoy.

JOHN DINGELL served as chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, where he was able to reveal dozens of instance of waste and abuse. His subcommittee directed an investigation of the safety of our Nation's blood supply that prompted the Red Cross to completely revamp its blood collection system. He exposed corruption in the generic drug industry and uncovered corrupt billing practices by defense contractors. JOHN DINGELL investigated waste and abuse in public and private institutions with such tenaciousness that correspondence from the Dingell Committee was one of the most feared letters in Washington.

I have had the privilege to know JOHN DINGELL more than 30 years; he hired me to work on his staff in Detroit prior to may election to Congress in 1964, and we have worked closely together ever since. He is one of the most dignified, honest and hard-working members this body has ever witnessed—and today those are qualities that are becoming harder to find in the House of Representatives. Congratulations, JOHN DINGELL, for 40 years of distinguished service.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Rep. JOHN DINGELL as we celebrate the 40th anniversary of this election to Congress. It has been an honor for me to serve on the House Energy and Commerce Committee under his effective leadership. Throughout his years of distinguished service, John always has been a fierce advocate and tough negotiator, and his legislative accomplishments are impressive.

John's efforts led to passage of milestone legislation to protect the environment. He was instrumental in passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and passed strong Federal nursing home care standards. He helped write legislation that protected the consumer from unsafe products and unfair practices. He led efforts to expose and end corruption and waste in the public and private sectors and wrote legislation that promoted competition in the telecommunications industry. Although John and I sometimes disagreed philosophically about the nature and scope of specific legislation, we developed a good working relationship and a special friendship over the years.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN DINGELL continues with great distinction his family's legacy of public service, following in the footsteps of his father, JOHN DINGELL, Sr., who preceded him in the House of Representatives. His son, Christopher, carries on the family tradition through his service as a Michigan State Senator—and perhaps he also will join this body one day. Such dedication to public service, Mr. Speaker, is part of our rich American heritage. Such commitment to public service, Mr. Speaker, deserves our respect and our gratitude. My friend and colleague, JOHN DINGELL, has served our country well and no doubt will continue to fight the good fight as long as he is a Member of the House of Representatives. I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to this great warrior.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Representative from the 16th District of Michigan JOHN DINGELL, for his 40 years of service in this body. This length of service, I am told, represents the longest continuous run of any Member who has ever served in the House of Representatives.

These days, as we witness a rash of voluntary retirements from this body, it is refreshing to reflect upon JOHN DINGELL'S career and his continued, and still very much intense, service to his constituents in this body. Leafing through just about any write-up on Members of Congress such as ''Politics In America'' it is impossible not to find the words ''powerful'' and ''influential'' as descriptions of JOHN DINGELL, especially in terms of his tenure as chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Indeed, during his chairmanship, JOHN'S legislative savvy and tenacious oversight activities grew to almost mythical proportions.

It is true that JOHN ruled the Committee on Energy and Commerce between 1981 and 1995, and that few dared to cross him. But in my dealings with him, I knew of a kinder and gentler JOHN DINGELL. A Member of this body who would listen to your concerns, and who if he could, would seek to accommodate them into his legislative strategy. I personally found this to be true during our consideration of the Clean Air Act reauthorization in 1990, and when we devised the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

JOHN DINGELL represents the type of Member many of us view as the ideal. So to the dean of the House of Representatives, I salute you. Congratulations on your years of service, and I look forward to seeing the distinguished gentleman from Michigan serving in this body for many more years. You are a dear and true friend, ''Big John,'' to me and many in my family. Thank you.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Representative JOHN DINGELL, the dean of the House of Representatives, on the 40th anniversary of his election to Congress.

As all of us recognize, JOHN DINGELL possesses a strong commitment to public service and a stellar record of legislative accomplishment. John has worked to enact meaningful legislation to protect the environment, improve health care, and defend the consumer from unsafe products and unfair practices. In fact, John has authored several of the most important environmental protection measures, including the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

In addition, as chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, JOHN has written legislation to lower cable television rates, to stop securities and telemarketing fraud, and to improve energy efficiency.

It has been an honor and a privilege to serve in the House with Representative DINGELL. Clearly, JOHN's hard work and dedication to public service have improved the lives of all Americans.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to pay the highest tribute to my long-time colleague, Commerce Committee ranking member, and great friend, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL of Michigan. On this day, marking his 40 years of distinguished and unparalleled service to this institution, it is only proper that we take this time to reflect upon the momentous impact Representative DINGELL's dedicated work has had on the lives of all Americans.

The list of Congressman DINGELL's accomplishments is long and impressive. For four decades, he has been a leader in the fight for expanded access to quality health care for all of our citizens. From the battle to create Medicare to the current attempts by the majority to

destroy it, JOHN DINGELL has stood firmly on the side of the people, upholding the rights and needs of seniors across the Nation. He was instrumental in establishing standards governing nursing home care in response to abuses throughout the system and shepherded the Individuals with Disabilities Act through this body, giving a voice in Congress to those with special needs.

On the environmental front, Representative DINGELL has been a strong protector of our country's vast and valuable public lands and wildlife, authoring the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act. In addition, the Congressman has staunchly championed the public health and safety of our children and families through his efforts to improve the quality of the air we breath and the water we drink.

Both the Clean Air Act Amendments and the Clean Water Act are the products of JOHN DINGELL's commitment to our future generations. When he could easily have backed down from pressure by major business interests such as the auto industry on these and other major fights over the years, Congressman DINGELL held his ground.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I constantly marveled at the fairness that JOHN DINGELL, as chairman, exercised in moving legislation through that committee. I recall working closely with him on numerous occasions as we tackled such weighty issues as the divestiture of AT&T and the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992. Each and every time I approached Congressman DINGELL with the concerns of my constituents on a particular matter before the committee, JOHN treated me and my constituents with the utmost respect and consideration, always welcoming our input.

In his long-standing role as chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee, Representative DINGELL has been singlehandedly responsible for uncovering some of the most profligate cases of waste, fraud, and abuse at several government departments—saving American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. His investigations of U.S. defense contractors turned up the infamous $600 toilet seat while his probes of EPA contract mismanagement and lack of enforcement practices in the 1980's fundamentally improved the functioning of that Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for hours. The contributions Congressman DINGELL has made to our Nation and its citizens cannot be overstated. JOHN DINGELL is truly a Representative of the people. I am proud to serve with him, and congratulate him on this historic day.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to pay tribute to one of the most remarkable individuals the Congress has ever known, Congressman JOHN DINGELL of Michigan.

As a Member of Congress, JOHN DINGELL has helped write landmark legislation to protect the environment, promote American competitiveness, and defend consumers form unsafe and unfair practices. He has written legislation to improve energy efficiency, stop securities and telemarketing fraud, and lower cable television rates by promoting competition in the industry.

Under his guidance, the Energy and Commerce Committee passed measures to remove asbestos from public schools, improve clinical laboratory standards increase railroad safety, and promote the development of alternative fuels.

Throughout Michigan, JOHN DINGELL is known as a defender of the people; an advocate for issues that are often unpopular but always critical. In this body, he has come to represent an ideal that is in short supply: the willingness to take a stand for what is right, and what is good for this country, regardless of political implications.

JOHN DINGELL is legendary for his tenacity, especially when it comes to fighting for causes in which he believes. He has been a mentor and a friend, and it has been a great honor knowing him over the years. His outspoken leadership in the area of environmental protection was inspirational in my own legislation to fight environmental injustice in poor and minority communities.

His legislative accomplishments are far too numerous to list, but let me simply say that without the presence of JOHN DINGELL this body—and this nation—would have missed one of the few great men of our time.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr.Speaker, it is indeed my pleasure to join my House colleagues in saluting a man whose 40-year contributions to our Nation are only exceed by his commitment to public service and his unswerving sense of personal, political and professional integrity, Congressman JOHN DINGELL.

For 40 years JOHN DINGELL has been a champion in the fight to protect consumers from fraud, waste, corruption and environmental pollution. The 16th District of Michigan and all Americans can be confident that their welfare has been well served by the former seven term Commerce Committee chairman.

As a member of the Commerce Committee, I have fond memories of my initial introduction to the former chairman, whose vast reputation was only matched by his gigantic physical stature and expansive intellect. During my tenure as a committee member I have marveled at his mastery of legislative procedure and his gift for building political coalitions. Without equivocation, JOHN DINGELL has created an indelible impression upon anyone with whom he has come in contact. When the political annals are written about legendary members of Congress, without question, JOHN DINGELL's name will appear at the top of that list.

America owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to Congressman DINGELL for his discovery of corrupt billing practices by government contractors, and major safety violations at nuclear weapons facilities. And it was JOHN DINGELL who was directly responsible for prompting the American Red Cross to revamp its blood collection system. Americans with disabilities can now function much more effectively and comfortably given the input of Congressman DINGELL and his contributions to the Americans with Disabilities Act. And every American who cherishes breathing clean air, owes a tremendous debt to Congressman DINGELL for his efforts in promoting the Clean Air Act of 1990.

I consider JOHN DINGELL a personal friend and mentor. His 40 years of selfless service merit recognition and commendation. The institution of Congress, and the taxpaying public, has gotten the best that JOHN DINGELL has had to offer. I salute him for his years of service to, and love for the United States Congress

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 40 years, the people of Michigan's 16th district have benefited from the representation of JOHN DINGELL. JOHN is a gentleman whose example challenges us in the House of Representatives, and will continue to do so.

Michigan is consistently recognized each year as one of the most influentional delegations in the House. Through experience and leadership, both sides of the aisle have made their legislative mark for both their State and the entire Nation. JOHN demonstrates both tenacity for his personal interests and causes, as well as a spirit of cooperation within the legislative process.

His record reflects a dedication of addressing needs of his district while balancing those with the needs of the Nation. His hard work, legislative ability and conscientious votings have earned him the admiration of his constituents and fellow Members of Congress.

I join my fellow colleagues in paying tribute to JOHN, his accomplishments and his continued service to our Nation.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my long-time friend and colleague, JOHN DINGELL, as he marks his anniversary of serving four decades in the U.S. Congress.

JOHN is certainly a landmark around here, one of the true legends to ever serve in the Congress. He is the House's longest serving Member and no one has worked harder on so many important and complicated issues over the years.

He was one of the most outstanding chairmen we've ever had and he certainly made his mark on Energy and Commerce matters. JOHN DINGELL has always been respected for his leadership and legislative capabilities.

He remains one of most able and capable leaders in the Congress. I hope JOHN will serve many more years here. We need people of his caliber and intellect as our public servants. His fine record of accomplishment will always be remembered and appreciated.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN DINGELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 60 minutes, but I will be happy to start off, and I am going to talk about the defense bill, I will be happy to start off by yielding to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I am a Republican, and the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, is a Democrat. I

have been here 3 years, and what I have discovered is he is just a good person. He cares about people. His knowledge is extraordinary. I served with his son, Chris Dingell, in the Michigan Senate for 10 years. I asked Christ about 3 years ago if he was going to follow the family tradition and run for the U.S. Congress. Chris said, ''Nick, you wouldn't believe how hard dad works.'' I did not believe it then, I believe it now.

JOHN, I think, you know, this is not a eulogy, it does not mean you can relax or let down. We need your experience, we need your help, we need your camaraderie to make some of the tough decisions ahead of us. It is a shame, you know more about many subjects and many areas and probably you have more knowledge than anybody else in the world in some of the aspects of your experience over the last 40 years. I personally think you should work harder and write a book. Debbie, encourage him to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be from Michigan and a colleague of a gentleman that has helped Michigan a great deal and helped America a great deal. Thank you.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to state that I am not from the State of Michigan, but I have had the opportunity to serve with JOHN DINGELL for the past 3 years I have been here in the House of Representatives, and I just wanted to take a moment, just a few minutes, a few seconds, actually, and just stop by and say JOHN, I want to thank you for your years of service, 40 years.

I am only 33, but I tell you, you have been serving the people of this country as long as I have been living, and it was an extraordinary opportunity for me to meet you, not only meet you, but also to develop a friendship with you, and I want to thank you for the time that you have given me in your office and talked to me about the oil and gas industries and issues relative to my State. As a young Member of this Congress, I want to thank you for taking out the time with me.

I want to also thank you for giving me the opportunity to be in your district. It was encouraging to see a Member like the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, at a rally at the University of Michigan, to see young students rally around a Member of this institution.

□ 2200

Martin Luther King once said, ''The measure of a great man is not where he stands in moments of confidence; it is where he stands in moments of challenge and controversy.''

Through your 40 years of service, I am sure you have been through a lot. I just want to say, thank you so much; on behalf of not only the college students in Michigan, but across the country, thank you for your years of service.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank our colleague for those very eloquent comments, and I yield to our friend from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have been patiently waiting here just in case there was no one here to take the Republican hour, and I am happy to make additional comments about JOHN DINGELL, the icon of this institution.

I came here in 1983 with a very large freshman class, I think it was something like 57 Democrats and a total of 80, and about two-thirds of the members of my freshman class all wanted to serve on the Committee on Commerce. I had a mindset for education and labor, so I was not a part of that group.

I can speak objectively, because I am not a member of the Committee on Commerce, I am not from Michigan, but I would like to add my voice to those who paid tribute to JOHN DINGELL tonight.

I could go on and on and talk about the Individuals with Disabilities Act, a piece of legislation which a number of enemies swore would never get past the Committee on Energy, but it of course got past the Committee on Energy, and in the end, all of the Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, joined in making that act pass as a result of the kind of leadership shown by JOHN DINGELL.

On term limitations, somebody has already spoken. I think JOHN DINGELL's 40 years in the Congress certainly answer the assertion made that we have people here too long. I have always argued that term limitations are a bit silly. Nobody goes out to look for a lawyer fresh out of law school to take a case that is important; you do not go to surgery expecting a doctor fresh out of medical school to put your life in their hands; and certainly it should not be done in a complex job like this.

The legislative process is just as complex, and those who insist that you do not need to stay here long to understand it are misunderstanding the process. I think JOHN DINGELL shows that in order to succeed in the legislative process here in America you have to have the wisdom and skill of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, combined with the skills of Machiavelli and Jesus Christ all together. It is a very complex process and it takes a great deal; and just as nobody would say that Einstein, because he had a head of white hair and looked very old, should step down because of term limitations, I think JOHN DINGELL will never be asked to step down, in deference to some kind of theory of term limitations.

JOHN DINGELL is the Einstein of the Federal legislative process, and it is a pleasure for me to and an honor for me to raise my voice with others to pay tribute to JOHN DINGELL, Mr. Chairman, from the State of Michigan.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank our colleague for joining us and I thank all of our colleagues who have joined with Congressman JOHN BONIOR, in his Special Order and the beginning of my Special Order this evening; and I again wanted to thank Mr. DINGELL for his tireless efforts in this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I will take approximately 20 or so minutes to discuss a piece of legislation that has finally made its way through this body and the other body and is now headed down to the White House for consideration by the President, and that is the 1996 defense authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening the Senate passed this piece of legislation, which is the major authorization bill for our entire military, by a vote of 51 to 43. Last week the House went on record and supported the exact same conference report for this bill with a total amount of almost 270 votes. I think the final vote was 267.

The bill, when it originally passed the House, Mr. Speaker, gathered 300 signatures, the largest number of Members in a bipartisan way to support a defense bill, certainly in the 9 years that I have been here, and it is certainly showing a strong bipartisan backing of our defense authorization process.

In fact, when the bill left the Committee on National Security of the House, it passed by a vote of 48 to 3, the largest vote we have ever had, at least in my time here, in support of a bill coming out of committee.

So this is in fact a good bill, Mr. Speaker. Despite intense lobbying by the White House and by the Secretary asking Members not to support final passage of the conference report, getting almost 270 Members of this body to support a national defense authorization is a major accomplishment.

In fact, there are several major items in this legislation that really merit the President to fully consider supporting this; not to do as has been rumored, and that is to veto this legislation.

The bill is consistent with the appropriated defense dollars for the next fiscal year. We worked very closely with the appropriators to make sure that our dollar amounts were consistent, that there in fact was not a large disagreement between the dollar amounts for the various items within the budgets, both authorization and appropriation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the conference report for the defense authorization for the 1996 fiscal year contains major legislation dealing with acquisition reform. This administration and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have repeatedly stated that we need to reform the way that we spend our DOD dollars, that we can save significant amounts of money, that we can buy better equipment and materials for our military and in the end save the taxpayers their tax dollars. That acquisition reform is in this legislation.

If President Clinton vetoes this bill, we lose the acquisition reform which is so critical in this year of declining defense dollars. In addition, we have the pay raise authorization.

Last week, we had the debate on whether or not to support the troops. The President asked us to support the troops; we supported the troops. Members on both sides of the aisle, depending upon which version of legislation that they supported, were unanimous in one argument on the House floor, and that was to support the troops as they are being deployed to Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, there is no better way to support our troops than to vote for the authorization to give them a pay raise. Contrary to what is being stated here in this body, the military personnel will not receive their full pay increase if we do not have the authorization bill approved by the President and become law. The appropriation bill will not do it alone.

Those are major reasons why this President needs to consider supporting this legislation and express the urgency of putting this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some comments that perhaps the reason why the President might want to veto this bill is because of what we have done in the area of missile defense. Mr. Speaker, that is an area that I have worked on this entire year as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development and have worked to try to turn around the whole debate on protecting the American people from the threat of a missile attack, either an accident or deliberate, by any Nation, not just Russia. In fact, I would agree with my colleagues that what we did in the missile defense area is perhaps one of the single biggest policy changes that we made from the President's stated policy objectives when he came out with his defense request for 1996.

It is a tough issue, but Mr. Speaker, we have tried very carefully and very exactly to make sure that what we came out with is a bill that this President can sign into law.

We were very careful this year, Mr. Speaker, during the authorization process in the committee and on the House floor; we were careful that in plussing up the funding for theater missile defense, for national missile defense, and for cruise missile defense that we do it in a way that was consistent with what the administration and the Pentagon thought should be our priorities.

Mr. Speaker, as I have sat on this floor, many times over the past several months, each of the areas in which we plussed up funding in missile defense were given to us by the administration's point person for missile defense policy. We asked Gen. Mal O'Neill, who heads the BMD office, the missile defense operation for the Pentagon, to tell us where he would put additional dollars if the Congress were to provide those dollars to him.

So we followed his advice in plussed-up money for theater missile protection, for a robust national missile program that had been devastated by the President's request, and by a plus-up in the cruise missile area, because of the threat that cruise missile proliferation poses not just to the American people, but to our troops wherever they are deployed, and we did those plus-ups, Mr. Speaker.

We fully funded programs in theater missile defense like those that are being tested right now for use in those theaters where our troops are in fact going to be committed in the future. We plussed up national missile defense to give us the ability over a period of 3, 4, or 5 years, to have a system in place much like one the Russians already have.

Most American people when you ask them whether or not they believe that we have a system like the Russians have to protect themselves against an accidental launch, they would tell you, oh, sure we have a system like that, obvious. They cannot believe that we today do not have a national missile defense system to protect the American people against a rogue nation launch.

Mr. Speaker, we also saw the threat in our hearings of cruise missile proliferation. We saw that 77 nations in the world today have cruise missiles that they are capable of using right now, today. We heard testimony from experts, including the administration, that over 20 nations are today building cruise missiles, some of them very sophisticated, well beyond what we saw with the Scuds, even beyond what we saw with our own capabilities in terms of cruise missiles. We have to put more of our resources in protecting our people and our troops from the threat of a cruise missile situation.

Mr. Speaker, we did all of these things and we did them finally in a way that this administration could not stand up and say was in violation of the ABM Treaty. That is a very important point, Mr. Speaker, because some in our Congress and in this institution wanted us to take the treaty head on on the bill.

While I have serious reservations about the ABM Treaty, I think in the end the treaty has outlived its usefulness, I think we are dealing in a different world today; I was in agreement that that should be a debate left and a fight left for a different day.

This bill, when it left the House last week and when it left the Senate today, by a vote of 51 to 43, in no way violates the ABM Treaty. In fact, it is totally consistent with the ABM Treaty. We in fact now have on the record both the Army and the Air Force telling us that we can deploy a single-sight system which is compliant with the ABM Treaty, as the Russians already have and have upgraded at least two times since they have had that system, that can protect the entire 48 States and Alaska and Hawaii.

The Air Force says they can do it using the existing Minuteman system with upgrades costing about $2.5 billion over 4 years. The Army says they can do it using THAAD for a cost of $4 billion to $5 billion over the same time period.

Well, we say in our bill that we want a system deployed by the year 2000. We want a system that is not pie-in-the-sky. We want a system where we know that technology is available today that we can afford that will give us no more than what the Russians have. My colleagues on the other side during the debate on the conference bill last week said, well, the Russians' system does not protect the entire nation of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the ABM system that Russia deploys today protects 80 percent of the population of Russia because it was designed when it used to be the Soviet Union. So they already have a system, so that if we were to fire a missile at Russia, they could protect their citizens. If a rogue nation like Iraq or Iran or Libya were to fire a missile, they could, in effect, shoot up their missiles to protect their people.

We have no such system today, even though it is totally and completely allowable under the terms of the ABM Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that we send to President Clinton tonight, approved by both bodies of this institution, does not violate any treaty, and if the President says that to the American people tomorrow, he is just not being truthful.

Mr. Speaker, that is really an outrage, because we have been extremely careful. In fact, in the negotiations that we were involved in with the Senate, with Senator THURMAN and Senator NUNN and with Senator LOTT, we were very careful in bringing in the administration's point person on missile defense, Bob Bell. He raised eight specific concerns in the bill with us, issues involving missile defense. We were able to resolve each of those items, and finally it came down to Bob Bell realizing that we were not going to give in on the issue of a date certain for deployment.

He found out also, and I know he has called various officials in the administration that would be able to respond to this question, that what we have done in this bill in no way violates the ABM Treaty.

So what is really going to come down to the actual decision of the President and whether to veto this bill or not if he does veto it and uses the issue of missile defense, is very simple: It is that this President does not want to provide a system to provide any defensive protection for the American people.

□ 2215

Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous because we are not talking about building more offensive weapons. We are beyond that now. We are talking about defending the American people. We are

talking about a defensive system that would be able to shoot an incoming missile if it were fired not just from Russia but from China, who we know is developing a CSS–2 system that has tremendous capabilities. We know the North Koreans are about ready to deploy a new system that could eventually reach Hawaii and parts of Alaska. We know that Iraq and Iran want to buy these systems.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am going to include an article that appeared in the Washington Post on December 15 where the United Nations came out and said they have found documentation of missile parts and state-of-the-art technology to be used for long-range missiles that were bound for Iraq, that were made in Russia.

This is not something that came out years ago. This is from the December 15 issue of the Washington Post. I am putting the entire article in the RECORD, because in the article the United Nations verifies that missile components that can be used by Iraq to develop a long-range missile that we cannot defend ourselves against have now been captured, and even though Russia is denying where they came from, they have no idea, the best guess is that someone within the former Soviet Union has made these parts available in the black market.

Mr. Speaker, let me also say that our efforts here are not about sticking a twig in the eye of the Russian nation. This is not about calling the Russian nation an evil empire.

As most of my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, I have been a student of the Russian government and people since I graduated from college with my undergraduate degree in Russian studies. I have spoken the language, I have traveled there, I have lived in homes.

In the past year alone, I have hosted 120 members of the Russian Duma in my office and here on the Hill. I lead the bipartisan effort in the area of energy cooperation with my colleagues GREG LAUGHLIN and STENY HOYER and GLENN POSHARD. For the last 3 years, we have worked with our energy companies to encourage and follow through on joint energy deals.

Just today we learned that the Sakhalin one and two deal had been grandfathered by legislation passed by the Russian Duma. These two projects, when completed, will see the largest western investment of dollars in energy development in the history of Russia and the former Soviet republics.

In the area of the environment, working with Nikolay Vorontsov in the Russian Duma, I lead American efforts to work with the Russians on cleaning up their nuclear waste. In January, I will be in St. Petersburg representing America in a major conference on ocean protection.

Last week, in the first ever subcommittee of our committee on ocean protection, I brought over Aleksey Yablokov, the leading environmental advocate in Russia, a member of Yeltsin's National Security Council, who testified for an hour before my subcommittee in terms of ways that we can work together to deal with the problem of ocean dumping that he helped expose in his homeland of Russian.

We are not about a radical agenda. Mr. Speaker, these efforts are designed to say yes, we want to build a strong relationship with Russian. We want to work with its leadership and its people and its Duma, but we do not want to do it with blinders on and we do not want to walk into a situation where we have some of the former military leaders still thinking that it is the cold war. Some will say, well, that is not true.

Mr. Speaker, let me include some other articles in my special order this evening. The first is an article that appeared in Krymskaya Pravda, and I monitor the FBIS reports, the Foreign Information Broadcast Service, every day. Every article that appears in the Russian media that is highlighted there, I go through.

This one caught my eye from November 28 of this year. It is an article written by Admiral Baltin, who was commander of the Black Sea fleet, hero of the Soviet Union.

Remember, the Russian Navy and the Soviet Navy has had a reputation of being among the best in the world, in many cases able to go toe-to-toe with our Navy. Here we have the commander, the current commander of the Baltic fleet, Admiral Baltin, doing an article in the Russian media about his state of concern for what is happening in his country.

I would encourage all of our colleagues to read this article in depth, Mr. Speaker, because in this article Admiral Baltin makes the case that we are in the midst of World War II. He says this is not a war like we have fought in the past. He refers to it, and I will use his direct quote, as a velvet war, a velvet war because the United States has sucked Russia into a process of not being able to defend itself.

And what does he advocate? He advocates, and I will quote him directly here, ''World War III is not over.'' The last of the elements that are inaccessible to the West is Russia with its nuclear might. He goes on to say that Russia must not do away with its nuclear arsenal but must reinforce it, that it is the only way to deal with the West.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not some radical person in the Russian media. This is the commanding officer, a decorated admiral in charge of the Baltic fleet, just recently, Mr. Speaker, on November 28 of this year.

Now, I am not saying he speaks for Boris Yeltsin, I am not even saying he speaks for Pavel Grachev, but this is the mindset of some of the military leaders inside Russia that we have to be aware of, that we cannot ignore it.

Or, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps we ought to look at some of the comments made by the fellow I had in America last week before my subcommittee, Aleksey Yablokov. Three articles, again appearing in FBIS, this time on November 21, 1995, a week before he came over here to testify before my subcommittee.

The first article quotes Mr. Yablokov in his criticism of the Russian military. He has done this repeatedly in the Russian press. This article appeared in Itar Tass in Moscow. It was an article that ran on their national TV network.

Yablokov criticizes the Russian General Staff Chief Kolesnikov in his report that Russia only has 40,000 tons of chemical weapons in its arsenal. Yablokov in this article says that is not true. We know Russia has 100,000 tons of chemical weapons.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Member of Congress saying this. This is not some radical journalist saying this. This is a member of Boris Yeltsin's Security Council in the Russian media telling the Russian people that the military is not being honest, that it is not 40,000 tons of chemical weapons, there are 100,000 tons. In this article he says to the military, ''Tell us what you have done with the other 60,000 tons of chemical weapons. Are they hidden someplace? Have you buried them? Where are they?''

The second article, also quoting Mr. Yablokov, deals with miniature nuclear weapons. Again Mr. Yablokov questions the small nuclear weapons that are portable that Russia has, which they admit they have, that can be used in a battlefield environment.

Mr. Yablokov in this case disagrees with the Russian military leadership as to the extent and the potential impact these nuclear weapons could have in a theater of operation, let alone the damage they could cause accidentally. That article appeared, by the way, in Itar Tass, as I mentioned.

The third article appeared in English in Interface in Moscow. It deals with decontaminated nuclear submarines. Mr. Yablokov again is quoted. This time he says that as the Russian military is decommissioning its nuclear submarines, 50 of them still contain nuclear fuel that they do not know how to deal with, and that 7 to 10 of these submarines have nuclear fuel that cannot be extracted for technical reasons.

He goes on to say, and I quote, ''These submarines are the source of super high danger.''

Mr. Speaker, may point is simple: All of us, and certainly me, want to have a stable relationship with Russia. When I go to Russia in January, besides attending a conference on the oceans in St. Petersburg, I will be in Moscow, and I will be following up on establishing a process, a formal process, with members of the Russian Duma National Security Council for an ongoing dialogue with members of our congressional Committee on National Security.

This is an outgrowth of discussions that my good friend and colleague who

I am going to yield to in a moment, DUNCAN HUNTER from California, Chairman FLOYD SPENCE and I, along with Congressman and Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations BOB LIVINGSTON, had with members of the Russian Duma defense committees for 3 hours behind closed doors last spring.

Mr. Speaker, we want stable relations with Russia. Mr. Speaker, I want Russia to succeed economically, and my actions prove that. Mr. Speaker, I want us to help the Russians solve their environmental problems, and my actions prove that.

Mr. Speaker, I am reaching out to Duma members every day. If this President, Mr. Speaker, stands up and says that we are somehow radical people who want to distort the balance between our Nation and Russia, then, Mr. Speaker, I have a problem, and I will deal with that problem very vocally and verbally because the President, or whoever would say that, would in fact not be honest with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask that the President seriously consider supporting the bill. The elections that occurred this past weekend in Russia showed a small, not a really significant gain, but a gain by the Communist party. They garnered 22 percent of the vote. If you couple that with Zhirinovsky's party which pulled 11 percent of the vote or 12 percent of the vote, you have seen some reactionary movements in Russia, but that should not scare us.

Mr. Speaker, we want to work with people like Yablokov, we want to work with people like Yeltsin, but we do not want to do it in a vacuum or with blinders on our eyes. We want to protect the American people, and we want to make sure that in the end the people of Russia have the same protection that we have.

What is ironic about this whole thing, Mr. Speaker, if President Clinton were to veto this defense bill because we in fact are wanting to establish a national missile defense capability, the irony is that this President wants to give one of our key allies, Israel, a national missile defense largely paid for by the American people, to protect the people of Israel, but does not want that same protection for the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, that to me is the ultimate irony. Let me say in closing, before I yield to my friends here, I am a supporter of the ARROW program. It was my friend and colleague DUNCAN HUNTER, who is here tonight, who 7, 8, 9 years ago wrote a letter to the administration and to the Israelis suggesting as their strong friends and allies that instead of pursuing a Leve technology for a Leve fighter plane that they shift to missile defense. The outgrowth that that effort is the ARROW system being developed today with Israel paying a portion of the cost and America paying a portion of the cost. Is it ironic that this President and some people that are recommending bad advice to him in threatening a veto for this bill would want to fund a defensive system for Israel but not one for the United States? It just does not make sense.

So I hope the President is listening, and I hope he heeds our warning that this is a good bill and certainly one worthy of his consideration. I will be happy to yield to my friend and colleague from California the chairman of the Procurement and Acquisition Committee who did such a great job in the process of this bill and I am sure he is going to talk about the positive aspects of the bill as they were developed by his subcommittee, DUNCAN HUNTER from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for yielding. First let me talk about a positive aspect of his leadership. CURT WELDON has been a person who has driven this bill with respect to missile defense and you are absolutely right that in many cases you asked and solicited as much information as you could get on the problems that the administration had with this bill. Each time they developed a problem, you sat down and tried to work it out. I think you did everything you possibly could do to meet their concerns. It is going to be tragic if the President vetoes this bill, which provides by a date certain some modicum of defense, of missile defense, for the American people which, as you further pointed out, most Americans think we already have.

So I want to salute you for your leadership because you had to work with both Members of the other body and folks from this body and some of us that wanted to do more in this bill, and the President's people, and you made a number of agreements and put a number of pieces of language to accommodate them, and for the President to veto this thing simply on the basis that he does not want to protect the American people make no sense at all. I agree with you, if he did the same thing, if he was a leader of Israel and made the same decision with respect to Israel, he would not get 10 percent of the vote in the next election. Let us hope this President does the right thing and to my friend, let me just say briefly, because I know our friend from Michigan has something to add to this discussion, also, that we have done a lot for the troops in this bill. You have mentioned the 2.4 percent pay raise, the increase in the housing allowance that we have in this bill.

□ 2230

If the troops are going to get their pay raise January 1, this is the way to do it, but, secondly, we give them some good equipment, and we have increased the number of trucks, armored personnel carriers, tanks, small arms. We have given them new weapon systems. We added a lot of ammo, all the way from basic M–16 ammunition right through to these precision guided munitions like the ones we saw operating in Desert Storm that allow you to stand off, and make strategic hits, and protect people, and keep us from having to put soft bodies into a very violent contact zone with the enemy.

So we do a lot of things to equip our soldiers, to give them a quality of life, and, you know, I served a brief, served a tour in Vietnam, did not do anything special, but I served with a lot of special people. I never read a congressional resolution, we passed a number of them now, but I always read my pay raises. If the President really wants to support the troops, the way to support the troops is to sign this bill that will give the families of all those military people who are over there in snow that is even deeper than it is in Washington, DC a little bit of value and a little bit of buying power over the next several months by giving them that 2.4-percent pay raise. Let us see President Clinton really support the troops by sending a few more bucks to their families.

So I want to thank the gentleman for everything that he has done because I think you put together an excellent missile package, one that the President can work with over the next 8 or 9 months, we can get together, we can work out some of our more detailed problems in hearings working with the other body.

We have the same concern that the Soviets have about the ABM treaty, we understand that they are still wary of the United States, but one thing that you brought out when the members of the Duma met with us was that they, too, are worried about missiles coming from Third World nations, and the real tragedy in this is going to be, if we are so—if the President is so insistent on vetoing a bill that does anything at all toward moving us to defense against missiles on the basis that he thinks in some point in the future this will violate the ABM treaty, here we have an ABM treaty that was signed by two parties, us and the Soviet Union, and yet there are many countries now like North Korea, like Libya, like Iraq which are developing missiles. So because of an agreement that we made with the Russians, we are going to allow a Third World nation to have a vulnerable target either in the United States, on the mainland or against our troops in theater, because we do not want to violate this deal we made with the Russians. The North Koreans did not sign the ABM treaty. They do not care about the ABM treaty. The Libyans did not sign it, Iraqis did not sign the ABM treaty, and when you were discussing this with your fellows and your colleagues in the Duma when they were visiting the United States Congress, I noticed you asked a question of one of them, and that was were they not also concerned with missiles coming in not from the United States, but from third nations, and they answered, yes, they were, and because of that I think—I think if the President will sign this bill, they will understand

that, they will understand our problems, and they will move forward accordingly to accommodate not only the United States and the Soviet Union or the Russians in our arms negotiations, but also to accommodate the safety requirements of their own citizens against incoming missiles from other countries.

So this is a good defense bill, and lastly I just say to my friend for those who say that might tell the President we are spending too much, this bill is roughly $100 billion less in real dollars than Ronald Reagan's 1986 defense bill, and the reason it is less is because we held the line in those days, and we stood strong, we stayed strong, we funded adequate ammunition, and equipment, and readiness for our troops, and because of that we were able to bring about a peace with the Soviet Union. We achieved in the 1980's peace through strength.

This budget is about a hundred billion dollars less than those budgets, and yet I think we have done the right thing in many places in this budget, and we can maintain this peace with this defense bill, and I hope the President signs it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague for his excellent comments, and, before he leaves, I just want to enter into a brief dialog with him about the—you know we hear on the floor all the time about the state of our economy and how some of the decisions that this Congress is making are putting people out of work. And you are the chairman of the acquisition committee which oversees all the items we procure. Is it not true that, what I read in the Fortune magazine and on the pages of the Wall Street Journal, that we have lost over 600,000 manufacturing jobs in the defense industrial base because of the downsizing, and while you and I both agree, I think, that our priority is not to be a job producer, that is a secondary benefit, that our ultimate goal is to protect the American people and give our troops the best.

But you wonder why you never hear these same Members of Congress talking about the only area where we are making such draconian cuts, putting real people out of work, and what is interesting is and which still boggles my mind, most of these people that have lost their jobs are members of the UAW, the machinists' union, the electrical workers. They are all AFL–CIO workers, and where are they? They are out there looking for jobs in southern California, in Pennsylvania, because they have—and Michigan. They have no place to go, people who have lost their jobs paying $40,000 and $50,000 a year where this Government has just said, ''Oh, well,'' and is it not true that those cuts in jobs have been caused directly by our lack of support for procurement?

And you might want to comment on how much we have procured in the way of new aircraft compared to some of our allies like some of the—even the Scandinavian countries in Europe for instance.

Mr. HUNTER. Well, the gentleman is right. Last year we purchased fewer combat aircraft than that warmaking nation in Switzerland. We had—I think we did something like 29 aircraft, and they did about 31 or 32. But the facts are that every billion dollars in economic activity expenditures on defense in manufacturing means about 25,000 to 30,000 jobs. So we have lost well over 600,000 jobs in the radical cut in defense spending that this administration has embarked upon. They have gone down roughly $129 billion under the levels that George Bush, and Colin Powell, and Dick Cheney got together and agreed upon as what they considered to be a prudent number, and now we are learning in Bosnia, and the gentleman has been a leader there, we are learning that the world may be a different world now, now that the Berlin Wall has come down. But it is still a very dangerous world.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Is it not also true, to my colleague who chairs the acquisition subcommittee as I chair the R&D subcommittee, that you were lobbied, as I was lobbied, by the heads of each of the services who told us privately that they desperately needed additional dollars to meet the needs of their troops so that when this President, if he does, and he said this repeatedly, says and makes the claim that we are spending too much on defense, that the Pentagon did not ask for this; the only one in the Pentagon who did not ask for this is his appointee who happens to be his Secretary, but that each of those service chiefs, who are career people who are responsible and whose necks are on the line if our kids are killed and not able to respond, each of them have come to us personally, as I know I have, and I would ask you if you have had the same meetings in your office saying these cuts are way out of line, you know we are not going to be able to meet our needs.

Is that true with your role as chairman?

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is absolutely true, my friend is stating the fact.

Once the President makes his decision on the defense number, and in this case I think it was totally arbitrary, much less than we should spend to be prudent, and you ask the leadership, military leadership, in the series of hearings that we held, you ask them at the table what do you think about this in terms of funding, their answer is we support the President's budget. It has to be like that, and it is. But there are also good, honest, candid Americans, and later on you get to have a conversation about ammunition, about modernization, and they have every single piece of equipment that we put in this bill, the gentleman has put in and I put in this bill, and other members of our committee, because we have a very bipartisan committee, Democrats and Republicans. Everything we have put in has been put in after discussion and thorough discussion with military leadership, and you know that has all come out now in the last few days. They had an article in the Washington Post to the effect that the military leadership had gone to the Joint Chiefs and said we needed to increase spending on modernization by 50 percent. Now we spent a little over $40 billion, so that is saying here they were telling their leadership in the Clinton administration we need to spend an extra $20 billion on modernization, and yet the President's aides say that the 5, or 6, or 7 billion extra that we have spent this year is just too much, and nobody wanted it, nobody asked for it.

Well, everything we put in the bill has been asked for, and you know something? I think, as the President gets into this very serious situation in Bosnia and other situations that will come down the line in the next year, he is going to say thank God for those increases in defense.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to my friend from Michigan. I would ask him the question:

He sat through the State of the Union speech, as we did. Does he recall the President standing at this very podium, and pounding his fist on the table, and saying we will not cut defense spending any further, and in fact, if the gentleman would respond, my recollection is he said he was going to add $25 billion to defense spending.

Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. CHRYSLER. Yes, I absolutely do.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And what he said though unfortunately is that he is not going do that until after the next Presidential election, which it is convenient for him to make that statement after he runs for reelection.

With that I will yield to our good friend from Michigan for whatever comments he would like to make.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I would just like to rise in support of this bill and certainly encourage President Clinton to sign this bill, and I commend my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] for their efforts in giving us a procurement bill, a business-type procurement bill, that can save us on the $400 billion of goods and services that this Government buys up to 20 percent, which is some $400 million, and it means no more $600 toilet seats, it means no more $200 hammers, and it helps cut down the 300,000 people that we have in this Government that work at acquiring goods and services for this Government, and one of the things, and I know I went against my chairman and my subcommittee chairman on this legislation to get it passed and to get at part of this bill, and that is why I am so interested in seeing this sign, is because one of the things that we find is that this Government is the single largest purchaser of vacuum tubes.

Now some of you might be too young to remember what vacuum tubes were, but we buy more vacuum tubes than anyone else. We do not make them in this country, but because of our procurement system we have to buy them.

Now you can get a computer chip about the size of your little fingernail that equals 3,150,000 vacuum tubes, and of course nobody that is listening wants to know what we use vacuum tubes for in this Government because we use them to keep the air traffic controller system running in this country, and we need to modernize that system. This bill will allow us to do that for the first time, and that is why I rise in such strong support of it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman because he played a major role as one of our newer Members of this institution, hit the ground running and played a major role in pushing the agenda of acquisition reform that is going to help us save the dwindling defense dollars that we are currently spending. We appreciate your leadership. It is not often that a Member comes in here and makes that kind of a difference, and we on the defense committee—I know the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] shares my feelings—appreciate the leadership of you on the Government Ops Committee who played a key role in getting this added to our defense bill.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is especially valuable to us because he comes with a business background, and he understands acquisition in the real marketplace; that is, in the private marketplace, and we are going to save a lot of money because of what you did.

We still have a long way to go. We still have those 300,000 Government shoppers in the Department of Defense which is roughly 2 United States Marine Corps. We call them fighting shoppers from the sky, and we are going to be trying to build a more efficient system in terms of personnel in the next couple of years, but your work has been extraordinary, and we are going to save the taxpayers some money because of it. I thank you.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my colleagues for their cooperation here and for joining me here in this special order to reiterate to the President and to our colleagues the importance of this bill becoming law. It would be a real tragedy for the American troops and for the American people if this President ignored the authorization process, ignored the acquisition reform, ignored the pay raise, the benefits in terms of housing that were outlined by my friend from California, and the advances we have made in areas like missile defense consistent with his own people in the Pentagon if we would choose to veto this legislation.

□ 2245

I would say to my friends and colleagues that we will be there to respond to whatever case this President attempts to make as to why this bill should be vetoed. If it is based on the missile defense, we are going to have an out-and-out war on our hands, because it will have to be filled with untruths, because of the efforts we went to to meet the administration more than halfway in getting a bill finished that he can sign into law.

With that, I thank both of the gentleman, I thank our staff and our distinguished Speaker, the scholarly gentleman from the deep South, from Arkansas, Mr. DICKEY, for bearing with us this time.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the articles mentioned:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 15, 1995]

U.N. IS SAID TO FIND RUSSIAN MARKINGS ON IRAQ-BOUND MILITARY EQUIPMENT

(By R. Jeffrey Smith)

United Nations investigators have determined that an Iraq-bound shipment of sophisticated military equipment seized by Jordanian authorities last month was built in Russia and may have been designed for use in long-range, intercontinental missiles, according to informed diplomatic sources.

The shipment, which has been valued by the United Nations at more than $25 million, was seized on a western government's tip just days before it was to be shipped to Iraq, the sources said. They said it consisted of about 100 sets of advanced guidance equipment, such as accelerometers and gyroscopes, which Iraq may have wanted to use in banned missiles capable of carrying chemical or biological warheads.

The equipment was shipped in 30 or so boxes to Jordan's capital Amman in August on flights that originated in Moscow, according to three diplomatic sources. But Washington is uncertain whether the export was secretly sanctioned by part of the Russian government or was the work of criminals who obtained the parts in Russia on the black market, officials said.

If the United Nations confirms that the equipment was meant for use in long-range missiles, it would mark the first occasion that such advanced missile technology has been exported from Russia to a country considered hostile to U.S. interests.

If the export was approved by Moscow it would be a violation of Russia's pledge to abide by the terms of the Missile Technology Control Regime, a global accord aimed at stopping the spread of missiles capable of carrying nuclear, chemical or biological warheads. It would also violate Russian promises to adhere to the global trade embargo imposed on Iraq by the U.N. Security Council after the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

If the Russian export was instead illicit, it suggests that long-standing U.S. fears that such advanced arms technology would eventually leak from Russia are finally being borne out, a U.S. official said on condition he not be named. ''There is a very real . . . possibility that this was provided by black marketeers'' who obtained it directly from the Russian military's stockpile of long-range missile equipment, he said.

Although the Clinton administration has not yet raised the matter directly with the Russian government, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Moscow issued a statement last week denying any knowledge of the shipment. ''It does not belong to Russia,'' said a spokesman for the Russian Embassy in Washington, U.S. and U.N. officials said the denial was not credible, however, because the parts were clearly marked and recognizable.

''These are Russian-made components, definitely,'' one official said. The parts were designed for use in Russian long-range missiles but could be adapted for use in shorter-range missiles.

Documents obtained by the United Nations indicate that the missile parts had been ordered by the Karama research center near Baghdad, where Iraq continues to work on missiles with a range of less than 150 kilometers (about 90 miles). Such short-range missiles are allowed by the cease-fire resolutions approved by the United Nations, which sought only to prohibit arms capable of directly threatening Iraq's neighbors.

But Iraq has not claimed it was trying to buy the parts to use with such short-range missiles; it instead has sought to pin the blame for the attempted export on any overly enthusiastic Jordanian businessman who it claims tried to sell the banned parts on at least two occasions this year without ever receiving an Iraqi tender offer or negotiating contract.

''The Iraqi industrial facility refused this offer categorically, in compliance with United Nations resolutions,'' the Iraqi News Agency said in a written statement issued in Baghdad last week.

Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz, who is visiting the United Nations this week to seek an early lifting of the punitive trade embargo, told U.N. officials on Tuesday that the seller had been arrested by the government pending a full investigation. He also alleged that the incident had resulted from a conspiracy meant to undermine Iraqi cooperation with the United Nations.

A knowledgeable diplomatic source identified the businessman as a Palestinian from Gaza and Wiyam Abu Gharbieh, and said his company's name was listed on the shipping manifests for the equipment. ''We have reason to believe the Iraqi account [of official disinterest in the parts] is inaccurate,'' a U.N. official said.

U.S. officials said that Iraq may have wanted to use the guidance equipment on banned medium-range missiles, which they suspect remain hidden in Iraq. Alternatively, Iraq may have wanted to stockpile the equipment until it could produce other vital long-range missile components, an effort that would require many years to complete.

U.S. intelligence officials said they are confident that any Iraqi attempt to develop, assemble and test such a missile would be detected long in advance.

''We now have tangible proof of our statement'' in October that Iraq was still trying to buy sensitive missile parts from foreign suppliers, said Swedish envoy Rolf Ekeus, who chairs the U.N. Special Commission on Iraq. He added that ''we don't think this [revelation] is the end of the road,'' because Iraq has made other such purchases or attempted purchases.

[From Krymskaya Pravda, Nov. 28, 1995]

THE THIRD WORLD [WAR]? . . .

(By Adm. E. Baltin)

MILITARY DANGER FOR RUSSIA IS A REALITY

The geopolitical consequences of the collapse of the Soviet Union have not yet been completely studied. However, their negative manifestations are already visible to everyone who has made even the briefest observations on the development of events throughout the world.

A very important peculiarity of the present international situation that has an extremely unfavorable effect on Russia's situation is the existence and reinforcement of NATO, as well as the West European Union, which, essentially speaking, represent the power ''fists'' of the consolidated West. We might recall the discussions that were held

in Brussels after the self-disbanding of the Warsaw Pact. The topic of discussion was not only the need to transform NATO from a military-political association into a political one, but even the possibility of disbanding it has having fulfilled the goals that had been set. But the words remained words. Today NATO not only preserves the structure that used to exist, but even is intensifying and consolidating it by attracting new members into its orbit. Cover for activities of this kind is provided by programs such as the notorious ''Partnership For the Sake of Peace.''

Meanwhile it is absolutely clear that in its present form NATO is nothing else but a military-political anachronism that not only failed to serve the reinforcement of security in Europe, but kept undermining it. The military-power course in resolving acute international questions, the arbitrary, uncontrolled expansion of the zone of its responsibility, and the policy of ''movement toward the East'' are links in a single chain and they are aimed primarily against Russia.

Operation Desert Storm and the recent demonstrative punishment of the Serbs, despite the lack of similarity of their causes, nevertheless had much in common. The first and most important thing is: under United Nations cover (after the divulging of the existence of a secret treaty between NATO and the United Nations that pertains to former Yugoslavia, the essence of the interaction between these organizations does not evoke any illusions), the NATO bloc personally assumed the duties of ''world policeman,'' maintaining order in his fiefdom, and that order is established by the ''policeman'' himself.

Second, The armed forces of the NATO allies obtained unprecedented experience in waging aggressive combat actions on foreign territory, with the modern methods of armed combat being applied with respect to an opponent with a Soviet organization and using what is basically our tactics and weapons.

Third. Psychologically, the armies and public opinion in the countries participating in NATO have become adapted, to a considerable degree, to the waging of aggressive combat actions on foreign territory—by means of the broad-scale propaganda campaigns concerning the ''extremely precise,'' ''intelligent,'' and ''human'' weapons, the ''carpet bombings,'' ''surgical strikes,'' and the ''clean,'' ''local'' warfare. For professionals, the absurdity of these propaganda efforts is obvious. In the Persian Gulf, NATO pilots were definitely not fighting against Khussein's army, which had lost its combat potential, but against peaceful citizens.

And there is one more thing. The undeclared NATO war against the Serbs is already the obtaining of practical experience, the conditioning of world public opinion, and the psychological preparation of NATO soldiers for unpunished combat actions against Slavs.

Let us now examine the foreign-policy situation that Russia has found itself in today and the problems in this area that are awaiting their immediate resolution. With the collapse of the USSR, Russia, which had been occupied exclusively by its domestic problems, actually lost its previous allies and failed to acquire any new ones. As a result, its situation in the world, as well as in Europe, is extremely indefinite and shaky.

The process of crowding Russia out of its age-old geopolitical positions is continuing. All we have to recall is Ukraine, which is being drawn increasingly into NATO's embrace, and the successful activity of Turkey in the trans-Caucasus, not to mention the processes in the Baltic region. The extensive crowding out of the country from Western and Central Europe has already led to the loss of basic ports in the Baltic and Black seas, as well as communication hunger with Europe. In the south of Russia is the well blackened ''arc of instability''—across the Black Sea, Chechnya, Georgia, and even across Central Asia to the border of the KNR [People's Republic of China], as well as the gradual shifting of that ''arc'' to the north under the flag of Islamic fundamentalism. The situation is no better in the Far East or the Asia-Pacific Region. In those areas there has been the continuing weakening of Russia's positions against the background of the unresolved nature of a number of international problems, with the growing economic and military power of China, Japan, and other close neighbors of ours.

And there are also comparisons that already are not in our favor: Europe is integrating and is consolidating its positions more and closely—in our country, with the aid of certain conceited neighbors, even such an unsteady boat as the CIS is being rocked until it is listing dangerously; the United States and other NATO members have a permanent presence in practically all the regions of the world, and we are abandoning the forward-base lines that our army and navy have had for many years in the countries not only of the far abroad, but also of the near abroad; NATO submarines, the carriers of nuclear and conventional weapons, carry out constant combat duty and patrols in the immediate proximity of our borders. By virtue of our extremely meager financing, we are not only failing to build new technology, but cannot even use that which exists. By means of the holding of ''joint'' maneuvers and exercises, the armed forces of the NATO countries are becoming acquainted with newer and newer theaters of military actions. In Russia, even the conducting of conventional intelligence has been left practically to drift along on its own momentum, and the intelligence services that have been reorganized and renamed many times are taking on an attributive nature...

There arises the completely reasonable question of the goals pursued by the United States and NATO, which expend—for the purpose of arming their armies and conducting exercises and, finally, combat operations—amounts of money that would be more than enough to provide fundamental assistance to starving Africa and to carry out the technical re-equipping of the entire post-Communist Eastern Europe. The goal of these miliary preparations is obvious: to prevent the Russia that is being reborn and its allies, assuming that such should arise sooner or later, from reconstituting a serious competition to the West that has been experiencing increasingly serious problems, despite its former prosperity.

What has been stated may seem to be improbable. Since the time of open confrontation between West and East, the world has truly changed very much. But the crux of the matter is that, despite the external illusion that has been skillfully created by Western specialist in psychological operations, the world has not become more stable or more just, but, on the contrary, has become even more dangerous and unpredictable—as a consequence of the disruption of the balance among the forces that used to constitute it and the predominance in that world of interest that are extremely remote from humanitarian ones. ''We won the war, but we did not win the peace,'' Boris Yeltsin has said. And that is the truth.

For that category of our citizens who look at the world through the prism of a forced system of values, it seems impossible that the West can find a reason for armed interference in Russian affairs—not necessarily in Russia itself.

Now the West is deciding how much democracy is sufficient for us, and how much is not. The West is dictating the principles of the construction of the Russian economy. The West determines whether human rights are being observed in our country. So long as Russia was a strong country, ''comments'' such as this were called interference in internal affairs, and that was perceived completely adequately by our opponents and by the world community as a whole.

The system of double standards that has been used for so long by specialists in the area of the struggle of ideas is not new. So it is strange that we have once again been hooked by it. The world remains silent about the fact that unarmed Kurds are being killed by shells fired from tanks of governmental troops in Turkey. The passions have not yet subsided in the Ireland that is thirsting for independence, but people also are generally not being reminded of that either. For yet another year the United States is incapable of coping with the periodically arising unrest among the Negro population (of whom there are approximately 30 million in the States), a population that is demanding autonomy. And is anyone actually speaking seriously about the crudest violations of human rights in Serbian Kraina? Who has counted the number of defenseless Serbs who perished under NATO bombs, or the number of their homes that have been destroyed? Those are areas that could use the numerous commissions on human rights from the CSCE and the European parliament! But they prefer to come to our country, in order to discuss the situation in Chechnya. The West has certain criteria for judging human rights in our country, and completely different ones for itself.

Let us imagine now what might become a reality in the situation of a collision between Russian and Western interests that is completely possible in the future. An invented reason (Panama, Somali, the Balkans), the United Nations ''blessing,'' and...

The only thing that is currently restraining the appetites of our new ''friends'' is the nuclear weapons that Russia continues to have. Although the West attempts constantly to put under its control the production, testing, deployment, and reduction of those weapons. With the aid of the government of the former USSR, the West partially managed to do that, and continues to this day to make such attempts.

REPARTITIONING

Everything that was formulated above is occurring during a unique period of world history. I have in mind World War III, which broke out and almost ceased rumbling before our eyes. It was not a classic ''world war,'' but, rather, a ''velvet'' world war that became such by virtue of the factors that caused it and the conditions in which it occurred. For all the mootness of this kind of assertion, no one will deny that mankind has entered a new phase in its development, a phase that has exceeded all its expectations. For the third time in the present century there has been a repartitioning of the spheres of influence among the leading world powers. And the most extensive one of all those known to us.

What became physically the beginning of World War III was the destruction of the Berlin Wall. But a new classic world war—judged on the basis of its form, content, and methods of waging combat actions—did not break out simply because, first of all, the public awareness of the twentieth century was saturated by the two preceding ones, which had been the bloodiest wars that had been its misfortune to endure, and, secondly, because there was absolutely no need for the classic continuation of a policy specifically

by military means. There had been an offensive, but there was no proper defense, since the opponent was so demoralized by internal upheavals that he could scarcely have been called an opponent in the usual understanding of that word.

The third world war, the ''velvet'' one, is being waged in other forms and by other methods. Its essence lies in the strategic-informational offensive, in which the basic role is played by the well-organized means of psychological operations. But all the unconventional, nonclassic methods of waging that war combine closely with the numerous military conflicts of small and average intensity. All of which, in their turn, are frequently engendered by the same psychological effect.

Yet another peculiarity of World War III consists in the fact that it is being waged on the territory of the Old World, chiefly Europe. At one time Iosif Stalin stated that he would be able to prevent a war on the territory of the Soviet Union. His conviction has been implemented by the pragmatic Yankees.

The results of World War III have exceeded all the expectations and everything that mankind has known up until now. In none of the classic world wars were such astonishing successes achieved with practically no bloodshed. The first such success was the achievement of NATO's political goals: the system of socialism, with what had been at one time its powerful economy and military potential, was destroyed.

But World War III is not over. The last of the elements that are inaccessible to the West is Russia, with its nuclear might. In order to eliminate that factor, our state, by means of all kinds of subterfuges, is being drawn into numerous international programs under the aegis of the United Nations, NATO OSCE, CSCE, WMF, and Council of Europe (at times one cannot get rid of the impression that those programs were invented only with this purpose in mind). Within the framework of these joint programs, Russia is being pressured into participating in international agreements that are of a political, economic, and only partially a military nature (limitation, control of limitations of weapons production and testing, etc.). Participation in such missions, which are being conducted under the noble slogans of peacekeeping activity, most-favored economic conditions, arms reduction, human-rights protection, etc., leads to a situation in which the elements that are desirable for the West are forced into Russia's domestic- and foreign-policy strategy, that is, leads to the programmed formation of our policy. Factually speaking, this is the end of the process of the destruction of the Russian state system.

Hence Russia's complete political, economic, and military dependence upon the West.

But Russia is definitely not the first country to suffer as a result of World War II. Its deplorable consequences for the Old World, for Europe, will require more time to evaluate. As a result of the geopolitical reforms that have occurred, Europe lost its face by allowing the processes occurring on its territory to get almost completely out from under its control. Europe had a direct influence on those processes before and after World War II, but currently Europe has become only a test range for the concepts of world structure that have been developed in the United States, thus having transformed its peoples into hostages of the transoceanic national interests.

At one time Adolf Hitler used to dream about ruling the world. However, for him that goal proved to be unattainable. The embodiment of the wildest of all ideas that ever existed—true, with the existence of the objective prerequisites and by means of other instruments—apparently proved to be possible several decades later by the United States. The scheme ''Center of power (United States)—NATO—United Nations—. . .'' still lives and, as we may be convinced, is winning. The main thing now is for the world that has been deprived on equilibrium must not slip of its fulcrum. . .

A STRONG ARMY IS A STRONG RUSSIA

The current period in the history of the Russian state is a critical one. Here has been an understanding of the changes that have occurred in the world and in the country, and the first, albeit shy, attempts are being undertaken to correct the miscalculations that have been made. This segment of time has coincided with the latest parliamentary election in Russia. It appears to be indisputable that Russia's population, which has obtained a definite amount of political experience, will make the most correct choice if one compares it with the previous ones.

I would call the broad participation of the military in the current election campaign completely natural. The military, more than anyone else, are capable of subordinating themselves to the state's interests, and of differentiating among all its misfortunes and problems. Because, unlike a large number of other politicians, serving the state is their profession. Being completely aware of the importance of the Armed Forces in the modern world and, on a daily basis when resolving exceptionally practical tasks, coming up against the objective impossibility of constructing the activities of military units according to canons that correspond to the vital needs of the state, the military are forced to go into politics. Because, essentially speaking, the struggle for the Armed Forces today is becoming a struggle for the Homeland. From what has been stated above, this must be absolutely clear.

What, then, is the Russian army and Navy today? That which we have been accustomed to calling them are only fragments—and not even the largest or the best ones—remaining from the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union. Almost everything that is the best has remained on the former forward base lines, in what are now the countries of the near abroad. The only thing that remains now is to rebuild the Russian Armed Forces.

Throughout the world the building of the armed forces is carried out by proceeding from the national interests of the state. It is necessary on that basis to create the concept of the county's national security and the military doctrine the evolves from it; the structure of the Armed Forces, the concept and long-range arms program, and the state production order for them have been determined. This is the classic scheme, and that is precisely the scheme that should be followed today when we create the Russian Armed Forces for the twenty-first century. It is also necessary to save that we inherited from the former USSR: today's shield, the guarantee of the unique, independent path of Russia's development, if such is chosen. But with the attitude of society and many state figures to the Ministry of Defense that we observe today, it is a miracle that the Armed Forces are still functioning. It must be admitted that this is thanks only to the colossal stamina of the Russian enlisted man.

Let us analyze to a certain extent how the Russian power structures and de-facto functioning today. It is a paradox when only one-third of the people who are ''under arms'' are subordinate to the minister of defense, and the remaining two-thirds are subordinate to other power departments. Moreover, the emphasis is made on the MVD troops, the border troops, and the creation of numerous special subdivisions. The power structure are being inflated to unprecedented proportions, but this results, first of all, in the dissipation of manpower and funds, and, secondly, there is a lowering of the army's role as a factor that cements together the state system and obedience to the law. Meanwhile, all the state power institutions are being used to create conditions for the normal functioning of the state under the ordinary conditions that prevail, and under the emergency conditions it is only the army that is capable of fulfilling this task. From what has been stated it clearly follows that at the present time we are waiving the chief benefits to the advantage of the momentary ones. How, then, can a military man who understands all of this fail to go into politics?

Before our very eyes, rather than in accordance with anyone's ''command,'' as some people attempt to represent the situation, but, rather, by virtue of objective reasons, a new formation of Russian politicians is being born. What that formation will consist of does not raise any doubts. It should not be called the ''war party'' or the ''military party.'' It is the party of patriots.

The words ''military'' and ''patriot'' have always been inseparable, because a nonpatriot cannot be a military person. And if today there are so many people in shoulder boards among those laying claim to seats in the Duma, that means that the country is truly in a desperate situation.

Currently we still have perhaps the last opportunity to hold onto our Homeland's existing defense line.

PETROV: 40,000 TONNES OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS 'ACCURATE'

(By Anatoliy Yurkin)

MOSCOW.—Russia's store of 40,000 tonnes of chemical weapons, reported by Russian General Staff chief General Mikhail Kolesnikov, is an accurate figure, commander of Russian radiation, chemical and biological protection forces Colonel-General Stanislav Petrov told ITAR–TASS.

Petrov said he was surprised by the statement of Aleksey Yablokov, a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, intersectoral commission chairman of the Ecological Safety Council, at a parliamentary meeting today that Russia has produced a total of 100,000 tonnes of chemical weapons.

Yablokov said they must have been dumped at secret sites.

Petrov said the Russian Defence Ministry has no secrets about the chemical weapons, and sites of its storage are known to the Russian Academy of Sciences and Western experts, who had visited the storage sites under international accords.

The general said Yablokov has any possibility to contact Defence Ministry officials for information about chemical weapons.

Yablokov knows full well that Russia lacks the great funds required for disposal programmes, Petrov continued, adding that President Boris Yeltsin had issued a decree on November 6, 1995, setting up a commission on chemical weapons.

The decree opens a prospect for Russia's meeting its international commitments in the area of chemical weapons, Petrov said.

He said Yablokov undoubtedly knows that and exploits the rostrum to his ends the election race.

OFFICIAL CONFIRMS SECURITY OF MINIATURE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

(By Lyudmila Yermakova)

MOSCOW.—Russia does have miniature nuclear ammunition, but panic over possible theft of it is unfounded, the head of the Russian Defence Ministry's ecological centre, Colonel Boris Alekseyev, said in a statement today.

His statement follows warnings by Aleksey Yablokov, the intersectoral commission chairman of the Russian Environmental Safety Council, at parliamentary hearings on environmental safety.

According to Alekseyev, a minimal weight of the nuclear charges is over 90 kilogrammes, not 30–40 kilogrammes, as asserted by Yablokov.

The ammunition is stored in arch-secure settings and have a fourth-degree protection system which precludes an accidental explosion.

Only the nuclear button, which is in the hands of the Russian president, can trigger this ammunition, Alekseyev said.

The military official said a restricted number of people have access to the nuclear charges. ''For this reason Yablokov might be uninformed about the details,'' he added.

The miniature nuclear ammunition is ''one of shields for Russia's security, and this is known in the world'', he said.

DECOMMISSIONED NUCLEAR SUBMARINES SAID TO POSE DANGER

MOSCOW.—Over 140 nuclear submarines have been decommissioned in Russia today, but 50 of them still contain nuclear fuel, chairman of Russian Security Council's commission for ecology and Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Professor Aleksey Yablokov said on Tuesday [21 November] in the Federation Council.

Nuclear fuel cannot be extracted from 7–10 submarines ''for technical reasons,'' he said. ''These submarines are the source of super-high danger,'' said Yablokov.

Deputy chief of the Russian Defense Ministry's nuclear security inspection Viktor Kruglov confirmed for INTERFAX the presence of ''submarines from which it is impossible to unload nuclear fuel.'' However, he said those submarines do not present ''danger of radiation for the population or the environment.''

''The Defense Ministry has recommendations on how to scrap those submarines,'' the spokesman said. It is necessary to determine a burial site for them and earmark money for this program.

Kruglov said that there are four disaster submarines in Russia: one in the North Fleet and three in the Pacific Fleet.