and have earned him a high degree of renown and respect. Some of the numerous awards bestowed upon him include the 1963 Michigan Veteran of the Year, the Chapel of Four Chaplains Award, the Wayne County Artistic Excellence and Community Commitment Award, and a special Resolution of Tribute from the Michigan Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I say without a doubt that every veterans organization in Michigan owes part of their success to Raymond O'Neill's constant diligence. Our veterans have been affected in so many ways by his hard work and advocacy on their behalf. Although he is retiring, I know that he will remain the best advocate a veteran could have. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to Ray and wishing him well in his retirement.

HONORING CHARLES SEIPELT

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1997

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge Charles Seipelt, who is retiring after 35 years as principal of Pleasant Hill Elementary School in Milford, OH. Mr. Seipelt has been the one and only principal of the school since it was built. His long and dedicated service as principal is truly remarkable, and he will be greatly missed by students, teachers, and fellow administrators. I know I speak for everyone in Milford in wishing him the best of success in his future endeavors.

THE LEGACY OF THE MARSHALL PLAN: 50 YEARS LATER, THE WORLD STILL BENEFITS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this week the United States and the countries of Western Europe mark the 50th anniversary of the June 5, 1947, Commencement Address at Harvard University by then Secretary of State George C. Marshall in which the idea of the Marshall Plan was first publicly discussed. That idea was an act of statesmanship, and its implementation was one of the greatest examples of bipartisan foreign policy.

Secretary Marshall's address was given just 2 years after the end of World War II at a time when the economy of Europe was still in shambles. Many cities were in rubble, in most countries food was still rationed, and those factories that were still functioning were operating at only a fraction of their prewar levels. The decision by the Government of the United States to contribute to the rebuilding of Europe by sending money, equipment, and services was a major factor in accelerating Europe's recovery. It helped restore the confidence of the political and economic leaders of the countries of Western Europe, and it brought to Europe an infusion of American ideas—economic and management concepts, as well as political ideas. These have been major factors in the economic and political transformation of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, this House considered and adopted a resolution which I introduced with the cosponsorship of a number of my colleagues, House Concurrent Resolution 63, recommitting the United States to the principles of the Marshall Plan. Mr. Speaker, that resolution recognizes the wisdom and insight of Secretary Marshall's address and of the policy that resulted from it, and it recommits the United States to that wise policy first enunciated 50 years ago. I appreciate the wisdom of the House in rededicating our Nation to those principles.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post Outlook Section in its issue of May 25 published a brilliant essay by historian John Lukacs on the legacy of the Marshall Plan. Professor Lukacs is one of the most distinguished and articulate scholars of contemporary history, and he is the author of a number of important books on international politics in the second half of this century. He points out that the greatest importance of the Marshall Plan was not its contribution to European economic recovery, but the affirmation of an American commitment to the political and military security of Europe. We recognized through our unselfish implementation of the Marshall plan that our own Nation's future was linked with the security, prosperity, and democratic success of Europe. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the article by Professor Lukacs be placed in the RECORD and I urge my colleagues to give it careful, serious, and thoughtful attention.

THE IDEA THAT REMADE EUROPE

(By John Lukacs)

The fifth of June, 1947, was a milestone in the history of the United States, and of what was soon thereafter called the Western World. Fifty years ago, in a speech to Harvard University's graduating class, Secretary of State George C. Marshall announced the European Recovery Program, later known as the Marshall Plan. It described the American government's firm resolution to underwrite the economic recovery of European countries damaged by the recently ended war and threatened by the possible expansion of international communism.

The plan was a great success. It provided for generous loans, outright gifts and the furnishing of American equipment, eventually amounting to some $13 billion (or about $88.5 billion in today's dollars) tendered to 16 countries over five years between 1947 and 1952. West Germany was included among the recipients when it became a state in 1948.

The Marshall Plan was a milestone; but it was not a turning point. The giant American ship of state was already changing course. Two years before, the government and much of American public opinion had looked to the Soviet Union as their principal ally, even sometimes at the expense of Britain. But by early 1947, the Truman administration had begun to perceive the Soviet Union as America's principal adversary—a revolution in foreign policy that has had few precedents in the history of this country.

In 1947, this was marked by three important events; the announcement of the Truman Doctrine in March, committing the United States to the defense of Greece and Turkey; the announcement of the Marshall Plan in June; and the publication in the July issue of Foreign Affairs of the famous ''X'' article by George F. Kennan, then director of the State Department's policy planning staff, who defined a policy of Soviet ''containment.'' In a radical department from American traditions, these three statements showed that the United States was committed to defend a large part of Europe, even in the absence of war.

All this is true, but perhaps a whit too simple in retrospect. The term ''Cold War'' did not yet exist, and there was still hope that a definite break with the Soviet Union—leading among other things to a hermetic division of Europe—might be avoided. Marshall's speech suggested that the offer was open to the states of Eastern Europe too, and perhaps even to the Soviet Union. One reason for this somewhat indefinite generosity was to maintain an American presence in Eastern Europe, since the plan called for the establishment of ties with the United States, including the temporary presence of American administrators.

That is why Stalin refused to countenance the Marshall Plan from its inception. (As Winston Churchill had said, Stalin feared Western friendship more than he feared Western enmity.) Czechoslovakia provides a case in point. Ruled by a coalition government in which the Communists were amply represented but which was parliamentary and democratic, Czechoslovakia still hoped to remain a possible bridge between East and West. The first reaction of the Prague government was to accept the offer of the Marshall Plan. Moscow then ordered the government to refuse it, which it did—instantly.

This did not surprise officials in Washington, including Kennan. By June, the division of Europe was already hardening fast. The Iron Curtain (a phrase first employed 15 months before by Churchill) was becoming a physical reality. Eight months after Marshall's speech, the Communists took over Prague. Soon after came the Russian blockade of West Berlin, the Berlin airlift, the final separation of Western from Eastern Germany, and the formation of NATO in early 1949. The partition of Europe was frozen; the Cold War was on.

So, generously offered and eagerly accepted, the Marshall Plan was restricted to Western Europe. Within four years, the economic and financial recovery of Western Europe was advancing swiftly. It is interesting that the costs of the American contribution to rebuilding Europe during those first crucial years of the Cold War were about the same as the costs of the materials it had given the Soviet Union during World War II to help with the Allied victory. After 1947, not a single European country went Communist that was not already Communist in 1947—a situation that remained unchanged until the dissolution of the Soviet Eastern European empire in 1989.

But the economic effects of the Marshall Plan should not be exaggerated. Its principal effect was political: a definite sign of America's commitment to the defense of Western Europe, and to maintaining an American presence there. Behind the Marshall Plan, of course, was the habitual American inclination to overrate economic factors, coupled with the inclination to think in ideological terms, to be preoccupied by the dangers of communism, rather than by the existence of Russian nationalism, including the Russian military presence in Eastern Europe. Despite the success of the Marshall Plan and of Western European economic recovery, the proportion of Communist voters in countries such as France and Italy did not decrease from 1947 to 1953.

The Marshall Plan left a more long-standing legacy than recovery. It was one of the instruments of the democratization of Western Europe, resulting in the emulation and adoption of American ideas and institutions, such as progressive income taxation, Social Security, near-universal education and installment buying, all of which led to the

gradual homogenization and rising prosperity of entire peoples. It included giving credit to the masses, financially and otherwise: ''*On ne prete qu'aux riches*''—credit is only for the rich—was not just a French aphorism but the established capitalist practice in Europe until about 1948.

By the 1950s, the social structure of Western Europe was starting to resemble that of the United States. Now, this transformation is largely completed and the differences between the United States and other democratic societies are no longer mainly economic or social, but national and cultural.

The Truman administration was able to push the Marshall Plan through a predominantly Republican Congress in 1947–48, in which the main opponents of the European Recovery Program were right-wing Republicans, the very people who accused Truman and his government of being soft on communism. Most of these people had been isolationists before and during the first years of World War II. Their conversion to another kind of internationalism (more precisely: supernationalism) was easy. By 1956, the Republican party adopted a platform calling for ''the establishment of American air and naval bases all around the world''—proposed by a party that was even then called ''isolationist'' by its opponents, wrongly so.

The Marshall Plan in 1947 was followed, less than two years later, by the creation of NATO, an alliance that, for all its merits, contributed to a political division of Europe lasting for 40 years. With the retreat of the Russians from Eastern Europe in 1989, the Cold War—and the partition of Europe—came to an end. Some people called for a new Marshall Plan for Eastern Europe and, perhaps, for Russia. But this did not come about, for many reasons. In 1947, the United States was the only economic superpower in the world; 40 years later, this was no longer the case. In 1947, the countries of Western Europe were threatened by a possible expansion of communism; the opposite was true of Eastern Europe 40 years later. In 1947, the global financial economy was in its embryonic stage; 40 years later, principal investments abroad no longer required the principal thrust of a government.

But with all of these differences in mind, there remains one similarity. History does not repeat itself, but some historical conditions do. The main beneficial result of the Marshall Plan was Western Europeans' confidence that the United States was committed to maintaining their freedom. The American commitment to Eastern Europe now is not clear. It is suggested here and there by American actions, as in Bosnia, but it is not a commitment. Yet it is in the interest of most European countries—yes, including even Russia—that a new division of Europe should not occur. The main instrument for its avoidance may no longer be an Eastern European Marshall Plan; but it is certainly not an extension of NATO.

TRIBUTE TO THE NATIONAL PUERTO RICAN PARADE, 40 YEARS OF HISTORY

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1997

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great joy that I rise today to pay tribute to the National Puerto Rican Parade on its 40 years of history. The parade, to be held on June 8 in New York City, is the largest celebration of Puerto Rican culture in the United States.

Throughout its history, the parade has grown into a national event under the leadership of its president, Ramón S. Vélez. The event attracts thousands of Puerto Ricans from across the Nation and from Puerto Rico, as well as many other individuals, their families and children, from all ethnic backgrounds.

This year's parade will honor the life of a Puerto Rican hero, Roberto Clemente. Mr. Clemente's exceptional athletic talent was paired with his outstanding humanitarian and charitable contributions to this Nation. He died 25 years ago in an airplane crash, while he was on a mission to help the victims of an earthquake in Nicaragua.

Mr. Clemente's memory has also been honored with the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian award bestowed to an individual by the U.S. Congress. Clemente's legacy is an inspiration and an example to the children of Puerto Rico, as well as those of this Nation.

As a Puerto Rican, a New Yorker, and a Member of Congress, it is an honor to once again participate in this national event, in which thousands of individuals will march along Fifth Avenue, in Manhattan, in celebration of our Puerto Rican heritage and our achievements in this Nation. Among other accomplishments, Puerto Ricans have been instrumental in transforming New York City into a great bilingual city. Moreover, the parade has served as a national landmark in which people from all ethnic groups unite to commemorate our Nation's glorious immigrant history.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Roberto Clemente and the National Puerto Rican Parade, in its celebration of our Puerto Rican legacy, and the many contributions made by the sons and daughters of Puerto Rico to the greatness of this Nation.

THE REDUCTION IN MEDICARE OVERPAYMENT COSTS ACT OF 1997

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1997

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Reduction in Medicare Overpayment Costs Act of 1997, which imposes an administrative fee on providers who submit inaccurate Medicare claims.

The American taxpayer spends nearly $200 billion on Medicare every year. However, billions are lost due to inaccurate claims or overpayment. This burdens the Nation with serious financial costs, threatening the quality of medical care and endangering the long-term sustainability of the Medicare Program.

The Reduction in Medicare Overpayment Costs Act of 1997, which was introduced in the Senate by Senator MCCAIN, will help eliminate overpayments by imposing an administrative fee to offset recovery costs. The purpose is to discourage doctors from submitting false or misleading claims and to prevent hospitals from excessively overestimating Medicare costs.

The act promotes these purposes in three ways. First, the act imposes an up to 1 percent administrative fee if the repayment is more than 30 days late. Second, the act will impose an up to 1 percent administrative fee if the provider overestimates Medicare needs by greater than 30 percent. Third, the act requires the issuance of a report detailing which services typically result in overpayments.

This act is needed to crack down on incorrect or inflated claim practices in Medicare. I urge my fellow members to vote in favor of this bill to ensure claim accuracy by Medicare providers.

IN MEMORY OF SERGEANT MARLIN C. CARROLL

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1997

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I inform the House of the death of Sergeant Marlin C. Carroll of Warsaw, MO. Sergeant Carroll had a distinguished 30-year career in the Missouri State Highway Patrol before his retirement in 1988. I knew him as a friend, as a dedicated law enforcement officer, and as a man of honor and integrity.

Sgt. Carroll was born on a farm in Worth County, MO, in 1933, the son of Ralph Wayne and Aloha June Morin Carroll. He grew up in Worth County and graduated from Grant City High School in 1951. He married Gerry Heisman on May 18, 1952. He served his country with distinction in the U.S. Army and in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

In 1958, Sgt. Carroll joined the Missouri State Highway Patrol, and was stationed in my hometown of Lexington, MO. IN 1965, he received the American Red Cross Life Saving Award for his prompt and professional actions in rescuing a child from a life-threatening accident. In 1967, he was promoted to Corporal and transferred to Carrollton, MO, and in 1971, he was promoted to Sergeant and moved to Warsaw where he served as zone sergeant for Benton and Henry Counties until his retirement.

Sgt. Carroll was an active member of his community, and he will be missed by all who had the privilege to know him. I know the Members of the House will join me in extending heartfelt condolences to his family: his wife, Gerry: his daughter, Patty; his two sons, David and Eddie; his nine grandchildren and two great-grandchildren; and his mother, brother, and two sisters.

TRIBUTE TO BOB BLONSKI

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1997

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay heartfelt tribute to my long-time friend, Mr. Robert J. Blonski, of Milwaukee, who is leaving Lincoln Community Bank on July 1. After many years of dedicated service to Lincoln, Bob is moving on to new challenges as president of M&M Services, a subsidiary of Merchants and Manufacturers Bancorporation.

Bob and his wife, Kathleen, are the proud parents of two wonderful boys. Bob has diligently served as a member of my academy selection board, helping with the difficult and