two people over the years to make it all happen.

I ask my colleagues to join in thanking Gerry and Doris for their lengthy service and send them best wishes on the occasion of their retirement from service to their State and country.

ALICE ZABOROWSKI IN RECOGNITION OF HER WORK AS DISTRICT ONE PRESIDENT OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS LADIES AUXILIARY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 2000

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, today I pay a very special tribute to an outstanding individual from the state of Ohio. On Saturday, March 25, 2000, the Liberty Center Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 6596 and the Ladies Auxiliary Post 2898 will honor Alice Zaborowski for her work as District One President of the VFW Ladies Auxiliary.

Alice Zaborowski is a member of the VFW Auxiliary Post 2898 in Toledo, OH, and has served as 1999–2000 District One President. As District One President, Mrs. Zaborowski has jurisdiction and responsibility for managing 28 Ladies Auxiliaries in eight counties in Northwest Ohio.

Alice Zaborowski has served in various positions during her time with the Ladies Auxiliary. She has served as President of the George Rill VFW Auxiliary No. 606 three times. During that time, she gave unselfishly of her time to work for veterans in our area. She then transferred her membership to the Lucas County Auxiliary No. 2898 in Toledo where she is a Life Member and currently holds the office of Secretary.

Alice's commitment to our nation's veterans runs very deeply as her husband, Edward Zaborowski, is a World War II veteran. She has been very active in various VFW Auxiliary groups and gives freely of her time to many volunteer organizations. Clearly, Alice Zaborowski lives each day by the theme she employed during her Presidency—''Protect the rights of those who fought for our freedom.''

Mr. Speaker, our nation's veterans have paid the ultimate sacrifice in protecting the very freedom and liberty that we enjoy today. Alice Zaborowski has spent much of her life serving and working on behalf of our veterans. Her efforts are a true testament to her patriotism and her affection for those who served our country. I would urge the members of the 106th Congress to stand and join me in paying special tribute to District One President of the VFW Ladies Auxiliary, Alice Zaborowski. We thank her for all of her work and we wish her the very best in the future.

TRIBUTE TO ROSALIE GANN

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 2000

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished American and proud Californian, Rosalie Gann, on the occasion of her induction into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame.

Rosalie Gann began her volunteer service at the young age of thirteen as a Recreation Leader. As a Camp Fire Girl she was honored for her leadership in both service and citizenship oriented activities. While attending Mills College she established the Mills Community Outreach Corps, an organization which encourages Mills students to become involved in community action. She has also volunteered at Oakland Children's Hospital where she worked with chronically and terminally ill children.

Rosalie Gann has focused her professional life as an employee of Oracle Corporation on social welfare, championing community service through founding Oracle's Corporate Giving and Volunteer Programs. Because of Ms. Gann's leadership, Oracle's Corporate Giving Program has donated millions of dollars to causes that improve the quality of life of those whose communities are beset by problems and challenges. Oracle's Volunteer Program enables employees to donate service hours in the Bay Area and has recently expanded to other Oracle field offices.

In 1992, Rosalie Gann was honored as a San Mateo County Outstanding Volunteer for her work with the Center for Domestic Violence. Her vision for social change, her personal volunteer experiences and her professional achievements in corporate community relations serve as a role model for all women and our entire community.

Rosalie Gann's life of leadership and community involvement is instructive to us all. Her dedication to the ideals of democracy and community commitment stands tall. It is fitting that she has been chosen to be inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame and I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join me in honoring a great and good woman. We are indeed a better county, a better country and a better people because of her.

HONORING GENERAL WILLIAM F. MOORE ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE U.S. AIR FORCE

HON. CHARLES W. ''CHIP'' PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 2000

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and say farewell to a distinguished Air Force officer, Major General William F. Moore, upon his retirement from the Air Force after more than thirty years of commissioned service. Major General Moore has served with distinction, and it is my privilege to recognize this Meridian, Mississippi native for his many accomplishments, and to commend him for the superb service he provided to the Air Force and the Nation.

Major General Moore entered the United States Air Force Academy from Meridian, Mississippi in 1965. He received his commission as a Second Lieutenant in 1969 from the U.S. Air Force Academy. Since then, Major General Moore's assignments have made untold contributions to national security. Upon his graduation, General Moore served with the Drone and Remotely Piloted Vehicles System Program Office, Aeronautical Systems Division, at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. He subsequently served in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Development Plans, Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. In 1976, General Moore received a Master's Degree in Business Administration from the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia.

General Moore's career is reflective of his commitment to our country. He served as Executive Officer with the Peacekeeper ICBM Engineering Directorate in California, and as Director of Program Control for the Advanced Medium Range Air to Air Missile, at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. From there General Moore made many more contributions to our national security, serving as small ICBM Deputy Program Director, Norton Air Force Base, California, and deputy director of Strategic, Special Operations Forces and Airlift Programs, at the Pentagon, Washington, D.C. General Moore then served as the vice commander at San Antonio Air Logistics Center, Kelly Air Force Base, Texas. General Moore finished his illustrious career with another stay in Washington serving as the director of special programs in the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology and as the deputy director of Defense Threat Reduction Agency both at the Pentagon.

General Moore is a fully certified acquisition professional whose awards include two Defense Distinguished Service Medals, the Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal with service star, the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, and the Vietnam Service Medal.

During his long and distinguished career, General Moore served the nation with excellence and distinction. He is a visionary leader, and a true warrior who profoundly impacted the United States Air Force, and made significant contributions to the strategic defense of the United States and its allies.

General Moore will retire from the Air Force on May 1, 2000, after more than thirty years of exceptionally distinguished service. On behalf of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I would like to recognize this Meridian, Mississippi native for his accomplishments and his service. Congratulations on the completion of a long and distinguished career.

PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO SOUTH ASIA

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 2000

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Administration for its decision to travel to South Asia. I strongly share its position that closer ties with the countries of the region, particularly India, will greatly benefit the United States. The President will be visiting the home to one-fifth of the world population and home to the world's largest democracy—India. The Subcontinent is a strategic part of the world for the United States. I have encouraged the Administration to use this opportunity to send a clear and strong signal to underscore India's great potential to be a leader in the international community. The trip will pave the way for a stronger and enduring relationship that highlights our common democratic traditions and values.

For the past three decades, India and Pakistan have been engaged in a nuclear rivalry that reflects a long history of conflict including three wars and a long-standing territorial dispute over Kashmir. U.S. nonproliferation policy faces a major challenge as an all-out nuclear arms race threatens to break out in South Asia. For these reasons, I submit the following policy brief entitled, ''Preventing a Nuclear Arms Race in South Asia: U.S. Policy Options.'' This concise and insightful paper was written by David Cortright, guest lecturer in the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies of the University of Notre Dame, which is located in my district, and Samina Ahmed, fellow at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government.

Among its recommendations are that the United States demand that India and Pakistan both join the Non-Proliferation Treaty; that punitive sanctions, including curbs on the sale of military hardware and other technology, be deployed against those Indian and Pakistani entities responsible for the expansion of nuclear weapons programs; that such incentives as debt forgiveness and increased financial assistance for development programs in both countries be offered in exchange for concrete steps toward military and nuclear restraint; and that the U.S. fulfill the still unmet obligations to which it is committed by the NPT. I request that the enclosed copy be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to review these policy recommendations as the President prepares to visit South Asia in the coming weeks.

PREVENTING A NUCLEAR ARMS RACE IN SOUTH ASIA: U.S. POLICY OPTIONS

By Samina Ahmed and David Cortright

RECOMMENDATIONS

The United States must unequivocally demand that India and Pakistan join the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) as non-nuclear weapon states.

The United States should retain punitive sanctions which target Indian and Pakistani institutions and policymakers responsible for their nuclear weapons programs.

Targeted incentives should be provided that seek to diminish internal support for nuclear weapons in India and Pakistan.

The United States should fulfill its obligation under Article VI of the NPT to achieve global nuclear disarmament.

U.S. nonproliferation policy faces a major challenge as an all-out nuclear arms race threatens to break out in South Asia. An Indian draft nuclear doctrine released by an officially constituted advisory panel to the Indian National Security Council on August 17, 1999 envisages a nuclear triad in which nuclear weapons would be delivered by aircraft, submarines and mobile land-based ballistic missiles. While it is not certain that New Delhi will opt for such broad capabilities, the current direction of policy is clearly toward nuclear weapons deployment. Since Pakistan's nuclear policy is India-centric and reactive in nature, the introduction of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems within the Indian armed forces would greatly increase the likelihood of a retaliatory Pakistani deployment. Operational nuclear weapons and delivery systems will result in a South Asian nuclear arms race that could have serious consequences for regional stability, the stability of the Middle East, and global peace.

For the past three decades, India and Pakistan have been engaged in a nuclear rivalry that is both a symptom and a cause of their bilateral discord. India and Pakistan have a long history of conflict including three wars and a long-standing territorial dispute over Kashmir. Each Indian and Pakistani step up the nuclear ladder introduces new tensions in their troubled relationship. India's decision to acquire nuclear weapons and to demonstrate its nuclear weapons capability in 1974 resulted in the Pakistani adoption of a nuclear weapons program. As their nuclear weapons capabilities grew, so did their mutual suspicions and animosity. In May 1998 as India and Pakistan held nuclear tests, abandoning nuclear ambiguity for an overt nuclear weapon status, relations between the two states were seriously strained. From May to July 1999, India and Pakistan came perilously close to war during a major military clash near Kargil in the disputed territory of Kashmir, a conflict that had the potential of escalating into a nuclear exchange. Since mistrust and hostility continue to mar their relationship, as the recent controversy over the hijacked Indian airliner underscored, the potential for a conventional war remains high. Nuclear weapons deployment will fuel a nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan and at the same time heighten the chances of an intentional or inadvertent nuclear exchange.

Since a nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan will further destabilize a violent and conflict-prone region, there is a pressing need for the U.S. to dissuade India and Pakistan from deploying nuclear weapons and to reverse their nuclear course. Beyond the immediate threats posed by such an arms race to the one-fifth of humanity which resides within South Asia, nuclear weapons deployment in India and Pakistan would also have a far-reaching impact on the nuclear dynamics in the region and beyond, threatening vital U.S. national security interests. The deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems in Pakistan, for instance, would strengthen the position of nuclear advocates in neighboring Iran. The deployment of nuclear weapons and nuclear-capable ballistic missiles by India would influence China's nuclear doctrine. An India-Pakistan nuclear arms race could therefore result in a parallel Pakistan-Iran and Sino-Indian nuclear arms race. A South Asian nuclear arms race would also erode the global non-proliferation regime, embodied in the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), undermining the confidence of signatory states in the treaty's ability to buttress their security. For all these reasons, the U.S. must prevent the incipient nuclear arms competition in South Asia from becoming an all-out arms race.

U.S. POLICY AND NUCLEAR SOUTH ASIA

Some analysts and policymakers argue that the United States has failed to prevent nuclear proliferation in South Asia because of flawed policy directions and an over-reliance on sanctions as an instrument of U.S. influence. Since the initial U.S. emphasis on the rollback and elimination of Indian and Pakistani nuclear weapons capabilities failed to contain South Asian nuclear proliferation, these analysts contend, the U.S. should accept nuclear weapons in South Asia and adopt the more realistic goal of ''arms control,'' which merely seeks to limit their number and sophistication. According to this view, Washington should concentrate on encouraging India and Pakistan to refrain from a nuclear arms race and seeking ways to reduce the risk of nuclear war. At the same time, incentives should replace sanctions as the primary means of influence. U.S. interests would be best served, according to this view, by a policy of engagement with India and Pakistan that goes beyond the one-point agenda of nuclear non-proliferation.

To prevent India and Pakistan from embarking on a nuclear arms race, it is indeed important to examine the previous shortcomings of U.S. nonproliferation policy in South Asia and to identify alternative policy options. This must not mean, however, abandoning non-proliferation goals in favor of arms control. Any U.S. attempt to promote an India-Pakistan arms control regime is unlikely to succeed. Aside from the challenges posed by conventional and nuclear asymmetries between India and Pakistan and the integration of a reluctant China into a South Asian arms control arrangement, a formal India-Pakistan nuclear restraint regime requires at the very least the absence of war and a modicum of mutual trust. On the contrary, relations between India and Pakistan are shaped by an ongoing, decade-old, low-intensity conflict in the disputed territory of Kashmir and three near-war situations since the 1980s. It is imperative for the United States to dissuade India and Pakistan from going further down the nuclear road. Washington cannot achieve this goal through the abandonment of non-proliferation, and the tacit acceptance of India and Pakistan's nuclear weapons status.

Proliferation may have occurred already in South Asia, but India and Pakistan can be convinced to cap, rollback and even abandon their nuclear weapons programs if the reasons that prompted them to acquire nuclear weapons are addressed. Indian and Pakistani decisions to acquire nuclear weapons were the outcome of cost-benefit analyses of the presumed benefits of nuclearization. The United States can play a major role in influencing the present and future directions of nuclear proliferation in South Asia by convincing Indian and Pakistani decision makers that the costs of nuclearization far exceed its benefits. This will require clearly defined non-proliferation goals and the use of the most appropriate instruments to reverse the nuclear directions of India and Pakistan.

In the past, U.S. policy goals and objectives were contradictory. As a result, the tools of U.S. policy, sanctions or incentives, failed to dissuade Indian and Pakistani decision makers from pursuing their nuclear ambitions. Cold War strategic considerations often took precedence over non-proliferation objectives. U.S. policy shifted from elimination to rollback and then to the current emphasis on a cap on Indian and Pakistani nuclear weapons capabilities. Each shift in U.S. policy emboldened India and Pakistan's nuclear advocates.

Washington's use of policy instruments was also ineffective. Sanctions and incentives only succeed if they are properly targeted and consistently applied. These preconditions were not present in South Asia. Washington's reluctance to sanction India after its nuclear test in 1974 motivated Pakistan to follow the Indian nuclear example. In the 1980s Washington again sent the wrong signal to Indian and Pakistani decision makers. The United States not only failed to sanction Pakistan for its nuclear development but showered billions of dollars of military aid on the Zia ul Haq dictatorship as part of the struggle against Soviet involvement in Afghanistan. In the 1990s Washington offered incentives to India and Pakistan to encourage nuclear restraint, despite accumulating evidence of each country's continuing nuclear weapons development.

Following the May 1998 nuclear tests in South Asia, Washington imposed mandatory sanctions on India and Pakistan and identified five benchmarks for their removal: curbs on the further development or deployment of nuclear-capable missiles and aircraft, Indian and Pakistani accession to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), participation in Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT) negotiations, curbs on the transfer of nuclear

technology and hardware, and an India-Pakistan dialogue on normalization of relations. The imposition of sanctions initially led to Indian and Pakistani concessions, including their declared willingness to accede to the CTBT and the resumption of an India-Pakistan dialogue. The United States subsequently failed to sustain these punitive measures, however. India and Pakistan backed away from their earlier pledges to join the CTBT, while their normalization dialogue became the casualty of the May-July 1999 undeclared war in Kashmir and the presence of hardline governments in both states.

With tensions in South Asia remaining high, the United States must clearly state its opposition to the presence of nuclear weapons in South Asia. Washington must demonstrate its resolve through targeted, consistently applied sanctions and incentives designed to influence the cost-benefit analysis of Indian and Pakistani nuclear decision makers. A failure to do so will result in the deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems in India and Pakistan and the likelihood of the first use of nuclear weapons since 1945.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In its policy toward India and Pakistan, the United States must unequivocally demand that India and Pakistan join the NPT as non-nuclear-weapon states. The current U.S. emphasis on South Asian nuclear restraint is being misconstrued or deliberately misrepresented by the Indian and Pakistani governments as a tacit acceptance of their nuclear weapons status.

2. In an amendment contained in the U.S. Defense Appropriations Bill, Congress has given the President indefinite waiver authority to lift military and economic sanctions, including those imposed automatically under earlier legislation on Pakistan and India. This waiver authority must be used judiciously. Broad and sweeping economic sanctions that adversely affect the weaker segments of Indian and Pakistani society should be removed. But Washington should retain those punitive measures that target Indian and Pakistani institutions and policymakers responsible for their nuclear weapons programs. These include curbs on the sale and supply of military hardware to Pakistan, the transfer of dual-use technology to India, and military and scientific exchanges with nuclear entities and actors in both states.

3. Targeted incentives should be provided, conditional on progress towards non-proliferation, that would seek to diminish internal support for nuclear weapons in India and Pakistan. These could include the partial forgiveness of India and Pakistan's external debt, increased U.S. assistance for social sector development, and enhanced U.S. support for developmental loans and credits from international financial institutions to India and Pakistan. Such assistance should be linked to concrete steps toward military and nuclear restraint.

4. In re-committing itself to the goals of non-proliferation, the United States should fulfill its own obligation, under Article VI of the NPT, to achieve global nuclear disarmament. This will encourage the advocates of denuclearization in both India and Pakistan and strengthen the norm against the development and use of nuclear weapons not only in South Asia but throughout the world.

CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY OF VIRGINIA CELEBRATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TOM BLILEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 2000

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Children's Home Society of Virginia was chartered in 1900 by an act of the Virginia General Assembly and is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year. When Children's Home Society of Virginia began its work, orphaned children were numerous. The society's founders believed that the dependent and neglected children of the Commonwealth would be better off in a family situation than in alms houses or orphanages. The stated purpose was for ''finding homes for homeless, indigent, or dependent poor children in the State of Virginia, and other purposes incident thereto.'' This belief continues to inspire the work of Children's Home Society of Virginia today.

In the society's early days, children came to us through court commitment or direct parental release. The first head of the society, the Reverend William J. Maybee, described its work as being ''on behalf of the most dependent, the most unfortunate, and the most deserving children, including orphans, half orphans, abandoned and grossly abused.'' And he stated furthermore that, ''civilization may be quite correctly measured by their treatment of childhood.''

By the 1940's the programs had changed from primarily boarding care for dependent and neglected children to a specialized adoption program for children under 2 years of age. The staff, initially comprised of untrained ''family visitors'' had become a staff of trained social workers.

During the 1970's the society began to see its major initiatives as adoption services, pregnancy counseling, and foster care. There was also a movement to a new policy of accepting infants over the age of 6 months as well as the placing of children of minority or mixed racial background into adoptive homes. In the 1980's and 1990's Children Home Society began to work on behalf of many special medical-needs children, and was successful in placing them into new homes.

Children's Home Society of Virginia will celebrate 100 years of service to the children of Virginia this year. As the needs of children have changed since 1900, the services of Children's Home Society have changed to meet those needs. The agency is devoting more and more of its resources to the care and adoptive placement of children with special needs—babies with medical problems, older children, sibling groups, and infants and youngsters of mixed race. I am pleased to report the Children's Home Society is working in a collaborative effort with Chesterfield County Department of Social Services to place older children and teenagers into loving homes.

One of the most successful stories Children's Home Society of Virginia can share is a 100 percent success rate—every child that has come into their care has been placed into a permanent home. If a child needed to be placed in foster care, the average duration has been 85 days—far below the national average. Children's Home Society of Virginia looks forward to meeting the special needs of children in the 21st century and I commend them for their 100 years of hard work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HELEN CHENOWETH-HAGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 2000

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 2000, I missed three rollcall votes at the end of the day because of unavoidable obligations in Idaho. Had I been present, I have voted ''nay'' on rollcall vote 53 (Mr. BOEHLERT's substitute amendment to H.R. 2372), ''nay'' on rollcall vote 54 (on motion to recommit with instructions), and ''yea'' on rollcall vote 55 (on passage of H.R. 2372).

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. FULLER IN RECOGNITION OF HIS WORK AS DISTRICT ONE COMMANDER OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 2000

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great pleasure today to pay special tribute to an outstanding individual from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. On Saturday, March 25, 2000, Robert E. Fuller will be honored for his work as District One Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America.

Robert Fuller was elected as District One VFW Commander for 1999–2000. During his tenure as District One Commander, he has unselfishly given of his time to benefit our nation's veterans. Commander Fuller holds responsibility for directing forty-two VFW Posts in Northwest Ohio. A lifelong resident of Henry County, he has spent much of his life working for the benefit of his friends, neighbors, and fellow veterans.

Robert Fuller served in the United States Army from 1951–1954. His service took him to Korea, where he served with the 23rd Regiment of the 2nd Indian Head Division from 1952–1953. For his honorable military service, Commander Fuller earned the Combat Infantry Badge, the National Defense Medal, the U.N. Service Medal, and the Korean Service Medal with three Bronze Stars, the Good Conduct Medal, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation with two overseas bars. After returning from Korea, Mr. Fuller joined VFW Post 6596 in Liberty Center, Ohio, and became a Life Member in 1986.

Mr. Speaker, Robert Fuller has served in many positions within the VFW ranks including Post Commander, Hospital Chairman, and District Chaplain. Mr. Fuller is also a Life Member of the American Legion, AMVETS Post 1313, and the VFW National Home for the children of deceased or disabled Veterans. Commander Fuller chose ''Second to None'' as his theme for 1999–2000. His efforts and work on behalf of veterans indicate that he carries those words with him every day.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans put their lives on the line and are called upon to make the supreme sacrifice in the preservation of freedom.