

of the California State Democratic Party; member of the Democratic County Central Committee; and an executive board member of the California Democratic State Party and the Wilshire Community Police Council.

John is the recipient of numerous awards for his many contributions to the citizens of Los Angeles, including community service awards presented by Assemblywoman Gwen Moore, and Councilman Holden, respectively; the Outstanding Community Service Award, presented by the National Black Police Association, region 5; Member of the Year Award from the New Frontier Democratic Club; and Member of the Year in the 49th and 53d Assembly Districts Awards, presented by the Los Angeles County Democratic Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my sincere pleasure to count John and his lovely wife, Susie, as my friends for many years. And it is especially fitting that a dinner is being held in John's honor to commend him on a fine record of service to the community. I am especially pleased to join in that tribute and to have this opportunity to pay tribute to John on this happy occasion. Please join me in extending to John and Susie best wishes for a retirement that is rich with happiness and full of prosperity.

TRIBUTE TO BRIG. GEN.  
SEBASTIAN F. COGLITORE, USAF

**HON. ANDREA H. SEASTRAND**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 17, 1995*

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, a friend of the Congress and a long-time leader in this Nation's space programs is retiring from the U.S. Air Force on February 1 of this year, Brig. Gen. Sebastian Coglitore. His most recent position has been as the director of space programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Washington, DC. In this position he has provided leadership and program management direction for development and procurement of all Air Force satellites and launch systems and the related ground infrastructure including communications, navigation, surveillance, weather, radar, and command and control systems.

General Coglitore has had a distinguished career of nearly 30 years of military service. After being commissioned through the New Jersey Institute of Technology Reserve Officer Training Corps Program in August 1965, he started his military career as a deputy missile combat crew commander for the Minuteman Intercontinental Ballistic Missile System at Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND. His last two decades of service have contributed directly to the success of the Department of Defense's space programs in both development and operations. General Coglitore was program manager of the first Department of Defense spacecraft to fly on the space shuttle and later, as the program manager for the United States largest space booster, the Titan IV, he led the Department's efforts to return to space after the *Challenger* disaster. His many tours of duty at the Pentagon included being deputy to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Space Plans and Policy and being military assistant for space to the Secretary of the Air Force. He also held the position of

command director at the NORAD Command Center, Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Base, CO. Before returning to the Pentagon in August 1993 he was the Commander of Space Command's 30th Space Wing and Director of the Western Range, Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA, where he was responsible for all west coast launch operations.

General Coglitore has received numerous awards and decorations, including the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, the Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, the Air Force Commendation Medal with oak leaf cluster, and most recently the Distinguished Service Medal, the citation of which is reprinted below.

General Coglitore plans to continue his work in space programs in a civilian capacity, but has not yet picked a specific location. On behalf of my colleagues and the congressional staff who have known and worked with General Coglitore we wish him and his wife Reggi the very best in their future endeavors.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO SEBASTIAN F. COGLITORE

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress July 9, 1918, awards the Distinguished Service Medal to Brigadier General Sebastian F. Coglitore for exceptionally meritorious service in a duty of great responsibility. General Coglitore distinguished himself as Director of Space Programs, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, the Pentagon, Washington, District of Columbia, from 20 July 1993 to 31 January 1995. In this important assignment, the forceful leadership and dedicated efforts of General Coglitore were significantly displayed in the research, development, and acquisition of space systems that are critical elements of the future operational effectiveness of the United States Air Force. The singularly distinctive accomplishments of General Coglitore culminate a distinguished career in the service of his country and reflect the highest credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

PUBLIC OPINION ON NUCLEAR  
WEAPONS ISSUES

**HON. ELIZABETH FURSE**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 17, 1995*

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, 1995 is a very important year for the issue of nuclear testing. The U.N. Conference on Disarmament will resume negotiations January 30 on a comprehensive test ban treaty [CTB].

Failure to make significant progress toward a CTB before the Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT] Extension Conference in April could jeopardize the future of the NPT, which is a vital check on the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world. The new Congress must provide the strong bipartisan political support necessary to expand efforts to halt nuclear proliferation and achieve a CTB.

A new poll shows that almost 80 percent of the American people believe that reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now should be an important priority for the U.S. Government. The overwhelming majority favor more aggressive arms control measures. These results were true for Republican, Independent and Democratic voters alike.

The national poll of 1,011 Americans revealed that: 90 percent favor further cuts in the world's total of nuclear weapons; 82 percent favor a global ban on all nuclear tests; and 82 percent favor eliminating all or most nuclear weapons.

Some 80 percent of Republican voters favor a test ban, as do 85 percent of Democratic voters and 81 percent of Independents. Similarly, 90 percent of all three voter groups favor further cuts in nuclear weapons, with 81 percent of Republicans opting for eliminating all, almost all or a lot of the weapons, compared to 84 percent of the Democrats and 83 percent of the Independents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert the poll's findings in the RECORD. We need to listen to our constituents and get on with ridding the world of the scourge of nuclear weapons.

PUBLIC OPINION ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS  
ISSUES—DECEMBER 30, 1994—JANUARY 3, 1995

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A new poll shows that almost 80 percent of the American people believe that reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now should be an important priority for the US government (with 56% saying it was a very important priority). The overwhelming majority favor aggressive arms control measures over the current policies, with lesser majorities supporting building a missile defense system or increasing defense spending. These results were true for republican, independent and democratic voters alike.

The national poll of 1,011 Americans asked about specific policy options:

90 percent favor further cuts in the world's total of nuclear weapons (72% strongly in favor).

82 percent favor a global ban on all nuclear tests (with 56% strongly in favor).

82 percent favor eliminating all or most nuclear weapons.

68 percent favor trying to build a theater anti-missile system for troops (43% strongly favor).

64 percent favor trying to building a global anti-missile system for the US (38% strongly favor).

54 percent favor increasing the US military budget (32% strongly favor).

80% of republican voters favor a test ban, as do 85% of democratic voters and 81 percent of independents. Similarly, 90% of all three voter groups favor further cuts in nuclear weapons, with 81% of republicans opting for eliminating all, almost all or a lot of the weapons, compared to 84% of the democrats and 83% of the independents.

Given a choice, 58 percent favor eliminating all nuclear arms in the world rather than for a few countries, including the United States, having nuclear weapons so no other nation would dare attack or while trying to keep the rest of the world from getting them. Only 40 percent supported the current policy of a few countries in the world having nuclear weapons.

Sixty-three percent say they had read or heard little or nothing about President Clinton's policies on nuclear weapons. Fewer than half (45%) said they were satisfied with the President's actions to reduce the danger of nuclear weapons, with 42 percent saying they were dissatisfied.

The poll was conducted of 1011 Americans over age 18 December 30 through January 3, 1995, by ICR Survey Research Group, which does polling for the Associated Press, The Washington Post, and others. The margin of error is +/- 3.1 percent (at the 95% level of confidence, according to standard polling practice.)

## MASTER QUESTIONNAIRE

[Field dates: Dec. 30, 1994–Jan. 3, 1995]

Note: The following precautions were taken to minimize the effect of bias by averaging out small, deliberate biases introduced in question pre-ambles and response choices. This method also serves to prove that small biases do produce comfortingly small changes in the response statistics, so that the resulting averages not only probably produce less bias than the older method of survey design where preambles and response menu choices introduced by the survey designers are not tested at all. The new method also brackets the effect of bias, and often shows how little dependent on wording-bias responses are, and when they do occur what the exceptions to that rule are and how they arise: Questions were read in the order presented to both half samples. Q1 is identical to Q2 except Q1 has a more "comforting" introduction and Q2 has a more "alarming" introduction. Questions were read to half sample A as presented here. Half sample B had the "comforting" and "alarming" introductions [the words in brackets, like these] interchanged in Q1 and Q2. Half sample B in Q3 and Q8 were read the response choices in reverse order, and half samples A and B in Q12 tested the support for two strong but different reasons for not aiming toward the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

First a little background—

1. (half sample A). [The nuclear arms race has substantially diminished and many nuclear weapons have been eliminated in the last five years.] Should reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now be an important priority for the U.S. government or NOT an important priority? Is that very or somewhat important/unimportant?

Very important, 46%; Somewhat important, 30%; Somewhat unimportant, 17%; Very unimportant, 4%; and DK/NA, 3%.

Important 76%; Unimportant 21%.

1. (half sample B). Very important, 60%; Somewhat important, 21%; Somewhat unimportant, 10%; Very unimportant, 6%; and DK/NA, 3%.

Important 81%; Unimportant 18%.

2. (half sample A). It is also true that [the U.S. Russia still have many thousands of nuclear weapons. Terrorists could buy or steal nuclear weapons from a nuclear state. And other nations such as Iraq and North Korea may be building nuclear bombs.] Knowing that, I'd like to ask you again: Should reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now be an important priority for the U.S. government or NOT an important priority? Is that very or somewhat important/unimportant?

Very important, 61%; Somewhat important, 18%; Somewhat unimportant, 14%; Very unimportant, 5%; and DK/NA, 2%.

Important 79%; Unimportant 19%.

2. (half sample B). Very important, 58%; Somewhat important, 24%; Somewhat unimportant; 11%; Very unimportant, 5%; and DK/NA, 1%.

Important 82%; Unimportant 16%.

Average of four: Q1 and Q2 responses, A and B samples:

Should reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now be an important priority for the U.S. government or NOT an important priority? Is that very or somewhat important/unimportant?

Very important, 56%; Somewhat important; 23%; Somewhat unimportant, 13%; Very unimportant, 5%; and DK/NA, 2%.

Important 79%; Unimportant 18%.

3. How concerned are you that renegade countries or terrorist groups could get nuclear weapons?

Extremely, 21%; Very, 40%; Somewhat, 28%; Not very, 8%; Not at all, 2%; and DK/NA, 0%.

4. How much have you read or heard about President Clinton's policies on nuclear weapons?

A lot, 7%; Some, 30%; Just a little, 37%; Nothing, 26%; and DK/NA, 0%.

5. Are you satisfied with what President Clinton has done to reduce the danger of nuclear weapons?

Extremely, 3%; Very, 9%; and Somewhat, 33%.

Total satisfied, 45%.

Extremely, 6%; Very, 13%; Somewhat, 23%; and DK/NA, 13%.

Total dissatisfied, 42%.

Now some suggestions for dealing with nuclear weapons—

6. Do you favor or oppose the U.S. negotiating an international agreement to end all nuclear test explosion?

Strongly, 56%; and Somewhat, 26%.

Total favor, 82%.

Strongly, 7%; Somewhat, 8%; and, DK/NA, 3%.

Total oppose, 15%.

7. Do you favor or oppose negotiating an agreement where all nations with nuclear weapons agree to further reduce the world's total stockpile of nuclear weapons?

Strongly, 72%; and Somewhat, 19%.

Total favor, 90%.

Strongly, 4%; Somewhat, 3%; and DK/NA, 3%.

Total oppose, 7%.

8. [Asked of 90.4% who favor in Q7] Reduce the world's nuclear weapons stockpile how much? Of those asked:—

A little, 7%; A lot, 26%; Almost complete, 27%; Completely, 39%; and DK/NA, 2%.

Of total sample:—

Eliminate completely, 35%; Eliminate almost completely, 24%; Reduce a lot, 24%; Reduce a little, 6%; Oppose reduction (from Q7), 7%; and DK/NA (Total of Q7 and Q8), 4%.

Total reduce a lot, complete or almost, 82%.

9. Do you favor or oppose increasing the U.S. military budget?

Strongly, 32%, Somewhat, 21%.

Total favor, 54%.

Strongly, 22%, Somewhat, 21% and, DK/NA, 3%.

Total oppose, 43%.

10. Do you favor or oppose building an anti-missile system to protect the overseas troops of the U.S. and its allies from nuclear missile attack?

Strongly, 43%; and Somewhat, 25%.

Total favor, 68%.

Strongly, 12%, Somewhat, 15%; and, DK/NA, 4%.

Total oppose, 27%.

11. In addition, some say we need a new anti-missile system to protect the U.S. from accidental launches, unauthorized launches and threats of attack from third world nations. Others say that such systems will be expensive, will work poorly—in some circumstances not at all—and would sooner or later violate our ABM treaty obligations. Do you approve or disapprove of trying to build an anti-missile system that will try to shoot down missiles launched at the U.S.?

Strongly approve, 38%; and Somewhat approve, 26%.

Total approve, 64%.

Strongly disapprove, 19%; Somewhat disapprove, 13%; and DK/NA, 4%.

Total disapprove, 32%.

12. (A half sample) As a general goal, which of these two things do you think is more desirable—

1. The elimination of all nuclear arms in the world, 55%; or

2. For a few countries, including the U.S. to have enough nuclear arms so no country would dare attack them, 44%; and

3. DK/NA, 1%.

12. (B half sample). As a general goal, which of these two things do you think is more desirable—

1. The elimination of all nuclear arms in the world, 60%; or

2. For a few countries, including the U.S. to have nuclear arms, while trying to keep the rest of the world from getting them, 36%; and

3. DK/NA, 0%.

## A DUAL IN THE DEFICIT WAR

## HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the January 15 Rocky Mountain News editorial, "A Dud in the Deficit War."

The dud in question is the much-ballyhooed balanced budget amendment. The Rocky counsels that the "Republicans would better spend their time devising real cuts in real programs and leave the hocus pocus to Barnum and Bailey."

I'm afraid, however, that the Rocky's call for real cuts in real programs is falling on unreceptive ears. One of our distinguished Republican budget-cutters recently launched an assault on the deficit by proposing the elimination of the Board of Tea Tasters.

## A DUD IN THE DEFICIT WAR

The issue: The balanced budget amendment.

Our view: Sounds good, but probably wouldn't work.

The centerpiece of the Republican Party's Contract With America promises a line-item veto and a balanced budget amendment. The veto is a good idea, nearly everyone agrees, but the same cannot be said for the budget amendment, even if the principle behind it attracts the supports of 80% of Americans.

Few would deny that the idea of making the federal government spend no more than it takes in is pleasing to the ear. That, after all, is the economic philosophy private citizens ignore at their peril, at least in the long run. There was a time, in fact, when the idea of running a deficit in peacetime was thought to reflect a sort of moral shortcoming.

Yet there are several problems with the GOP's amendment. While the amendment promises to lock the government into a balanced budget and, in fact, outlaw deficits, a quick look at the not-so-fine type finds king-sized loopholes. By the mere act of securing a three-fifths vote, Congress can bust the budget with joyful abandon. We're not talking about wartime emergencies, which would suspend the amendment in order to allow for rapid increases in defense spending. No, the three-fifths vote looms like a bottle in a "reformed" drunk's basement—a strong temptation to backsliding.

Another ploy to get around the amendment's demands would be to use unrealistic budget assumptions and balance the budget merely on paper, a trick any politician who has been in Washington 15 minutes knows how to perform. There is also an element of deception in the fact that the amendment applies only to the formal budget document, not the actual operating budget.

A larger concern comes from state governments, which fear, for no little reason, that Washington's strapped politicians will pass on the cost of programs to them. Clearly enough, it is a great deal easier for Washington to force states to take up the slack than