Lieutenant Sloane and the wonderful legacy of his memory, known to us today as the Cathedral of the Pines.

A TRIBUTE TO RETIRING POLICE OFFICER AND DETECTIVE, MR. CHARLES MEIER

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute and pay tribute to an extraordinary leader, Detective Charles Meier, who has worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life for all New Yorkers throughout his tenure as a police officer. While growing up in Marine Park, Brooklyn, Mr. Meier quickly learned the rules of his neighborhood streets well enough to understand the undertones of issues facing his community.

Once joining the 79th precinct of the New York City Police Department, Charlie solidified his commitment to fighting crime, resulting in a long and honorable career. He patrolled his beat on foot and by scooter for over 9 years. After showing unwavering devotion to law enforcement, Charlie was selected to work as an Aerial Observer in the aviation unit. He soon came back to the force and worked at the 67th precinct and then to the 63d and stayed for over 11 years. Charlie's work was regarded so highly, that he was awarded the esteemed position of Detective Specialist for the New York City Police Department.

Few New Yorkers have contributed to the quality of life in New York as much as Charlie. Upon his retirement this year, Charlie will be lauded for his achievements as a dedicated law enforcement official in one of the most challenging cities in America for law enforcement. On behalf of the law enforcement community across the Nation, I applaud Mr. Meier for remaining on the force 32 years. He serves as a role model to us all. May God wish him well upon his retirement.

THE AMERICAN PROMISE

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1995

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, what is the American promise? It is as diverse as Americans themselves. Each of us defines it in our own way, based on our own experiences. Some call it freedom; some call it individual rights; some believe it's passing on a legacy to their community.

The upcoming PBS special, the American Promise, seeks to remind us of these commitments, to help us remember what made America great, to give our children a better understanding of American democracy in action. During the 3-hour program, stories of community spirit and involvement come to life, through real life stories currently being played out and through reenactments of significant events in American history.

One of these recreations describes how a French aristocrat, Alexis de Tocqueville, first viewed our infant democracy in 1831. De Tocqueville was one of the first Europeans to recognize how different America was from other democratic republics. The series' producers went to Mystic, CT, in my district, to recreate the scene of de Tocqueville marvelling at the busy seaport. Noting the clipper ships in port and the energy and enterprise of their crews, de Tocqueville determined that in a free country, all is activity and bustle, and that such energy in the conduct of commerce typifies our democracy.

America's rush to prosper financially was reflected in other areas of life as well; in the whirlwind of American grassroots politics and the restless activity and energy of civil society. Americans were constantly involved in all facets of public life. According to de Tocqueville, Americans deprived of such involvement and reduced to occupying themselves only with their own affairs would become incredibly unhappy. He believed that no country could work harder to be fulfilled.

This attitude, de Tocqueville claimed, was a direct result of the nature of American freedom. Freedom's achievement must be to forge common bonds, a common purpose. We must learn what de Tocqueville called the habits of the democratic heart, the balance between individual concerns and collective thought and action.

The American Promise, which airs October 1, 2, and 3, shows us that the nature of American freedom has not changed very much over the years. We may have to look harder for it because stories of carving a carousel as a community project and channeling graffiti artists into painting murals that celebrate the community do not often make front page news. The promise is still alive but must be nurtured in each individual and in every community.

I applaud PBS and the series underwriters, the Farmers Insurance Group of Companies, for bringing the American Promise to television. This partnership reflects de Tocqueville's theory of public spirit in America, where individuals are as interested in the public good as well as their own, and where each person takes an active part in the government of society.

THE WRONG MESSAGE TO PAKISTAN

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1995

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last week the other body, the Senate, approved a provision to the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill that would permit the transfer to military equipment to the Government of Pakistan. This provision was not included in the House version of the bill, and it is my strong belief that the conferees should not adopt this provision in the conference report.

The provision adopted last week, if enacted into law, amounts to a waiver of the Pressler amendment, named for the Senator who sponsored this provision which became law 10 years ago. This law prohibits U.S. military aid to Pakistan if the President cannot certify that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device. President Bush invoked the law in 1990 when it became abundantly clear that Pakistan was not in compliance with this provision of American law. Nothing has changed in the last 5 years. Indeed, supporters of this provision do not claim that Pakistan is now in compliance with U.S. conditions. Their argument, rather, seems to be that we should provide the arms in spite of Pakistan's flouting of the U.S. conditions.

Mr. Speaker, this arms transfer would have the effect of undermining the ongoing commitment of the United States to nuclear nonproliferation. It would also heighten regional instability in South Asia. And it would send the message that countries that disregard clearly stated U.S. conditions for aid can simply ignore those conditions and ultimately be rewarded.

Mr. Speaker, The New York Times on Saturday, September 21, 1995, published the following editorial, which very concisely sums up why this arms package should not be adopted as part of the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

THE WRONG MESSAGE TO PAKISTAN

In an unfortunate reversal, the Senate voted on Thursday to lift some of the military sanctions that were imposed on Pakistan five years ago. Pakistan has made no concessions to American requests that it cap its secret nuclear weapons program, and until it does so, and allows verification, it should not be the beneficiary of American military aid or be allowed to buy American military hardware.

South Asia has long been considered one of the most dangerous regions in the world for nuclear proliferation. India has tested a nuclear bomb and Pakistan wants to match its capability.

The Clinton Administration has concluded that Pakistan's secular, relatively democratic government should be supported. That is fair enough. But the way to do so is not with the military assistance program advanced by the White House and approved by the Senate. It would allow delivery of $368 million in military equipment to the Government of Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto.

Relations between Washington and Islamabad have been tense since 1990 after Pakistan violated its promises and began stockpiling nuclear materials and the United States refused to deliver 28 F–16A fighter planes that Pakistan paid for in 1988. That decision was part of a ban on military assistance to Pakistan imposed to discourage its development of nuclear weapons. The Senate would now allow reimbursement to Pakistan for the planes, which is a reasonable compromise. But the loosening of sanctions should have stopped there.

To resume military aid to a country that is secretly developing nuclear weapons and defying American nonproliferation policy makes no sense. American intelligence agencies have concluded that Pakistan possesses M–11 missiles acquired from China that can carry nuclear warheads.

The Clinton Administration could have improved relations with Pakistan by simply removing the barriers to economic aid. A poor country, Pakistan already directs too many of its resources towards the military, at the expense of its citizens.

The Senate measure was passed as part of the foreign aid bill. No similar provision exists in the House version. The House should not accept the Senate measure when it comes time to reconcile the bills. The United States should not be contributing to an arms race on the subcontinent.