

half of all family violence, most of it directed against women. And over 30% of all child abuse cases involve a parent using illegal drugs. Legalizing drugs will mean more violence against women and children.

Today, one third of the young people attending high school in our country smoke marijuana. It's no wonder our education system is a mess.

The high school dropout rate in the United States is over 25 percent, and 50 percent in major cities. A recent study of 11th graders showed that over half of the drug users dropped out—twice the rate of those drug-free.

Drugs rob kids of their motivation and self-esteem, leaving them unable to concentrate and indifferent to learning. Millions of these kids end up on welfare or in prison. Drug abuse in the workplace, violence against women and children, welfare dependency, high dropout rates, escalating health care costs, crack babies * * * could it get any worse?

If we legalized drugs it would get much worse! These problems are all interrelated and all have one thing in common. That common denominator is drug abuse. Legalizing drugs would be to say that all of this is acceptable * * * it is not acceptable.

Legislation I have introduced will send a strong and long overdue message to the young people in this country—Under no circumstances is the United States Congress ever * * * ever going to legalize drugs.

I have also introduced legislation aimed at reducing the demand for illegal drugs. Decreasing the desire for these substances is essential in safeguarding the most important things to all Americans: our children and families, our safety and our health and the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that police chiefs across the United States believe that the number one way to reduce crime is to reduce drug use. The fact is that mandatory minimum drug penalties put in place in 1988 was followed by the Nation's largest decrease in drug use.

It is a myth that many non-violent first time drug offenders are overcrowding our prisons. A comprehensive study by the Department of Justice found that 93 percent of state prisoners were either violent or repeat offenders, two thirds are currently in prison for a violent crime.

It is also a myth that drug arrests are overwhelming our prison systems. The fact is that drug arrests have been decreasing since 1989 and only make up 8 percent of all arrests nationwide. Despite lengthy sentences, the average Federal convicted drug possessor serves only 8 months.

The fact is that drug sentencing is still inadequate and that the last thing this Congress should consider is the repeal of mandatory minimum sentencing. Drug use and drug addiction cause most of the violence in this country and contribute to virtually every social, health and economic problem we face. And according to the most recent reports, hospital emergency room visits caused by illegal drugs are up again.

The fact is that the trend toward increased drug use in this country corresponds directly to President Clinton's term of office. For whatever reason, this President is either unable or unwilling to address this crisis. As a result,

millions of young people and their families are suffering.

This President has failed to come to grips with the fact that only one person in this country has the authority—the Office of the President—to reverse the worsening downward spiral of drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I am honestly willing to work with President Clinton to address this problem. And I commend Congressman Zeliff for establishing this working group. He has presented the President a golden opportunity to work effectively with Congress in a bipartisan manner. All we are missing now is a serious commitment from the President.

COLUMNIST GEORGE F. WILL, A
NATIONAL TREASURE

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the work of Pulitzer Prize winning columnist and author, George F. Will. In him, Mr. Speaker I believe we have a national treasure. Time and again by his labors at the keypad Mr. Will has shown himself to be a man of great insight and depth. I believe him to be among that rarest of rare breeds—an original thinker. The concision and clarity with which he transforms those thoughts to the written word evidences a deep commitment on his part to understand and illuminate the human condition. His will to toil year after year so that others might not be lead astray by intellectual fads or fallacious reasoning is a model to all who would seek to shape the course of public life. Anyone willing to give his work a fair reading will find each week some troubling societal question logically explored, element by element and ultimately reduced to its essence without rancor or sentimentality.

I became a fan of George F. Will many years ago when the writer and father in him came together in a gloriously uncompartimentalized way to render an unambiguous rebuke to anyone who might doubt the quality of a life lived at less than physical perfection. With a few deft paragraphs Mr. Will wrote of his own son's enormous capacity to love and be loved. He explained that his "Oriole fan", despite whatever limitations Downs Syndrome had placed on him, could experience the joys and tragedies of life in the same way we all do—mostly through things as common as baseball. The boy was fully alive, fully human and perfectly formed in the image of God. It is my belief, Mr. Speaker that no writer in our land of literary greatness could deliver this urgent message with more force and grace than Mr. Will. It is clear that we are truly blessed as a nation to have him.

It is also obvious that despite the passing decades Mr. Will has not lost any of the, above-described commitment to his craft. His most recent Newsweek column is another fine example of all that is good and true about his work. And so Mr. Speaker, I enter that essay into the RECORD so that Mr. Will's own words can testify to the greatness of this decent, courageous and talented American.

FANATICS FOR "CHOICE"

(By George F. Will)

Americans are beginning to recoil against the fanaticism that has helped to produce

this fact: more than a quarter of all American pregnancies are ended by abortions. Abundant media attention has been given to the extremism that has tainted the right-to-life movement. Now events are exposing the extraordinary moral evasions and callousness characteristic of fanaticism, prevalent in the abortion-rights lobby.

Begin with "partial-birth abortions." Pro-abortion extremists object to that name, preferring "intact dilation and evacuation," for the same reason the pro-abortion movement prefers to be called "pro-choice." What is "intact" is a baby. During the debate that led to House passage of a ban on partial-birth abortions, the right-to-life movement was criticized for the sensationalism of its print advertisements featuring a Dayton nurse's description of such an abortion:

"The mother was six months pregnant. The baby's heartbeat was clearly visible on the ultrasound screen. The doctor went in with forceps and grabbed the baby's legs and pulled them down into the birth canal. Then he delivered the baby's body and the arms—everything but the head. The doctor kept the baby's head just inside the uterus. The baby's little fingers were clapping and unclapping and his feet were kicking. Then the doctor stuck the scissors through the back of his head, and the baby's arms jerked out in a flinch, a startle reaction, like a baby does when he thinks that he might fall. The doctor opened up the scissors, stuck a high-powered suction tube into the opening and sucked the baby's brains out."

To object to this as sensationalism is to say that discomforting truths should be suppressed. But increasingly the language of pro-abortion people betrays a flinching from facts. In a woman's story about her chemical abortion, published last year in *Mother Jones* magazine, she quotes her doctor as saying, "By Sunday you won't see on the monitor what we call the heartbeat." "What we call"? In partial-birth abortions the birth is kept (just barely) partial to preserve the legal fiction that a baby (what some pro-abortion people call "fetal material") is not being killed. An abortionist has told *The New York Times* that some mothers find such abortions comforting because after the killing, the small body can be "dressed and held" so the (if pro-abortionists will pardon the expression) mother can "say goodbye." *The New York Times* reports, "Most of the doctors interviewed said they saw no moral difference between dismembering the fetus within the uterus and partially delivering it, intact, before killing it." Yes.

Opponents of a ban on partial-birth abortions say almost all such abortions are medically necessary. However, an abortionist at the Dayton clinic is quoted as saying 80 percent are elective. Opponents of a ban on such abortions assert that the baby is killed before the procedure, by the anesthesia given to the mother. (The baby "undergoes demise," in the mincing words of Kate Michelman of the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. Does Michelman say herbicides cause the crab grass in her lawn to "undergo demise"? Such Orwellian language is a sure sign of squeamishness.) However, the president of the American Society of Anesthesiologists says this "misinformation" has "absolutely no basis in scientific fact" and might endanger pregnant women's health by deterring them from receiving treatment that is safe.

Opponents of a ban say there are only about 600 such procedures a year. Let us suppose, as not everyone does, the number 600 is accurate concerning the more than 13,000 abortions performed after 21 weeks of gestation. Still, 600 is a lot. Think of two crashes of jumbo airliners. Opponents of the ban darkly warn that it would be the first step

toward repeal of all abortion rights. Columnist John Leo of U.S. News & World Report says that is akin to the gun lobby's argument that a ban on assault weapons must lead to repeal of the Second Amendment.

In a prophecy born of hope, many pundits have been predicting that the right-to-life "extremists" would drastically divide the Republican Party. But 73 House Democrats voted to bar partial-birth abortions; only 15 Republicans opposed the ban. If the ban survives the Senate, President Clinton will probably veto it. The convention that nominated him refused to allow the Democratic governor of Pennsylvania, Bob Casey, who is pro-life, to speak. Pro-choice speakers addressed the 1992 Republican Convention. The two presidential candidates who hoped that a pro-choice stance would resonate among Republicans—Gov. Pete Wilson, Sen. Arlen Specter—have become the first two candidates to fold their tents.

In October in *The New Republic*, Naomi Wolf, a feminist and pro-choice writer, argued that by resorting to abortion rhetoric that recognizes neither life nor death, pro-choice people "risk becoming precisely what our critics charge us with being: callous, selfish and casually destructive men and women who share a cheapened view of human life." Other consequences of a "lexicon of dehumanization" about the unborn are "hardness of heart, lying and political failure." Wolf said that the "fetus means nothing" stance of the pro-choice movement is refuted by common current practices of parents-to-be who have framed sonogram photos and fetal heartbeat stethoscopes in their homes. Young upscale adults of child-bearing age are a solidly pro-choice demographic group. But they enjoy watching their unborn babies on sonograms, responding to outside stimuli, and they read "The Well Baby Book," which says: "Increasing knowledge is increasing the awe and respect we have for the unborn baby and is causing us to regard the unborn baby as a real person long before birth . . ."

Wolf argued for keeping abortion legal but treating it as a matter of moral gravity because "grief and respect are the proper tones for all discussions about choosing to endanger or destroy a manifestation of life." This temperate judgment drew from Jane Johnson, interim president of Planned Parenthood, a denunciation of the "view that there are good and bad reasons for abortion." So, who now are the fanatics?

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099,
DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS
AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK RIGGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my colleague from California [Mr. LEWIS] the Chairman of the VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, for his work on this bill under difficult circumstances. His diligence and hard work are to be commended.

As a veteran myself, I am particularly sensitive to the importance of keeping our promises to our veterans.

Shortly before the House of Representatives was to consider the conference report on the

VA/HUD and related agencies bill, I learned the Clinton administration, in a "statement of administration policy," had failed to mention the lack of a VA replacement hospital at Travis Air Force Base as a reason for a potential Presidential veto. Earlier in the month, the administration had pledged its support to the hospital in a letter from Office of Management and Budget Director Alice Rivlin to the chairman of the House of Appropriations Committee, ROBERT LIVINGSTON.

In light of this apparent reversal of administration policy, I feel that I have no choice but to support the fiscal year 96 VA/HUD Appropriations Bill. It contains \$25 million for a new state-of-the-art VA outpatient clinic at Travis Air Force Base, in addition to a \$400 million increase in the VA medical accounts. This is especially important since every other account in the bill, except those pertaining to veterans, was significantly reduced.

The Travis outpatient facility will meet the immediate health care needs of most Solano County and northern California veterans. I feel a moral obligation to do what is right for my fellow vets and to support any measure that will have a positive impact upon the region.

I was dismayed that the conference committee provided only \$25 million for the outpatient clinic at Travis. I had worked to secure additional funding in light of the Veterans Administration's recommendation of \$39.5 million in funding for the outpatient clinic.

With a projected 85,000 annual outpatient visits, the new facility will meet the needs of most veterans who require ambulatory care. However, I still believe there is the urgent need to attend to the acute medical needs of northern California's veterans.

The very survival of the outpatient facility was placed in jeopardy due to a November 29 stalling tactic that sent the conference report back to committee. I was told by VA Chairman Lewis that the motion could have jeopardized the clinic if the committee had been forced to reallocate funds among competing accounts.

Further delay in enacting the VA/HUD appropriations bill could force the legislation to be integrated into a full-year continuing resolution. Under that scenario, virtually all programs, including veterans' medical care and construction projects, will receive less than under the conference agreement. This would leave the veterans of northern California at a severe disadvantage. Those individuals who could delay or defeat this appropriations bill would be putting their political whims before the needs of our veterans.

By no means should my support for this bill signal that I am abandoning the long-term goal of building a replacement hospital at Travis Air Force Base.

It has become clear to me that full funding for the proposed replacement hospital is not possible this year. I cannot ignore present fiscal realities. Rather than contribute to budget gridlock, I must do what is best for northern California veterans and support this bill.

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND JOHNSON
OF FORT WALTON BEACH

HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1995

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell this Chamber a story of remark-

able heroism, a story I recently heard about a World War II veteran who resided in my district and who, in a time of crisis in our Nation's history rose to the defense of his country. I relay this story, because it lets us know that, at a time when cynicism and pessimism seem pervasive, we need to be reminded that we are a nation of heroes and that we can rise to meet the challenges before us. Mr. Raymond Johnson was just a hero, and in the best tradition of the American spirit he rose to the challenges before him for no other reason than that he loved his country.

Raymond Johnson was like any other young American boy growing up before World War II. He enjoyed the innocence of playing baseball, climbing trees, fishing, and the other simplicities of a young life. But when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, bringing the United States into World War II, Raymond Johnson did his duty and went off to serve his country as an infantryman in the U.S. Army. In April 1942, Raymond and hundreds of other young men traveled to Inniskillan, Northern Ireland, for specialized training as an Army scout. After further training in Inverary, Scotland, Raymond and his comrades found themselves in North Africa with the 168th Regiment of the 34th Infantry Division. Their enemy—Field Marshall Rommel's vaunted Afrika Korps.

Soon enough, the 34th Infantry Division received their baptism of fire during the Allied invasion of North Africa on November 17, 1942. Raymond served gallantly in battle during two major campaigns in Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia. After being bombarded both day and night by German artillery fire for over 1 month, the 34th Infantry found themselves divided and in disarray. One morning, just before dawn, Raymond and his comrades found themselves encircled by German tanks and infantry. Those American soldiers who were not machine gunned immediately found their positions overrun and themselves taken prisoner. That morning marked what would become 2½ years of hell for Raymond Johnson in Nazi prisoner of war camps in Tunisia, Sicily, Italy, and ultimately the heart of the German interior.

Meanwhile, Raymond's family had no word of their son's fate. Reported missing, probably killed in action, the family feared for the worst. Then, a Canadian ham radio operator monitoring Vatican City Radio recorded the names of American prisoners of war that a Vatican City envoy had visited in a Nazi-controlled camp near Mount Vesuvius. Hearing the name Raymond Johnson and his home town broadcast over the radio, the ham radio operator contacted the Johnson family, giving them the first word that their son was alive. Despite his capture, the Johnson family, steadfast in their Roman Catholic faith, thanked God that their son was alive and that a priest had visited the men, giving them the sacrament of communion. Faith in God and confidence in their country were all that the Johnson family had to sustain them for some time to come.

Department of State Cables 446, 464, 579, and 649 mentioned Raymond Johnson as being sighted in Nazi POW Camps 7A and 3B near Furstonberg along with other prisoners, but the family was told nothing more than that their Raymond was a prisoner of war and that his fate was uncertain. Forced to labor on German public works projects and later on German farms, Raymond, like his fellow