The contrary—almost always Israel's problems are now being presented if they are entirely self-inflicted. Arabs are presented as if they are always simply reacting to Israel refusal to accept their reasonable demands that the Jews just clear out of more territory because it does not really belong to them.

American public support for Israel rises and for Yasir Arafat declines. But U.S. and European journalism is increasingly sympathetic to the Palestinians and unpleasant about Israel.

To each his own vision. To my eyes, and to those of the majority of Americans, Israel is one of history's soaring proclamations of mankind's worth to itself and its Creator.

These days it is not said much anymore, which is a pity, but Israel did indeed begin with nothing much more than sand, hope and belief. And yes, 50 years later it is indeed the Mideast's only democracy, a growing center of science, technology, art, music.

Israel is not a dirge—but a country; how happy the thought.

And I find emotion entirely permissible about Israel's ability to maintain life and progress though its neighbors have imposed an absence of peace for a half-century.

But about dangers to Israeli survival, cool is best. And stepping back coolly we see the realities.

One is that Israel may work out agreement with Palestinians—if they want it enough to agree to conditions that will give Israel security of borders and the end of terrorism. The agreement would bring respite that could grow into a peace of some years.

But another reality is that agreement on Palestine would not bring permanent peace. Ask ourselves, would Mideast rulers, the worker-merchant ''street'' and religious and intellectual establishments accept an Israel forever growing in skills and strength—or in their dreams and desires want Israel extinguished, and work toward the day?

Run them through the mind: Syria, Libya, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the gulf sheikdoms, the Sudan, Algeria, Iraq, Iran.

The hatred against Israel these countries receive, accept and pass on as heritage and religious obligation—would it vanish with an independent Palestine or would it continue in them, and in Palestine too?

If Iran and Iraq develop chemical, nuclear and biological weapons, will they strike against Israel? Would other Arabs extend sympathy to Israel—or dance on rooftops and scream their passion to kill Jews? Would the West take the risk of world war to rescue Israel?

We know the answers. Permanent peace in the Mideast will not come until sufficient Arab peoples replace dictatorship—fundamentalist, religious, military or terrorist—with democratic religious and political freedoms.

Then perhaps the Muslim governments will end the feuds among themselves that are the central cause of Mideast wars. Then perhaps they will even try to end the hatred of Israeli existence that infests the Mideast with the threat of war against Israel.

Freedom may happen in the Mideast, as in so many other places. But it will come slowly, fitfully.

Meantime, will Israel stand strong at arms, maintaining military power not for victory over another country but for defense?

Will the U.S. remain a friend or become a harassment? Will some foreign and Israeli Jews push their religious and political hostility against Israeli governments so long and hard that they sap Israel's strength, will power and self-belief, as Israel awaits Arab conversion to democracy?

From friends of Israel, cool questions in themselves are gifts to Israel—and to one another.

JOHN E. BARRIERE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1998

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and under appreciated aspects of the workings of our democracy is the extraordinarily dedicated and able work done by the professional staffs who serve those of us who have been elected to Congress. While it is popular to mock people who work in the political and legislative system, in fact their contribution represents one of the great bargains the American people receive. Our work is enormously helped by the large number of extremely talented and dedicated people who put in extremely long hours helping us make public policy, at far less compensation than most of them would receive in almost any other occupation.

I thought of that recently Mr. Speaker when I learned of the death of an extremely dedicated creative individual who is one of those who helped set the model for the kind of professional policy advisor on whom we are now so dependent. His name is John Barriere, and he came to Washington 50 years ago. Sadly, John Barriere died last week at the age of 78, and he left behind him a legacy of extraordinary service to democracy. I was recently reminded by Gerry McMurray, a former Chief of Staff of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking Committee, that Mr. Barriere was the first man to be a professional staff member of that subcommittee, having helped bring it into existence 43 years ago, and serving as its Staff Director until 1964. Because of the great ability he showed in that position, he was chosen by Speaker John McCormack in 1964 to be the first policy staff advisor to the Speaker, and he was the Executive Director—and heart and soul—of the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee until 1978. Among the pieces of legislation that he played an indispensable role in bringing to passage were the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Act of 1968—that extraordinarily important set of bills that helped break the back of legal racism in America.

He worked closely with Richard Bolling during his chairmanship of the Rules Committee in bringing forward the Congressional Reform Act of 1974 and 1976, and the Budget Act of 1974.

Indeed, along with John McCormack, Richard Bolling, Harry Truman and Senator Robert Wagner recognized John's great ability and put him to work. In other words Mr. Speaker he was a man whose great ability and equally great willingness to serve proved to be an important asset for a series of leaders in our governing processes.

I was pleased myself to meet him more than 30 years ago, when in the service of the gubernatorial campaign of the late Edward McCormack, a nephew of the Speaker, I came to Washington to do some research on federal issues. I was then a young graduate student in political science, and meeting John Barriere, and listening to him describe the interaction of the legislative process, politics, and substantive policy was an extraordinary education which I never forgot.

Many years later, when my domestic partner, Herb Moses, went to work at FannieMae, I was delighted to learn that one of his coworkers was Laura Barriere, the daughter of John, and vicariously through Laura I was able to renew that acquaintance. I was saddened by news of his death, and Herb and I send our condolences to Laura, and the rest of the family. And I wanted to note here the passing of this man who quietly, but very effectively, did so much to set a pattern of professional service in the House from which we continue to benefit.

SALUTE TO RUSS MUELLER ON HIS 25TH ANNIVERSARY WITH HOUSE

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1998

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize and honor a member of the staff of the Committee on Education and Workforce, Mr. Russ Mueller, on his 25th anniversary with the Committee.

Russ came to the Committee staff in the middle of the Congressional debate on the legislation that was subsequently passed and became known as ERISA—the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. Since then, for many of us, Russ and ERISA have become almost synonymous. John Erlenborn and Al Quie, the Ranking Members of the full committee and subcommittee at the time, wanted a staff member who understood the intricacies of pension financing and other employee benefits. So they brought in Russ, who was, and is, a certified actuary. Twenty five years later Russ is still setting Members of Congress straight on the intricacies of employee benefits.

Along the way Russ has worked on a lot of major legislation. I suspect that some of his prouder accomplishments have been in helping to stop a lot of bad ideas—like the Clinton health care proposal a few years ago, on which he worked day and night for weeks on end to point out the foreseen and unforeseen consequences of that government take over of health care.

All of us who have worked with Russ know of his knowledge in the employee benefits area and of his commitment to legislative craftsmanship. He truly is one of our experts in these complex issues and has worked untiringly on behalf of our voluntary, employment based health care and benefits system. Along the way he has found time to be an avid golfer and fisherman, and dedicated father. I am pleased to recognize and salute Russ for his 25 years of service to the Committee, the Congress and to our country. I wish him many more years of good health and continued good service.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1998

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, over the past week the debate on campaign finance reform has shifted, from when we will get a vote to what

kind of reform will we actually see. The leadership has chosen the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act, H.R. 2183, as the base bill that will be considered on the floor. I applaud that choice. This bill was drafted after a fifteen month process of bipartisan give and take among freshmen members of Congress. I am pleased to have been an original member of that task force.

The Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act is the only bill that was drafted as a truly bipartisan effort to take the big money out of the political system. H.R. 2183 does not contain any poison pills and does not unfairly impact one political party over the other. This legislation does not go as far in changing the system as most members of the task force wanted, however, we all recognized that this was the only way campaign finance legislation could pass this year. This bill takes the biggest influences of money in the system out of our campaigns. Passage of H.R. 2183 will be a significant step forward in returning our elections back to the people whom we are sworn to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I commend you for giving in to the pressure of the public and allowing a vote on campaign finance reform. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 2183, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act.

WE SHOULD PASS THE AFRICA TRADE BILL

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1998

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, ''We Should Pass the Africa Bill,'' an editorial written by Senator RICHARD LUGAR of Indiana was printed in the Wednesday, April 22, 1998, edition of the Washington Post. In the article Mr. LUGAR describes the broad support for the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, which included: House leadership, the Clinton administration, the business community and the African diplomatic corps, and led to the passage of this historic legislation by the House of Representatives on March 11, 1998. Mr. Speaker, I am entering for the RECORD the editorial written by Senator RICHARD LUGAR of Indiana.

WE SHOULD PASS THE AFRICA BILL

(By Richard Lugar)

Last month the House of Representatives approved the African Growth and Opportunity Act on a bipartisan vote of 233 to 186. The bill commanded support from the House leadership, the Clinton administration, the business community, the African diplomatic corps and representatives from all sides of the political spectrum. Action on the bill now shifts to the Senate, where the Finance Committee has jurisdiction. Enactment of this bill will signal a dramatic and constructive turning point in U.S.-African relations and mark a historic moment in our ties with the states of sub-Saharan Africa.

Last year I introduced S. 778, the Senate version of the original House bill. I took that initiative because I believed the United States must seize the opportunity presented by the end of the Cold War and the fundamental changes already underway in Africa. We should reinforce efforts to promote economic growth and stability and to provide new opportunities for American investors and trade.

The bill seeks to promote economic growth in Africa through enhanced private-sector activity and trade incentives for countries making serious and verifiable economic and political reforms. It seeks to reorient U.S. Africa policy from being based largely on foreign assistance to being based on increased trade, investment, self-help and serious engagement. It is a modest bill that requires no new public appropriations, but it could provide substantial economic opportunities for the United States and African societies.

Two years ago, as I campaigned in the Republican presidential primaries, I spoke on the need for a positive and coherent American policy toward Africa. These remarks came as surprise to many; some responded with bewilderment. They asked why a Republican presidential candidate would talk about Africa. The answer lies, in part, with the underlying rationale behind the African Growth and Opportunity Act, namely that the United States should elevate its policy toward Africa to a level commensurate with Africa's growing importance.

Sub-Saharan Africa can be a new frontier for American trade, investment and economic development. It can be a frontier for the expansion of democracy and market-based economies. It can be a frontier for cooperation in dealing with strategic global problems relating to narcotics, international crime, terrorism, infectious diseases and the environment. Success on each of these foreign policy priorities is important to the United States and to African societies, and it can best be achieved in an Africa that is economically open and politically more accountable and transparent. But this will not happen soon or without tremendous cooperative effort.

Beyond the promise of more prosperity and more stability on the continent, the Africa bill encourages African countries to undertake fundamental political and economic reforms in order to qualify for the trade and investment incentives. It places the burden on African leaders to take initiatives to help themselves. Many have already done so. Those countries that engage in gross violations of human rights, fail to eliminate trade and investment barriers or to improve fiscal policies, or that reject good governance and rule-of-law standards, would not be eligible for duty-free treatment of products under the Generalized System of Preferences, participation in debt reduction programs, projects managed by the Overseas Private Investment Corp., or other trade and investment programs in the bill.

No one can argue that this legislation will transform Africa overnight. But as Africa develops economically, we will benefit by assisting in that growth as new markets develop and mature. Indeed, U.S. exports to sub-Saharan Africa have increased by some 14 percent over the past two years, and bilateral trade now exceeds trade with all the states of the former Soviet Union.

The Africa bill is one of those rare pieces of legislation that has not been inspired by dire crisis, imminent threat or strong domestic pressure. It emerged from the realization that Africa has long been a neglected region of the world and that this neglect does not serve U.S. interests. The bill is visionary in that it acknowledges that Africa is changing, that the United States wants to be a partner in that change, and that we wish to share in Africa's better future. If the United States is a major player in Africa's economic and political transition, we will also be a major beneficiary.

FROM DIPLOMA TO DOCTORATE: 100 YEARS IN THE EVOLUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, MEMPHIS COLLEGE OF NURSING

HON. ED BRYANT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1998

Mr. BRYANT Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the special annivesary of the Univ. of Tennessee Memphis School of Nursing.

Memphis City Hospital and its school of nursing, identified as the Memphis City Hospital School of Nursing, opened in 1989. Lena Angevine Warner was appointed as Superintendent of Nurses and Director of the School. She is identified as the founder of the School of Nursing that later became part of the University of Tennessee. She resigned in 1900 to serve as an Army contract nurse in Cuba and later served with the Walter Reed Commission that studied yellow fever.

The first class of eight graduated in June, 1900 from the Memphis City Hospital School of Nursing. A 3-year curriculum was implemented in 1913.

By contract with the City of Memphis signed July 22, 1926, ''The School of Nursing has been launched on a University basis.'' The Memphis General Hospital furnished space and equipment and the University of Tennessee provided two nursing faculty members and instruction from its medical college faculty. Miss Winifred Atkinson, director of nursing for the hospital and the school from 1923–1926 was instrumental in bringing about this relationship with the University.

John Gaston Hospital replaced the old General Hospital in 1936. WWII brought practice blackouts and a shortage of nursing faculty and students. UT participated in the U.S. Cadet Nurse Program. Two graduates of the UT School of Nursing—Lts. Imogene Kennedy and Inez McDonald—were captured by the Japanese on with the surrender of U.S. Troops on Corregidor, Philippines. They were prisoners of war from 1942 until early 1945. Miss Ruth Neil Murry became Educational Director of the School in 1944 and Director in 1946.

A 4-year program leading to the BSN began in 1950 and the diploma program phased out in 1954. Under the leadership of Ruth Neil Murry, the school became autonomous in 1949. Murry, the first Dean, served until December 1977.

The City Hospital contract was amended in 1958 and major curriculum change occurred. National accreditation was awarded in 1960. The school achieved College status in February 1961.

The master's program in nursing admitted its first students in Summer, 1973. Family nurse practitioner and psychiatric-mental health were the initial offerings.

Dr. Michael Carter became Dean late in 1982 and continues in that role. Faculty and Dean Michael Carter placed increasing emphasis on research and practice in the mid 1980s. The college moved into a new building. In 1988 the Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Nursing began. The first PhD in Nursing was awarded in 1992 to June Hansen Larabee.

Over 4,500 nurses have been educated by The University of Tennessee, Memphis College of Nursing.