

Passage of the Reinstatement of Rehabilitation Benefits for Seniors Act, which I am proud to cosponsor, is necessary to ensure that seniors have sufficient access to necessary physical therapy, occupational therapy, and speech-language pathology services under Medicare. I am proud to say that this bill is also fiscally responsible, requiring the Secretary of Health and Human Services to implement a new methodology for payment of rehabilitation services by January 1, 2000, to ensure budget neutrality. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

HONORING NEIL RHODES WINNING
ESSAY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1998

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, please include the attached text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"MY VOICE IN OUR DEMOCRACY"

1997-98 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP
COMPETITION

(By Neil Rhodes, Colorado Winner)

A few years ago, when I was about eleven years old, I was profoundly affected by the chronicle of a young Jewish girl during the second world war: a girl who, while hiding out from the Nazis, wrote in the red-checked diary she had received for her thirteenth birthday; a martyr who was eventually discovered and sent to her death in a concentration camp; a visionary whose diary writings encompassed the plight of millions around the world. That little girl was Anne Frank.

One of the final entries in Anne's red-checked diary proclaimed the desperation of a nation without democracy. It read: "ideals, dreams, and cherished hopes rise within us only to meet the horrible truth and be shattered . . ."

At the young age I was, this was the first real connection I had ever experienced with the evils of tyranny. Since then I've encountered a multitude of other stories and situations that have increased my awareness of democracy.

Like the time I visited a small holocaust museum and spoke with Mr. Kelen—a survivor of the holocaust himself; or the time I traveled just across the Mexican border, and witnessed first-hand the crippling poverty caused by government corruption; the time I sat glued to the television, my eyes locked on the image of a young Chinese boy facing certain death as he stood in the path of an oncoming military tank.

Every new experience helped shape my thoughts, mold my perspective, and strengthen my voice as an American citizen. I have come to realize just how fortunate I am—how fortunate we all are—to possess the light of democracy.

I've learned that democracy is priceless and powerful. Priceless, because our basic rights are stained with the blood of millions who fought to gain them. Democracy also has boundless power: quite simply, the power to shatter the chains of bondage forever.

But as we live our lives in freedom we must remember the horrible truth that Anne Frank wrote about. The horrible truth is that there are still millions of people living in the darkness of oppression. For those not yet experiencing liberty, we must continue the battle. If we believe in our own sov-

ereignty, that is our duty. The Declaration of Independence does not say "All Americans are created equal" but that "All men"—all around the world—"are created equal." Thus, we cannot simply work to continue our own democratic system; we must bring that system to the rest of the world. Only then will the visions of our forefathers be completed.

In the social and political arena every American has a voice—a platform from which to speak. In many parts of the globe that could not be farther from the truth. Anne Frank never had a voice. I, however, do. I stand before you now, and I speak on behalf of those who couldn't and those who still cannot.

My voice in our democracy is the reflection of a free person; my voice pays tribute to the thousands who died for the cause of liberty; my voice cries out an urging for the respect of our nation and an offering of hope for the future.

Yes, even in the midst of the cruelest oppression, hope is one thing that can never be destroyed. Because, you see, I never finished the quotation by Anne Frank that I gave earlier. Here is the quote in its entirety: "ideals, dreams, and cherished hopes rise within us only to meet the horrible truth and be shattered . . . yet in spite of everything I still believe that people really are good at heart."

Anne Frank's devotion to the human spirit should serve as an example to all of us, and especially to Americans. Progress in the world must begin with you and me. I would hope that one day all Americans would understand that with strength, compassion, diligence, and the fortitude of our voices, we have the ability to change democracy from an ideal, a dream, and a cherished hope . . . into a powerful and permeating reality.

IN MEMORY OF BISHOP JUAN
JOSE GERARDI

HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1998

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep condolences to the people of Guatemala on the brutal murder of Bishop Juan Jose Gerardi on April 26th.

Bishop Gerardi played a leading role in establishing and directing the Catholic church's human rights office in Guatemala. Just two days before his death, his office made public its report, entitled "Guatemala: Never More," which documented over 55,000 instances of violence and human rights violations in that country's 36-year civil war. His death reminds us that despite the strides Guatemala has made since peace accords were signed in December 1996, the process of building peace, reconciliation and respect for human rights remains fragile. For that reason, I have joined several of my colleagues in writing a letter to President Arzu of Guatemala expressing our condolences on the death of Bishop Gerardi and urging him to maintain a clear and strong commitment to implement the peace accords.

Bishop Gerardi was truly a martyr to the cause of truth. The best way that we in the Congress can honor his memory is to pass the Human Rights Information Act, H.R. 2635, which would require all federal agencies charged with the conduct of foreign policy to declassify and disclose records on human rights violations in Guatemala and Honduras

after 1944. The survivors of human rights violations in these countries, and the relatives of those who did not survive, have a right to know the truth. If we are serious about our commitment to democracy, peace and human rights in Central America, then we should do no less.

IN HONOR OF KENTUCKY NURSES
WEEK

HON. ANNE M. NORTHUP

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1998

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize the nurses of Kentucky, as well as throughout this nation. Nurses are a strong component of our health care system and are known for providing health care with a human touch.

In my home state, nurses are celebrating Kentucky Nurses Week and they have every reason to be proud. Working hard and achieving professional and personal goals, many nurses in my community have proven themselves time and time again. Continually striving to upgrade standards of care and improve services, Kentucky nurses have shown that they are committed to providing the best quality health care possible for their patients.

I hope you will join me in recognizing this noble professional during this week, and throughout the year. Certainly, they are deserving of this acknowledgment.

THE NATIONAL GUARD IN A
BRAVE NEW WORLD

HON. JIM GIBBONS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 1998

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD.

[From the Economist Newspaper Limited,
May 13, 1998]

THE NATIONAL GUARD IN A BRAVE NEW WORLD
ANYTHING USEFUL TO DO, BESIDES FIGHTING
THE ARMY?

It was one of the sweetest victories in the 350-year history of the National Guard, the citizen-soldiers of Nevada left their factories, farms and investment banks for a battlefield in California, where they disguised their American tanks as Russian T-80s and donned the colours of an imaginary country called Krasnovia. Within a few hours they had pierced the defences of the adversary, a mechanised brigade of full-time soldiers from Georgia (the American state, that is). Guardsmen across the nation rejoiced at their Nevadan comrades' success. They had given the Pentagon sceptics a bloody nose—and proved that "weekend warriors" are perfectly capable of engaging in full-scale armoured combat whenever Uncle Sam needs them.

Unfortunately, not every battle in the relentless conflict between the full-time American army and the Army National Guard, a mostly part-time force with strong local roots, has such a rapid and decisive outcome. Most of the time, the two institutions are locked in an inconclusive war of attrition which makes it impossible for Pentagon

strategists to use either of them effectively. Like everybody else who is competing for slices of the Pentagon's shrunken pie, each side in this argument dismisses its opponents as superannuated, cold-war relics.

The swift, high-tech wars of tomorrow may have little place for the dentist or school-teacher who likes to drive tanks or fly helicopters as a hobby, according to the full-time army—whose strength has been slashed by about 40%, to 495,000, since the Soviet collapse. Nonsense, retorts the National Guard, which has lost only 20% of its cold-war strength and numbers around 370,000. As the guard sees things, the huge regular army that was built to fight the Soviet Union and its allies was an aberration in American history. Now that the cold war is over, America should revert to reliance on the citizen-soldier, a concept which dates back to colonial times. "Americans have always been suspicious of standing armies, ever since we fought the British redcoats," says a spokesman for the National Guard Association, one of the more formidable lobbies in Capitol Hill. To settle the matter, guardsmen point out that their position is safeguarded by the American constitution, which calls for the raising of militias "to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

But full-time army commanders remain sceptical. The guard's eight combat divisions, its pride and joy, have been steadfastly excluded from any significant role in the army's plans to fight two regional wars (presumably in the Gulf and the Korean peninsula) simultaneously—the worst-case scenario on which much Pentagon thinking is based. In the guard's view, this exclusion is based on a self-serving calculation: the army would not be able to justify retaining ten combat divisions of its own if it admitted that the guard could also play an important role.

As the army sees things, the Gulf war of 1991 proved its point: modern conflicts are too quick and deadly to have much place for troops that require 90 days or more to reach the proper state of readiness. The guardsmen allege, with real bitterness, that their combat brigades were kept out of the war even when they were well prepared.

The deadlock is so intractable, and the mistrust so deep, that the entire process of adapting the military to a changing world is at risk of paralysis. The latest round of peace talks, convened in April by John Hamre, the deputy defence secretary, persuaded the guard that the Pentagon's civilian bosses do want a solution. But the part-timers remain intensely suspicious of the army. They insist that they are ready for painful changes, such as converting some of their heavy-armour divisions into lighter ones, but only if the army does the same. "We are willing to change if the army is will-

ing to change, but we cannot take them at their word," says Major-General Edward Philbin, director of the National Guard Association.

Tensions increased a lot last year when the Pentagon published a quadrennial defence review that called for a cut of 40,000 in the guard's strength. Guardsmen muttered that the army had conspired against them; the army retorted that it was about time the guard bore its share of defence cuts like everybody else. Eventually the guard offered to accept a cut of 15,000 over three years, but only if the army recognised the guard's importance by signing up to 11 principles. Otherwise, all deals were off the table.

The reason why the guardsmen feel able to take such a firm line is that they have extraordinary political clout. Because guardsmen are based in every part of the country, no lawmaker can afford to ignore them. They also have a natural constituency in the state governors, who rely on them to cope with riots, explosions and (especially in recent months) natural disasters. At least in peaceful times, the \$5.5 billion which the Pentagon spends every year on maintaining the guard is a sort of transfer from Washington to the governors, who are gaining influence on several other fronts and are highly protective of their local troops.

The net result is a stalemate—and intense frustration for the defence planners, who long to save money on army personnel (whether full- or part-time) and use it to buy high-tech weapons. The Pentagon says annual procurement spending must rise by about \$20 billion, to \$60 billion per year, by 2001 if America is to retain its military edge against all comers. But with every legislator determined to protect bases and guard units in his or her home district, it looks harder and harder to see how money can be freed for this shopping spree.

In recent months, a new factor has emerged which could have a large, unpredictable effect on the stand-off between the army and the guard, and on the broader balance of power in the Pentagon. It is the belief among defence thinkers—especially those not wedded to any particular bureaucratic interest—that domestic security risks may be rising at a time when the United States looks virtually unchallengeable overseas. In military jargon, this is the theory of "asymmetrical threats". It goes like this: no adversary in his right mind would try to match America's vast arsenal of tanks, ships or nuclear weapons. It makes far better sense for the enemy—be it a terrorist group, a rogue state, or a combination of both—to wage chemical, biological or even cyber-warfare against American society, exploiting its openness.

There was, initially at least, much rejoicing among the guardsmen last year when the national defence panel, a group of experts with a mandate to review the country's mili-

tary priorities, called for greater emphasis on countering poison gas or germ warfare attacks at home. The panel suggested that a Homeland Defence Command could be organised around the National Guard.

But, on second thoughts, the guardsmen feel more cautious about the new defence thinking. Dealing with the ghastly consequences of a chemical or biological attack has always been part of their job, they point out. Governors would need them badly during the few crucial hours when the emergency was too serious for local police and fire services to cope and the federal authorities had not yet arrived. But the guard will strongly resist any changes to its structure that would compromise its ability to join the regular army on overseas combat missions. Since "the army would love to turn us into a constabulary" with purely local duties, the guard is bracing itself for a fresh bureaucratic fight, says General Philbin.

In fact, the advent of "asymmetrical threats" may not suit the institutional interests of any of the Pentagon's quarrelsome soldiers. Consider how the lines of authority would shift in the event of a chemical or biological attack on Anytown, America. Once the emergency became too serious for the state government, responsibility for "crisis management"—identifying the culprit and stopping further attacks—would shift to the FBI. The appalling human consequences of the crisis would be dealt with by a shadowy organisation called the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), originally designed to keep government functioning in secret in a nuclear war, but better known for mismanaging the aftermath of hurricanes. The mainstream defence establishment would hardly enter the picture. If the attack was clearly launched by a foreign state, the generals might get busy retaliating. But what if the culprits were home-grown terrorists?

In practice, nobody knows who would do what if American city-dwellers faced a lethal cloud of anthrax or nerve gas. An exercise in March, designed to test the authorities' response to a genetically engineered virus spread by terrorists on the Mexican-American border, led to better squabbling among rival agencies. "There is no clear demarcation line between the FBI and FEMA, and knowledge about disease and hazardous materials is spread over a broad array of institutions," says Zachary Selden, a germ-warfare boffin. "Somebody is needed to sit on top of these operations."

But as America waits for the barbarians, its soldiers and guardsmen may at last have found something in common. Both have an interest in keeping the Pentagon's mind concentrated on hypothetical overseas wars, as opposed to deadly attacks on the homeland which look all too possible.