In 1995, Rangemaster Boyd played a pivotal role in obtaining a Bureau of Justice Assistance grant for the Santa Ana Police Department's Firearms Trafficking Program. This program allies the Department's Weapons Interdiction Team with the FBI and ATF in combating illegal firearms trafficking.

The program proved to be an unqualified success and Rangemaster Boyd was an integral part of the team effectiveness, as he examined and tested firearms for ballistics evidence.

It was, however, in this capacity that Rangemaster Boyd lost his life. On January 28, 1998, Officer Boyd was testing an outlawed, nine millimeter ''MAC 11'' machine pistol for ballistics evidence. During the testing, the gun jammed. In an attempt to un-jam the gun, it tragically misfired, killing Rangemaster Boyd.

A devoted family man, Rangemaster Boyd is survived by his wife of 34 years, Marion, two adult children, and two grandchildren.

The loss of Rangemaster Boyd left a void that still resonates today. Unfortunately, this is just the beginning of this tragic story.

Since Rangemaster Boyd was not a ''sworn'' law enforcement officer, his family was not entitled to the Department of Justice's Public Safety Officers Benefits. Rangemaster Boyd was a ''civilian'' working in a law enforcement capacity.

These Department of Justice's Public Safety Officers Benefits provide financial relief to family members of law enforcement officers who've lost their lives in the line of duty. Rangemaster Boyd gave his life in the line of duty, in a law enforcement capacity, and his family deserved these benefits.

For the past three years, I have worked to correct this wrong. I introduced legislation, H.R. 513 in the House of Representatives which would have clarified that Rangemaster Boyd was a public safety officer who died as a direct result of an injury sustained in the line of duty. I worked with the Department of Justice to clarify this situation, and get Rangemaster Boyd's widow and family the benefits they deserved.

I am pleased that on July 21, 2000 the work of myself, and so many others in the community, paid off when the Department of Justice decided to release the funding to Rangemaster Boyd's family.

The benefit package is just a small expense to the Justice Department, only $100,000, but it has been a large relief to the Boyd family. I am glad the Federal Government looked beyond this ''technicality'' and realized what impact these benefits would make.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE FEATURES IMPROVEMENT BILL

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, Congress created the national defense features program in response to a report by the Department of Defense describing a shortage of sealift capacity during military contingencies. This shortage of shipping space for heavy military vehicles and other cargo was best cured by a program such as the NDF program that would be the most cost-effective way to augment the substantial investment that was being made in new sealift ships by the Navy.

Within the last several years, Congress has authorized and appropriated funds to install special defense features in new commercial vessels to be built in the shipyards of the United States. Most recently, at my request and as a result of the leadership of our colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON, Congress included in the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2001 a provision that would expand the Secretary of Defense's ability to fund militarily useful projects under the NDF program.

Since the NDF program was launched, Congress expected that our allies, particularly Japan, would find mutual defense benefits in promoting the program on their trade routes with the United States. Under one project that has received attention, ten commercial vessels would be built in the United States based on a design funded and approved by DARPA's Maritime Technology Program. These vessels would normally operate in the Japan-United States vehicle trade, which is at present entirely dominated by Japanese carriers.

Notwithstanding expressions of support by very senior officials in our government, this expectation has not been realized. The Government of Japan continues to take the position that the decision to employ NDF ships is strictly a matter for the commercial judgment of Japanese vehicle manufacturing and shipping companies. The vehicle manufacturers, which operate under closely inter-locking relationships with the Japanese vehicle carriers, continue to insist that the NDF program is a matter between the two respective governments since it addresses defense.

In view of the US role in providing security for our Far East allies, it hardly seems appropriate that defense concerns expressed by our government should not have been met with a more positive response. Our government's repeated representations to the Japanese government have fallen on deaf ears as if the NDF program was without military value, a position that is contradicted by two US Navy reports on the NDF program. Taking note of the extensive military collaboration of our two governments, which it is safe to say has conferred material benefits on Japan, this is not the position that Congress should have expected.

The position that this matter is purely commercial in nature rather than governmental in character is not defensible. Japan, like other nations, supports its merchant marine with financial assistance, including direct construction loans at artificially low rates of interest. This is not the mark of a purely private industry operating under purely commercial conditions.

The real reason our carriers are effectively being excluded from this market is the Japanese kereitsu system of doing business. It is not price, but rather the interwoven industrial and financial structure that closes this market like so many other sectors of the Japanese economy against international competition. The situation, then, is that a fleet of US built and operated ships, commercially competitive and having significant defense value to both nations, has apparently no chance to break through the economic fence encircling the Japanese vehicle trade.

Notwithstanding this state of affairs, I continue to hope that the Government of Japan and the vehicle manufacturers will ultimately see the merit of supporting the NDF program, especially given the longstanding support of the Department of Defense. Recently, the Secretary of Defense and the Director General of the Japanese Self-Defense Agency agreed to establish a regular consultative mechanism to ensure closer cooperation in improving our mutual defense capabilities. I understand the Secretary of Defense suggested that this might be an appropriate mechanism to move the NDF program forward. I agree.

Given past experience, however, we may nonetheless not see the type of action that is by now long overdue. Therefore, along with my colleague from Pennsylvania, I am introducing a bill today that we intend to push later next year if we do not see any movement on the part of the Government of Japan. The bill is very straightforward. It says: If the Federal Maritime Commission finds that vessels built under the NDF program are unable to obtain employment in a particular trade route in the foreign commerce of the United States for which they are designed to operate, and if that sector of the trade route has been dominated historically by citizens of an allied nation, then the Commission shall take action to counteract the restrictive trade practices that have led to this situation.

I trust it will not be necessary to enact legislation to encourage support for a program so self-evidently in the mutual security interests of our two nations and that as a result of the new consultative mechanism the NDF program can begin the much needed recapitalization of our aging Ready Reserve Force.

ATROCITIES IN SIERRA LEONE

HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join many of my colleagues in expressing our outrage with the continuing atrocities in Sierra Leone.

Two weeks ago, seven Sierra Leoneans testified before the House International Relations Committee's Subcommittee on Africa. They told chilling and horrifying tales that I will not soon forget.

Thousands of Sierra Leoneans—men, women, children, and even infants—have had their limbs amputated as part of a campaign of terror by rebels. As the democratically elected government and the rebels battle over control of the nation's lucrative diamond mines, the citizens of Sierra Leone live lives of fear and tragedy. Meanwhile, the international diamond industry continues to purchase enormous quantities of diamonds from Sierra Leone. It does not matter who controls the mines, the rebels or the government, as long as the industry continues to receive its precious commodity.

I want to commend brave Sierra Leoneans who have risked their lives to tell the world about the atrocities in their country. I also want to commend organizations such as the Friends of Sierra Leone. The Friends of Sierra Leone is a non-profit organization made up of Sierra Leone emigres, former Peace Corps