

Arthur Ruhl died in 1935 and his files were packed into boxes that went into storage for more than 60 years. I recently came into possession of his papers, which include both articles for *Collier's*, three letters from Orville Wright, and a note from Katherine Wright, the brothers' sister, thanking Arthur for some sweet peas he brought to dinner at the Wrights' home on Hawthorne Street in Dayton.

RECOGNIZING THE CLASS ACT
GROUP GRASSROOTS CON-
FERENCE TO RESTORE THE BRO-
KEN PROMISE OF MILITARY RE-
TIREE HEALTH CARE

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 2004

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Col. George "Bud" Day and the members of the Class Act Group who have worked so hard to restore health care to America's military retirees. I salute them for their grassroots efforts that helped make Tricare for Life the law of the land, and I commend them for coming together on February 17, 2004, in Fort Walton Beach, Florida, to develop a strategy to convince Congress to make good on more of the broken promises. I especially appreciate their efforts to enact H.R. 3474, the Keep Our Promise to America's Military Retirees Act, a bipartisan bill that I was proud to introduce.

The purpose of the recent meeting takes on a greater urgency because we must prepare to honor a new generation of veterans who have been willing to make the ultimate sacrifice for our country in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our government must be accountable for the promises it makes to young men and women who are asked to serve our country in this way.

Generations of young men and women were recruited into the uniformed services with the promise that health care would be there for them when they retired after serving a career in service. But while these career soldiers put their lives on the line for our country, the government did not keep its end of the contract. Finally, the Courts have laid to rest the matter of who is responsible for making good on those promises—the United States Congress.

The Class Act Group convention is in the best tradition of American democracy—they are joining together to petition their elected representatives to do the right thing and make good on promises the government made to our military retirees. As veterans, they have already set a good example for our young people by protecting our freedoms and rights. And by organizing this grassroots movement they are doing it again by exercising those freedoms and rights.

I send my congratulations to the Class Act Group for a job well done! I will work with CAG and anyone else who shares our goal, to see that Congress does Keep Our Promise to America's Military Retirees.

THE IMPORTANCE OF DUE
PROCESS FOR JOSE PADILLA

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 2004

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has agreed to hear two important cases regarding the balance between national security and the rights of American citizens. And in a February 24th editorial, the Rocky Mountain News clearly explains why we all have a stake in the outcome of the cases involving Yasr Hamdi and Jose Portillo.

While both evidently are American citizens now being held as unlawful combatants, their cases are not identical. As the editorial explains:

Both men are citizens, but the incarceration of Hamdi seems less convincingly a civil-rights incursion than the incarceration of Padilla. While Hamdi deserves his day in court, grabbing a prisoner at the site of armed hostilities in a foreign country is a different matter from picking someone up at a domestic airport.

And, in the words of the editorial, here is the bottom line:

The obvious issue with Padilla is that if the administration can stick him away as long as it likes without an indictment or court proceedings of any kind, why can't it do the same thing with any of us?

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point, and exactly why the Portillo case is so important. For the benefit of our colleagues, I am attaching the full text of the editorial.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Feb. 24, 2004]

PADILLA DESERVES DUE PROCESS—STILL

Some argue the Bush administration was justified in arresting a U.S. citizen and holding him for two years without due process because, after all, he was in league with terrorists. The logical fallacy here is known as begging the question—you assume the conclusion in the proposition.

How can the administration know Jose Padilla was a terrorist intent on mass killings through use of a "dirty" bomb without due process? And if this can be proven, why doesn't the government initiate a trial?

The Supreme Court is now going to take on the question of whether the administration violated the Constitution in holding Padilla, arrested in Chicago after a trip abroad, and Yaser Hamdi, captured in a battlefield in Afghanistan. Both men are citizens, but the incarceration of Hamdi seems less convincingly a civil-rights incursion than the incarceration of Padilla. While Hamdi deserves his day in court, grabbing a prisoner at the site of armed hostilities in a foreign country is a different matter from picking someone up at a domestic airport.

The obvious issue with Padilla is that if the administration can stick him away as long as it likes without an indictment or court proceedings of any kind, why can't it do the same thing with any of us?

It's hard to see how the Supreme Court could side with the administration in the Padilla case, even if a few other presidents, most notably Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War, have gotten away with the suspension of due process. Moreover, there is language both in Article I of the Constitution and the Fifth Amendment that allows exceptions to due process protections when there is a public danger. We simply don't believe that language would be correctly applied to the Padilla situation.

SPEECH OF DR. ARCH BARRETT

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 2004

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into the RECORD a speech given by a former staffer of the House Armed Services Committee, Arch Barrett. Arch is one of the most unassuming people I know, but was one of the most remarkable and able staffers I've met during my 20 years on Capitol Hill.

Arch had an undergraduate degree from both the West Point and Harvard, and later got his Ph.D. in political economy and government from Harvard. He entered the Air Force as a second lieutenant in 1957, saw plenty of action in Vietnam, and retired as a colonel in 1981. While in the Air Force, he received the Distinguished Flying Cross, Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medal with 12 oak leaf clusters, the Joint Service and Air Force Commendation Medals, and the Vietnam Service Medal.

As distinguished as his military record is, his greatest effect on the military came after he became a staffer for the House Armed Services Committee. If it were not for Arch Barrett, I do not believe Congress would have enacted the Goldwater-Nichols Act. Goldwater-Nichols forced the separate branches of the Armed Services to work cooperatively, and our forces would not be nearly as effective today had it not been for the Goldwater-Nichols Act. The Pentagon fought Goldwater-Nichols tooth and nail, and it took us about 4 years to actually pass the legislation. Whenever the Pentagon raised an objection, we sent Arch Barrett over and he'd argue with the naysayers until they ran out of objections and had to relent. It was a virtuoso performance by someone who had mastered the subject matter.

Arch Barrett is now a professor at the Navy Post-Graduate School in Monterey, still serving his country. He gave the graduation address to the Naval Postgraduate School's Joint Professional Military Education Course in June 2003. In that speech, Arch of course downplayed his own role in establishing Goldwater-Nichols, but did recognize important contributions from several Members of Congress. One of those is a man I, like Arch Barrett, admire—my good friend and colleague from Missouri, the Ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee, Ike Skelton.

I commend Arch's speech to all those with an interest in the founding of the Goldwater-Nichols legislation, and I am proud to enter it into the RECORD.

REFLECTIONS ON LEADERSHIP IN DEFENSE AND
PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION REFORM
(By Archie D. Barrett)

Sixteen years ago, in 1987, Congressman Les Aspin asked me whether there was an uncompleted task in the area of Defense Department restructuring that could be assigned to Representative Ike Skelton. Aspin was the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the U. S. House of Representatives. Skelton was a mid-level Democrat on the Committee who was intensely interested in improving the quality and performance of our Armed Forces. I was a member of Mr. Aspin's Committee staff.

At the time, the Pentagon was making little progress in implementing the education