

wrote a book-length examination of overall U.S. defense planning processes, and how they might be improved.

John Collins' single greatest service to the Congress and the Nation, however, was provided in the form of a series of book-length reports, beginning in 1976 and running through 1985, which meticulously documented the relentless military buildup and geostrategic expansion of the Soviet Union and its client states in almost every category of military power and area of the world. His comparisons of United States Soviet military forces, together with the respective allies of both countries, demonstrated with clarity and precision how American military capabilities, relative to our interests, were steadily declining, and those of the Soviet Union were increasing. Widely read, quoted, and debated, John Collins' works on the United States-Soviet military balance unquestionably played a role in persuading the American people and their elected representatives that, by the early 1980's, major increases in United States military forces and defense spending were required to restore our national credibility and deter and prevent Soviet expansionism. This was not an easy time for John Collins. Some were not happy with what he had to say about the shifting balance of military power in favor of the Soviet Union, and he had to withstand considerable bureaucratic and political pressure to continue to do his job. However, those who exerted such pressure against him are gone. He and his works remain.

By helping alert the country to the growing menace of Soviet military power in the late 1970's and early 1980's, Mr. Collins can also said to have played a role in the ultimate demise of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. Without the American military resurgence of the 1980's, it is difficult to see how the Soviet military-political juggernaut of the mid and late 1970's could have been halted, turned inward, and forced to collapse of its own internal strains. Indeed, in October 1985, only a few months after Gorbachev assumed power in the Soviet Union, he presciently suggested that "the whole Soviet security apparatus in Central Europe is coming unraveled."¹

The thawing of the cold war and the eventual demise of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact in no way lessened Mr. Collins' output. He produced authoritative studies of military space forces, United States and Soviet special operations forces, lessons learned from America's small wars, and a host of other reports and analyses. During the Persian Gulf war, he was frequently interviewed on national and international radio and television, and wrote numerous short analyses of possible issues and problems related to war with Iraq. At one point, well over a hundred congressional staffers gathered to listen with rapt attention to this veteran of three wars outline not the possible nature of a ground war with Iraq—not just in academic, and analytical terms, but how ground combat was "close up, and personal, and dirty." Within the past few years, his talents have turned to as diverse a set of subjects as counterproliferation, U.S. prepositioned military equipment, nonlethal weapons, and criteria for U.S. military intervention overseas. His last CRS report, finished

just days ago, deals with the military aspects of NATO enlargement.

Mr. Speaker, although John Collins is completing almost 54 years of total Federal service when he retires from CRS, he has no intention of remaining inactive. General Shalikhavili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has had the eminent good sense to agree to provide Mr. Collins with some office and study space at the National Defense University at Fort McNair. With the time he now will have, plus the assistance from DOD, Mr. Collins intends to write books on military geography and military strategy. He will have more time to spend with his wife Gloria, to whom he has dedicated many of his books; his son Sean, holder of a doctorate in aeronautical and astronautical engineering from MIT, and a contributor to national defense and security in his own right in the field of ballistic missile defense; and his grandchildren.

Few people have devoted so much of a long life to the service of the United States as has John Collins. I wish him well as he enters yet another stage of that service.

OPPOSES SECURITIES LITIGATION CONFERENCE REPORT VETO OVERRIDE

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. DE FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the motion to override the President's veto of the Securities Litigation Conference Report.

The laws governing securities litigation can certainly stand to be improved, but the language of this conference report does much more harm than good. This legislation—written by and for the large securities firms—is anti-small investor and anti-working family.

The conference report reduces consumers protection. An investors ability and right to sue unscrupulous securities firms should not be stifled or circumscribed by Congress. For example, the language includes a sweeping loser pays provision that will make it extremely difficult for anyone without a multimillion dollar trust fund to challenge a large corporation in court.

Supporters of this legislation claim that there is an explosion of frivolous suits. The fact is that the number of securities class action suits has shrunk over the past 20 years. During the last several years, suits have been filed against only 120 companies annually—out of over 14,000 public corporations reporting to the SEC.

The President was correct in his veto. This conference report goes against the interests of working people and small investors. I sincerely hope that the Congress will sustain the veto that we can then enact true reform of our Nation's securities litigation laws.

OPPORTUNITIES TO CHANGE

HON. SUSAN MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the December 8, 1995, editorial

from one of my local papers, the New York Post, which sums up exactly a sentiment most of us, I think, feel about Newt Gingrich. In these times of overt partisanship, the editors write that they,

[H]ope that Gingrich takes heart, stands his ground and stays the course. Opportunities to change the direction in American politics don't come around often; and if the Republicans don't succeed in disrupting business as usual in Washington now, the chance will likely pass.

We have no choice, for the sake of our children, but to balance the budget and I urge Speaker GINGRICH to continue his effort to focus this nation into realizing fiscal sanity.

[From the New York Post, Dec. 8, 1995]

THE GINGRICH INQUISITION

House Minority Leader David Bonior (D-Mich.) and other congressional Democrats have been trying for more than half a decade to pin ethics violations on Speaker Newt Gingrich. To this end, they and their allies in the land of the left leveled endless charges against Gingrich. Indeed, over the course of the last 15 months, the House Ethics Committee has considered 65 separate counts.

On Wednesday, the committee ruled that with respect to 64, the speaker has been completely or partially exonerated. (It should be noted that one of these charges turned on Gingrich's book contract with HarperCollins, a publishing concern owned by News Corp., which is also this newspaper's corporate parent.)

Only one of the 65 charges was deemed worthy of further exploration by an independent counsel. Pardon us if we suggest that this six-year fishing expedition has produced decidedly unimpressive results.

The committee voted to retain a special counsel to explore whether or not the speaker violated the law by using tax-deductible contributions to finance a college course he taught at Kennesaw State University in Georgia. Gingrich has expressed confidence that he will be fully exonerated on this seemingly narrow and highly technical charge. In light of the fate of all the other accusations lodged against him, it's hard not to credit this possibility. Many critics on both sides of aisle have contended that, in general, the standards for appointing independent counsels are exceedingly low; the Ethics Committee's decision here would seem to confirm this observation.

It is worth recognizing a distinction between the ethics problems allegedly swirling around Gingrich and those that brought down ex-House Speaker Jim Wright, a Democrat. The latter came under investigation after years of abusing his power. While Gingrich (as a back-bencher) played a leading role in the campaign against Wright, even loyal Democrats—in the end—couldn't ignore the ex-speaker's transgressions.

House Democrats, by contrast, have tried to demonize Gingrich ever since his success in that effort. And from the day the Georgia Republican became speaker, the "get Newt" campaign has been a central concern of the official Democratic party leadership.

Such prejudice suggests that what bothers Bonior & Co. about Gingrich has nothing to do with whether or not tax-deductible contributions were mistakenly used to help finance his political science lectures at Kennesaw State. The Democrats object to the fact that Gingrich—the most able parliamentarian in recent memory—is an energetic conservative who's mounted a serious challenge to the national ideological status quo.

Similarly, it is not the mere existence of the speaker's political action committee,

¹ Collins, John M. What Have We Got for \$1 Trillion? The Washington Quarterly, Spring 1988: 49, based on testimony before the Defense Policy Panel, House Armed Services Committee, October 9, 1985.

GOPAC, that disturbs the Democrats (though they are, in fact, urging the special counsel to expand his inquiry to include some of GOPAC's activities). What really distresses the Democratic leadership is the fact that Gingrich has used GOPAC to forge a spirited GOP congressional majority that's serious about welfare reform, tax reduction and shrinking the power of the federal government.

To a considerable extent, the Ethics Committee's willingness to order just one charge probed vindicates the speaker. We hope, therefore, that Gingrich takes heart, stands his ground and stays the course. Opportunities to change the direction in American politics don't come around often; and if the Republicans don't succeed in disrupting business as usual in Washington now, the chance will likely pass.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 134
MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL
YEAR 1996

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 134, a measure that will provide

the payment of compensation and pension benefits for our Nation's veterans and their families for fiscal year 1996. I am glad to see that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are at least concerned about some aspect of their obligation to these patriots who answered the call of their Nation.

Despite the fact that this resolution has a noble objective, it is clearly incomplete. It simply does not go far enough. While our veterans and their families will be somewhat comforted by the passage of this resolution, who will give some financial assurance to the millions of Americans who continue to face uncertain futures because Congress has not fulfilled its obligations regarding the remaining appropriations Bills? These remaining bills, which are not included in this resolution, are so harmful and unreasonable that the President has had to veto them and no action has been taken by the House to improve them or continue them in a continuing resolution.

Take for example, the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. Action on this measure is still pending. While the Department of Health and Human Services is closed, Medicare and Medicaid applications cannot be processed. While the Department of Labor is closed, unemployment applications cannot be processed.

In addition, the drastic cuts in the appropriations measure for the Department of Edu-

cation will deny critical resources to schools and communities across the country. The \$1.1 billion cut in title 1 will deny over one million children the basic assistance they need in math and reading. The 50 percent cut in safe and drug free schools will take away the resources necessary to provide children a safe, crime free, and violence free classroom in which to attend school.

While we take these steps to assist our veterans, the threat to our environment continues to intensify. Because the VA-HUD-and Independent Agencies appropriations bill is not completed, environmental protection and oversight has come to a screeching halt. There is no enforcement of the Nation's environmental laws—laws that protect our water and air. Polluters are going unchecked everyday that the EPA is closed. Furthermore, the level of cuts proposed for EPA in the FY96 appropriations bill deprives our children of clean and safe environment.

Mr. Speaker, the list of vital programs that enhance the quality of life for all Americans is far greater than just that of veterans compensation and pension programs. What we are doing for America's veterans tonight is the right thing to do. We should do the right thing for all Americans and pass a clean continuing resolution.