

Croatia has renewed and extended the original 12-month mandate seven separate times. While some sort of public order has been maintained and the Yugoslav Army has partially departed, the UNPA's have not been demilitarized. Heavily armed Serbian paramilitary units remain, the local non-Serbian population continues to be expelled and in some cases killed, and it has not been possible for a single displaced person to return to these areas. According to the 1991 census, there were 261,942 non-Serbs in the UNPA's. Since the arrival of UNPROFOR at least 39,000 non-Serbs have been forced to flee, 347 have been killed, 26 women raped, and 1,618 tortured at the hands of the Serbian occupiers. This is an intolerable situation.

With the intransigence of the Serbs to engage in serious discussions of peace, Croatia's mandate renewals have amounted to no less than tacit U.N. support for the indefinite continued Serb occupation of Croatian lands seized by aggression. In real terms, the positive economic contributions of the U.N. presence in the occupied territories have actually provided support for the Serbian occupiers and proven a major hindrance to forcing the Serbs to the negotiating table.

In this light, I ask my colleagues to review Croatia's U.N. Ambassador Nobile's discussion reprinted below about Croatia's refusal to renew the UNPROFOR an eighth time, and invite Members to take a good hard look at some of the causes of the deadlock and suffering which Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina have endured for too long. Moreover, my colleagues, this action by the Croatian Government is completely supported by the Croatian people as evidenced by two resolutions by the Croatian Parliament authorizing the Government's decision and a third binding the Government to this course.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1995]

CROATIA'S MOVE TOWARD PEACE

(By Mario Nobile, Croatian Ambassador to the U.N.)

Last month, the Republic of Croatia decided to terminate the mandate of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the occupied territories of Croatia. The decision is designed to reinvigorate the negotiating process and to reach a peaceful settlement of the territories, which are internationally-recognized as part of Croatia but illegally occupied by Serbia, with the cooperation of local Serbs.

Contrary to the views held by some, including speculation in The Post's editorial of Jan. 18 ("Another Balkan War?") Croatia did not take this action in order to pursue war with the local Serbs or their patrons in Belgrade. Our objectives are the exact opposite.

The departure of UNPROFOR will shift the total cost of Serbian occupation from the international community to the Belgrade government. The \$1 billion per year cost of maintaining UNPROFOR in Croatia has essentially become an "occupation fee" paid by U.N. member nations, including the United States, which itself contributes about \$300 million.

The presence of UNPROFOR provides the occupying forces with economic sustenance through a continued stream of hard currency, through aid deliveries, through UNPROFOR-paid rents, through fuel brokering, and through infrastructure maintenance and development. UNPROFOR is probably the largest employer in the occupied territories.

Because Serbia is weakened from the effect of international sanctions, it cannot afford to fund both its activities in Bosnia and its

support of Serbs occupying parts of Croatia. That makes it more likely that Serbia's President Milosevic will be compelled to work with the international community and Croatia to reach a negotiated settlement regarding Croatia's occupied territories.

It is clear that UNPROFOR is not a real deterrent to war, in Croatia or in Bosnia and Herzegovina. If Croatia were indeed intent on reintegrating its occupied territories by force, it could have done so already.

Croatia is further convinced that solving the problem of its occupied territories first can greatly improve the chances of a settlement in Bosnia along with the lines of the internationally-accepted Contact Group proposals. Here's why: A strong, reintegrated Croatia can better assist the Bosnian government through the Federation of Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats, thus forging a more effective balance of power in the region.

Additionally, without having to maintain a 15,000-troop presence in Croatia, UNPROFOR can transfer resources to Bosnia and Herzegovina, where they are badly needed. U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Boutros Ghali has recently called for an additional 7,000 UNPROFOR troops for Bosnia. He is unlikely to meet that need without tapping existing U.N. assets.

There are risks associated with our decision regarding UNPROFOR. But Mr. Milosevic and his dependents in Croatia's occupied territories have used U.N. soldiers as a buffer to reaching an expeditious settlement of a situation which could go unsolved for years to come under the current circumstances. Croatia views such a statement as far more dangerous than taking a pragmatic, albeit dramatic, action that we are confident will result in an accelerated peace in the entire region of southeastern Europe.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. MARTIN R. HOKE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 728) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is designed to address the problem of inaccurate reporting of crime statistics.

We all know that many localities do not make crime data gathering a top priority. However, under this bill their financial award will be based on their reported data. I am sure we all agree on the importance of making sure accurate data is used when the Bureau of Justice Assistance calculates awards.

My amendment states that if the director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance believes that the reported rate of violent crimes for a local unit of government is inaccurate, he must investigate the methodology used by the locality to determine the accuracy of the submitted data. If he determines that the submitted data is inaccurate—for whatever reason—he is to use the best comparable data available instead.

The amendment places no additional burden on the localities and gives the director the discretion to determine which cases deserve investigation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a common sense amendment. Local units of government should not benefit financially—at the expense of other localities—for inaccurately reported crime data.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to explain my amendment. I urge its adoption.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 728, AS REPORTED,
OFFERED BY MR. HOKE OF OHIO

Page 18, strike line 23 through "poses" on line 24, and insert the following:

"(C) UNAVAILABILITY AND INACCURACY OF INFORMATION.—

"(1) DATA FOR STATES.—For purposes".

Page 19, after line 4, add the following new paragraph:

"(2) POSSIBLE INACCURACY OF DATA FOR UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—In addition to the provisions of paragraph (1), if the Director believes that the reported rate of part 1 violent crimes for a unit of local government is inaccurate, the Director shall—

"(A) investigate the methodology used by such unit to determine the accuracy of the submitted data; and

"(B) when necessary, use the best available comparable data regarding the number of violent crimes for such years for such unit of local government.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KAREN L. THURMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1995

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 138 on H.R. 7, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

SUMMARY OF RULES COMMITTEE VOTES

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1995, the House adopted a new rule, clause 2(l)(2)(B) of rule XI, which requires that committee reports on any bill or other matter include the names of those voting for and against on rollcall votes taken on any amendment and on the motion to report. During consideration of the rule on the first day of the 104th Congress, an explanation included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Chairman SOLOMON states:

It is the intent of this rule to provide for greater accountability for record votes in committees and to make such votes easily available to the public in committee reports. At present, under clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI, the public can only inspect rollcall votes on matters in the offices of the committee. It is anticipated that with the availability of committee reports to the public through electronic form the listing of votes in reports will be more bill-specific than earlier proposals to publish all votes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD twice a year.

Upon examining the Rules Committee report to accompany House Resolution 44, the rule for House Joint Resolution 1—balanced budget constitutional amendment, I found it lacking

in the type of information which I believe is vital for public understanding of what the members of the committee were actually voting on. The report under the heading of "summary of motion" gives so limited an account as to be almost meaningless. While the rule does not explicitly require the report to contain a description of the motion and amendment being offered, the intent of better informing the public seems to have been lost. The lack of information will force the public to search in other publications for information vital to understanding what the issue is for which the votes are being cast. There is no way that the public, unless present at the Rules Committee markup, could understand what, for example, "Make in order Frank amendment No. 27 from Record" means without going to the Rules Committee transcript or other informational sources such as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. How would anyone know which CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the amendment was printed in? There is no date indicated. Also, the public would never know from the report that the Frank amendment would protect Social Security from cuts. The public would be better served if adequate information were included in the committee report.

With that in mind, I am, for the benefit of the public and the membership of this body, including the following summary of the rollcall votes which were taken in the Rules Committee on January 24, 1995:

COMMITTEE VOTES

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 9

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Moakley.

Summary of Motion: To report an open rule.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 8.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Not voting; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 10

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Moakley.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Conyers Truth-in-Budgeting Amendment No. 23, requiring Congress to spell out the spending cuts and tax increases necessary to achieve a balanced budget, printed in the Record on January 20, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 3 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Not voting; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 11

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Moakley.

Summary of Motion: Strike language that provides for the substitute with most votes wins and insert language to provide that the last substitute adopted wins.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 12

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Beilenson.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Franks of (NJ) amendment No. 7, prohibiting unfunded mandates, printed in the Record of January 19, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 13

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Beilenson.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Hoke amendment No. 8, requiring 3/5 vote on raising debt limit or tax revenues, printed in the Record of January 19, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Linder—Nay; Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 14

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Frost.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Istook amendments No. 10 and No. 32 printed in the Record of January 19, 1995 and January 20, 1995, respectively. Both amendments would sunset the 3/5 vote to increase revenues after two years.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz—Linder—Nay; Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 15

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Frost.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Schiff amendment No. 13, requiring special treatment for any trust fund with a surplus printed in the Record of January 19, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 16

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Frost.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Frank amendment No. 27, protecting Social Security from cuts, printed in the Record of January 20, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Members: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 17

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rules for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Hall.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Nadler amendment No. 35, exempting from 3/5 vote requirement for tax increases resulting from the withdrawal of most favored nation status, printed in the Record of January 20, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 18

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rules for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Hall.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Hilliard amendments No. 30 and No. 31 printed in the Record of January 20, 1995. Amendment No. 30 protects Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Amendment No. 31 protects Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 19

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rules for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Hall.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Foglietta amendment No. 28, requiring 3/5 vote to reduce funding for low-income health, education or employment programs, printed in the Record of January 20, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 20

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Hall.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Traficant amendment No. 43, requiring 3/5 vote to reduce Social Security benefits, printed in the Record of January 20, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 21

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Beilenson.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Waters amendment No. 20, protects capital investments in criminal justice, personal security, and fire prevention, printed in the Record of January 19, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 22

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Moakley.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Orton amendments No. 36 and 37 printed in the Record of January 20, 1995. Amendment No. 36 requires sequestration to bring budget back to balance and amendment No. 37 requires 3/5 vote to waive balanced budget requirement.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay;

Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ON ROLLCALL NO. 23

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Beilenson.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Skaggs amendments No. 41 and 42 printed in the Record of January 20, 1995. Both amendments prohibit Federal and State judicial review.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 24

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Frost.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Nadler amendments No. 33 and No. 34 printed in the Record of January 20, 1995. Amendment No. 33 exempts from $\frac{3}{5}$ vote measures that promote enforcement of tax laws and amendment No. 34 exempts from $\frac{3}{5}$ vote measures that reduce tax credits and deductions for corporations.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 25

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Frost.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Jackson-Lee amendments No. 45 and No. 46 printed in the Record of January 23, 1995. Amendment No. 45 takes Medicare and Medicaid off-budget and amendment No. 46 protects Medicaid payments from cuts.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 26

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Beilenson.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Skaggs amendment No. 14, waiving balanced budget requirement during periods of national security emergency or national economic emergency, printed in the Record of January 19, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 2 to 7.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Not voting; Goss—Nay; Linder—Not voting; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Not voting; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Not voting; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 27

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Beilenson.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Thornton amendment No. 18, protecting capital investments which provide long-term economic returns, printed in the Record of January 19, 1995.

Results: Rejected, 3 to 7.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Not voting; Pryce—

Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Not voting; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 28

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Beilenson.

Summary of Motion: Make in order the Volkmer amendment No. 44, striking the $\frac{3}{5}$ vote for revenue increases, printed in the Record of January 20, 1995.

Results: Adopted, 3 to 7.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Not voting; Goss—Nay; Linder—Not voting; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Not voting; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 29

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Moakley.

Summary of Motion: Make in order en bloc the Conyers amendment No. 24, the Coleman amendment No. 2, the Jacobs amendment No. 3, the Watt amendment No. 21, the Kleczka amendment No. 5, the Stupak amendment No. 17, and Fattah amendment No. 26. Amendments No. 2 and No. 3 were printed in the Record of January 17, 1995, amendment No. 5 on January 18, 1995, amendments No. 17 and No. 21 on January 19, 1995, and amendments No. 24 and No. 26 on January 20, 1995. Amendment No. 2 protects Social Security and Medicare, amendment No. 3 requires the national debt be paid off, amendment No. 5 and amendment No. 17 take Social Security off-budget, amendment No. 21 waives article provisions by majority vote, amendment No. 24 truth in budgeting with $\frac{3}{5}$ vote requirements, and amendment No. 26 provides waiver by majority in the event of natural disaster or fiscal or social infrastructure deterioration.

Results: Rejected, 3 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Not voting; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Not voting; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 30

Date: January 24, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.J. Res. 1, Balanced Budget Amendment.

Motion By: Mr. Quillen.

Summary of Motion: To report rule to the House.

Results: Adopted, 9 to 3.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Yea; Dreier—Yea; Goss—Yea; Linder—Yea; Pryce—Yea; Diaz-Balart—Yea; McInnis—Yea; Waldholtz—Yea; Moakley—Nay; Beilenson—Nay; Frost—Not voting; Hall—Nay; Solomon—Yea.

LIFELONG INVOLVEMENT, DEVOTION, AND COMMITMENT DURING A DISTINGUISHED CAREER HAVE RESULTED IN A MAJOR AWARD FOR DR. DONALD CUSTIS

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1995

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and former Chief Medical Director of the VA, Dr. Donald Custis, was recently honored by the American Medical Association. On Feb-

ruary 7, 1995, Dr. Custis received the prestigious Nathan Davis Award at a gala AMA presentation dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, attended by a large number of family, friends, and colleagues.

Although our work in the House prevented me from attending the dinner ceremony, I did have the great honor and pleasure to be one of those who recommended that Dr. Custis be considered for the award.

There follows an articles that appeared in the February issue of PN/Paraplegia News highlighting the distinguished career of this great American public servant:

[From the PN/Paraplegia News, February 1995]

THE CONSUMMATE ADVOCATE

The American Medical Association (AMA) has selected PVA Senior Medical Advisor Donald L. Custis, M.D., as a 1994 recipient of its prestigious Nathan Davis Award. A former surgeon general of the U.S. Navy and chief medical director of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), Dr. Custis joined PVA as director of medical affairs in 1984. He served as associate executive director of the Health Policy Department and continues as a consultant on a wide variety of healthcare issues. PVA Immediate Past President Richard Johnson nominated Dr. Custis for the AMA award in August 1994.

The Nathan Davis Award is given in the name of the founder of the approximately 290,000-physician member organization. It is presented each year to leaders in Congress and federal, state and local governments for outstanding contributions "to promote the art and science of medicine and the betterment of the public health." Dr. Custis received the award in the category of "Lifetime Service in Federal Government Executive Branch Career Public Service." Senator John Chafee (R-R.I.), Congresswoman Nancy Johnson (R-Conn.), and Governor Michael O. Leavitt (R-Utah) were selected in other categories.

On February 7, members of PVA's Executive Committee and invited guests from the U.S. House of Representatives, Senate, and Departments of Veterans Affairs and Defense attended a gala AMA presentation dinner to honor Dr. Custis and his family.

The AMA award is one more achievement in Dr. Custis's career, which has spanned 50 years and included numerous honors and distinctions in federal medicine. Following the outbreak of World War II in Europe, he registered early for the draft and applied for a Naval Reserve commission while attending Northwestern University Medical School in Chicago. He completed his internship and residency in general surgery at Presbyterian Hospital, Chicago, in 1944, entered active duty, and served in the Pacific Theater of Operations for the duration of the war, most notably on hospital ships during the Okinawa campaign and the initial occupation of Japan.

After a brief period of private practice following the war, Dr. Custis reentered active duty to pursue a career as a Navy surgeon and quickly rose in the ranks of executive medicine. He was appointed executive officer at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital (1967); commanding officer of the Naval Combat Hospital, Danang, Vietnam (1969); commanding officer of Bethesda Naval Hospital in 1970; and surgeon general of the Navy (Navy medicine's top post) in 1973. He retired with the rank of vice admiral in 1976.

In 1976, Dr. Custis continued his commitment to federal medicine by joining VA. He served as deputy assistant chief medical director for academic affairs, deputy chief