

colleagues and him of another Holmes' observation in *The Sign of Four*: "When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth." The truth is that Gerry Holmes will be missed. We want him to do well at all that he does, but his absence will leave a hole that will be hard to fill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in wishing Gerald E. Holmes every success in the days to come.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S.
BATTLESHIPS

HON. BRIAN P. BILBRAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1995

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to honor and commemorate the hundredth anniversary of the U.S. battleship, and the men who served on-board.

The battleship has played a vital role as a symbol of U.S. power. President Theodore Roosevelt sent 16 battleships, known as the "Great White Fleet," to sail around the world from 1906–1909 to demonstrate to European powers American strength and a willingness to use it to support our national interests. The U.S.S. *Missouri* (BB–63) epitomized the symbolism of the battleship by serving as the platform for Japanese surrender at the conclusion of World War II. The battleship has served in every major conflict this century, including our most recent in the Persian Gulf.

The first battleship, the U.S.S. *Indiana* (BB–1), was commissioned on November 20, 1895 and set sail under the command of Captain Robley D. Evans. At the beginning of the Spanish-American War, the *Indiana* helped define the United States as a great power, when she formed up with Admiral Sampson to intercept Spanish Admiral Cervera's squadron, which was positioning itself to defend Spain's colony on Cuba. The two forces clashed outside of Santiago, Cuba where the *Indiana* quickly sunk two Spanish destroyers, leading to the freedom of Cuba from Spain's domination, and ushering in an era of the supremacy of the battleship.

During World War II, the battleship played an important role in the defeat of the Axis powers. The *South Dakota* (BB–57), the *North Carolina* (BB–55) and the *Washington* (BB–56) helped to protect the first U.S. ground offensive of the Pacific at Guadalcanal. When General MacArthur made good his promise to return to the Philippines at Leyte Island in 1944, he came with battleships. The *Maryland* (BB–46), *Pennsylvania* (BB–38), *Tennessee* (BB–43), *West Virginia* (BB–48) and the *California* (BB–44), all resurrected from the disaster at Pearl Harbor, participated in the liberation of the Philippine Islands, seeing their most important action at the battle of Surigao Strait. In that battle, the battleships were tantamount in the effort to repulse the Japanese Navy, and saved the very vital supply ships. At Okinawa, one of the war's most difficult engagements, the battleships were able to repel Japanese kamikaze attacks while protecting the landing of the Marines.

In the European theater, battleships played an important support role during the D-Day landing of allied forces at Omaha and Utah

beaches. The U.S.S. *Nevada* (BB–36), *Texas* (BB–35), and the *Arkansas* (BB–33) were primary in this effort.

Throughout the cold war, the Pentagon saw fit to recommission battleships for a variety of important roles. During the Korean War, the *Iowa* (BB–61), *New Jersey* (BB–62), *Missouri* (BB–63), and *Wisconsin* (BB–64) were dusted off and called on to support U.N. troops. They also served important missions to destroy enemy railroads and coastal artillery batteries. In Vietnam, the battleship returned to service to provide long range artillery support to ground troops. The *New Jersey* (BB–62) was praised for its ability to create a 200 yard wide helicopter landing zone out of a triple canopy jungle in record time. The battleship also saw active duty during Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Outfitted with sophisticated Tomahawk cruise missiles, Harpoon surface-to-surface missiles, and the Phalanx close-in weapons system, American battleships participated in the initial missile strikes against Baghdad, and in gunfire support of U.S. Marines during the ground offensive.

Today, the battleships again lay idle, and their names have been stricken from the Naval register. Thankfully, they will be preserved as a symbol of U.S. strength, and in memorial to those who served and died in the service of their country.

Mr. Chairman, the battleship is a proud testament to American Maritime power. I would like to submit for the record a list of names of the surviving battleship commanders. These men should be respected for the service they have provided to their country, and envied for their place in history. Congratulations to these survivors and to all who serve on this occasion, the hundredth anniversary of the American Battleship.

ROSTER OF SURVIVING FORMER COMMANDING
OFFICERS WHO COMMANDED A UNITED
STATES BATTLESHIP

USS IOWA (BB–61)

RADM. Fred J. Becton, USN (ret)
RADM. J.W. Cooper, USN (ret)
RADM. G.E. Gneckow, USN (ret)
Capt. Fred P. Moosally, USN (ret)
Capt. John P. Morse, U.S. Navy
Capt. Larry P. Seaquist, USN (ret)

USS NEW JERSEY (BB–62)

RADM. W.M. Fogarty, USN (ret)
RADM. W. Lewis Glenn, USN (ret)
VADM. Douglas Katz, U.S. Navy
RADM. Richard D. Milligan, USN (ret)
Capt. Robert C. Peniston, USN (ret)
RADM. J. Edward Synder, USN (ret)
RADM. Ronald D. Tucker, U.S. Navy

USS MISSOURI (BB–63)

Capt. James A. Carney, USN (ret)
Capt. John Chernesky, USN (ret)
Capt. A.L. Kaiss, USN (ret)

USS WISCONSIN (BB–64)

RADM. David S. Bill, U.S. Navy
Capt. Jerry M. Blesch, USN (ret)
RADM. G. Serpell Patrick, USN (ret)
Capt. Coenraad van der Schroeff, USN (ret)

MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE
AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2586, TEM-
PORARY INCREASE IN THE
STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT

SPEECH OF

HON. L.F. PAYNE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in urging my colleagues to vote in favor of the motion to recommit, let me take a moment to address potential arguments that those on the other side of the aisle may raise against the motion.

Congressman SAM GIBBONS and I are offering a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instruction. As I have explained, the motion's instruction to the Ways and Means Committee is to amend the bill to provide a clean, temporary increase in the debt ceiling until either December 12—the same date as in the Republican bill—or the 30th day after a budget reconciliation bill is presented to the President for his signature, whichever is later.

First, our Republican colleagues may argue that the amendment would provide an unlimited period of time for the President to delay. That is incorrect. The amendment would raise the debt limit for a finite period of 30 days beginning as soon as a budget reconciliation bill is sent to the President for his signature. If a bill were ready today and sent to the President, the clock would start ticking today and stop ticking 30 days from now. The President's response to the bill would not affect the 30-day limit in any way. That 30-day period would allow us to put forth our best efforts to come together on the shared goal of a balanced budget. Our amendment is not indefinite and open ended. What seems to be indefinite and open ended is the ability of the Republican majority that controls this House to produce either a clean interest in the debt ceiling without partisan add ons or a budget bill.

Second, our Republican colleagues may argue that the amendment would give the Treasury Department a blank check to increase the debt limit to whatever level it wishes. That is incorrect. The amendment would raise the debt ceiling to exactly the same level as that in the Republican debt bill. If a budget is not presented to the President in a timely way, then a higher amount would be allowed and in that case the higher amount would be limited to only what is necessary to pay our bills in the intervening days. The amendment in the motion to recommit would raise the debt limit cleanly, that is, without extraneous provisions of any kind. This suggested amendment is the businesslike approach that the American people deserve to the current regrettable, and avoidable, impasse.

Third, our Republican colleagues may argue that the amendment would grant permission to the Treasury to raid retirement trust funds. That is incorrect. In fact, in the case of the civil service retirement fund this amendment would restore the current-law protections for Federal retirees and workers that the Republican bill would destroy. Current law requires that any funds used from civil service pension funds and retirement savings accounts to see ourselves through a debt limit crisis, such as the one we now face, must be reimbursed

with interest. Today this reimbursement is automatic. The Republican debt limit bill would take away that protection by repealing the requirement for automatic reimbursement of these funds with interest. My Democratic colleagues and I think that is wrong. Our amendment would protect Federal retirees and workers from that injustice. Regarding Social Security, the Secretary of the Treasury has said that he will not use funds from the Social Security trust fund for any purpose other than paying Social Security benefits. Social Secu-

urity beneficiaries are fully protected. Period. Those on the other side of the aisle would be dead wrong to suggest otherwise.

Fourth, our Republican colleagues may argue that the amendment would jeopardize the orderly process of managing our Nation's debt and honoring our Nation's commitments. That is incorrect. Our amendment would do exactly the opposite. The orderly way to proceed with these discussions about the best path to a balanced budget is to allow a clean, temporary increase in the debt ceiling un-

adorned by partisan add ons. That is precisely what our amendment would do. It is precisely that orderly process that the Republican majority disrupts by insisting that temporary debt increase include partisan add ons.

I hope that our colleagues across the aisle will give our motion to recommit a careful reading. It provides an opportunity to all of us to work together rationally toward a balanced budget rather than to contribute to the atmosphere of partisanship and distrust. Again, I urge a vote in favor of the motion to recommit.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, November 21, 1995, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

NOVEMBER 29

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee

To hold hearings on issues relating to franchise relocation in professional sports.

SD-226

NOVEMBER 30

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.

SD-226

DECEMBER 5

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Administrative Oversight and the Courts Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 984, to protect the fundamental right of a parent to direct the upbringing of a child.

SD-226

DECEMBER 6

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (P.L. 101-601).

SR-485