

credit for this movement, instead battering them with emotional claims that their budget would cause serious harm to the poor, the weak and the underprivileged.

House Majority Leader Dick Arney of Texas has called attention to congressional Republicans' significant concessions. At one time, he said, they had pushed for \$101 billion in savings on welfare programs over the seven years. Now they are willing to settle for \$65 billion. Originally, they targeted 300 government agencies for elimination. Now the goal is about 30.

A major element of the GOP budget plan was a \$354 billion tax cut. Arney noted that Republicans have allowed the tax cut to be scaled back to \$245 billion.

Pete du Pont, a former Republican presidential candidate, has pointed out that the House Republicans—the same people painted by Clinton as zealous, unbending revolutionaries—have already given up more than half of their pro-growth tax cuts. He said that in all likelihood they will give up half again to get a budget deal.

That's something you don't hear when Clinton tromps into the White House press briefing room to trash the Gingrich Republicans. And it's not something the television networks point out when they fill their newscasts with sobbing federal workers who can't pay their rent.

Arney demonstrated that congressional Republicans have made "a good-sized mountain" of concessions. Still, the president lays the full blame for the government's being without a budget and partially shut down at the feet of House Republicans. He whines that he is being blackmailed by intransigent Republicans in the House who place politics ahead of the national interest.

The government is shut down because the president vetoed a budget bill that included the funds to pay the federal workers now on furlough. Clinton is pressing Republicans to approve another continuing resolution to fund the government through Jan. 12. They've already been there, done that. The national interest, not to mention our children's security, would be best served by enactment of a balanced budget—not another stopgap spending measure. To resolve the impasse, it will take a president who quits posturing and makes concessions of a magnitude similar to those made by congressional Republicans.

REMEMBERING GEN. DAN GRAHAM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 1996

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this past New Year's Eve, America lost a true patriot. Gen. Dan Graham, the father of SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative, passed away that day. I want to share with our colleagues a column in today's Washington Times by Paul Weyrich which tells about the life of Dan Graham and his mission for a strong defense to protect the national security of the United States.

THE MISSION OF A TRUE PATRIOT

(By Paul M. Weyrich)

About six weeks ago, I received a newly published book with a personal note from the author hoping that I would find it useful. I read through the book and dropped the author a note suggesting that he appear on my program, "Direct Line," to discuss the book. I received no reply and yesterday I found out why. Gen. Dan Graham passed away on New Year's eve.

None of his friends, even those who had worked closely with him over the years, knew just how critically ill Gen. Graham was in recent weeks. We had known for some time that he was suffering from cancer and for the past few months that he was unlikely to recover. But Dan Graham was never one to whine or complain. In fact, the only time I ever saw Dan Graham truly upset was at the funeral of his first wife, to whom he had been married most of his adult lifetime, and who was the mother of their two sons and five daughters. This nation owes Gen. Graham a great debt of gratitude.

I had gotten to know Gen. Graham more than 20 years ago. He was chief of Defense Intelligence during the Ford administration. The Democratic Senate, then controlled by nearly a two-thirds margin, forced him into premature retirement because he wasn't politically correct on Vietnam. He was never bitter, even though he had every reason to be. He continued his work for a strong defense on the outside, just as he had done so ably from the inside for more than 30 years in the Army.

It was in the early 1980s that Gen. Graham began to talk about new breakthroughs in technology. The breakthroughs would permit an effective missile defense system to be constructed to defend this country from a massive attack from the Soviet Union or from a surprise attack from some rogue leader. We were going to build a primitive version of such a system in the early 1970s, but President Nixon bargained that right away.

I know almost nothing about technology and certainly had no knowledge about this sort of development, but Gen. Graham gave me the full briefing anyway and then asked for my help to find a home for his project, called "High Frontier." I called Ed Feulner, the president of the Heritage Foundation, and explained that Gen. Graham was assembling a group of scientific experts who intended to advocate a new type of missile defense system. Ed quickly agreed that Heritage would welcome the project as part of its public policy activities, and thus was born what we now call SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Gen. Graham soon found a willing listener in one President Ronald Reagan, who in 1983 delivered a nationwide televised address that shook the leaders of the Kremlin. Mr. Reagan committed the United States to research and deploy a defensive missile system. Critics, in an effort to kill the project, quickly labeled it "Star Wars." But given the popularity of George Lucas' trilogy, that label only enhanced it.

Despite near crippling opposition from the Democratic Congress, SDI made significant advantages under the Reagan administration, to the point where Soviet leaders were convinced that the United States was serious about deploying it. Some Soviet military leaders with whom I spoke early in this decade said that this shift in U.S. strategy was a contributing factor to the demise of the Soviet Union. SDI received only lip service from President Bush, despite the fact that Russian President Boris Yeltsin, in his first appearance as the leader of that nation, urged the United States and Russia to work together to develop SDI for the good of all mankind. Bush advisors were not enthusiastic about SDI because deployment would have required a change in the so-called MAD strategy, Mutual Assured Destruction, to which the United States has clung for decades. Still, SDI limped along and made modest progress.

When Bill Clinton took office, he all but killed SDI. The Republican controlled Congress, just a few weeks ago, passed a defense authorization bill that would have required deployment of a modified missile defense

system by the year 2000. That was Gen. Graham's finest hour and thank God he lived to see it.

Unfortunately, President Clinton vetoed the bill precisely because he said it would have required the construction of that missile defense system, which he did not want. So despite a decade and a half of work by Gen. Graham, this country remains unprotected from a missile attack. Still, the issue won't go away.

There would have been no issue at all, and the technology developments which have resulted in drastically reducing the cost of an SDI system would not have occurred at all, but for the dogged determination of Daniel Graham. In literally thousands of meetings, public and private, Gen. Graham pushed this idea. It was Gen. Graham who convened a special meeting at my office to encourage opposition to John Tower as Secretary of Defense under then President-elect Bush on the grounds that Sen. Tower was an opponent of SDI. In Secretary Dick Cheney, Graham found someone much more to his liking.

All of this aside, Dan Graham was a decent, religious, family man who had an endearing sense of humor and was terrific at getting people, even opponents, to work together. He could be tough as nails if he opposed you on policy grounds, but Dan Graham was never mean spirited. He always handled opposition with great dignity, which was part of his military training.

This nation owes Dan Graham a great deal. And one day soon, we will have a system to protect us against some fanatic or deranged leader who wants to blow up part of America to make a point. When that day comes, and it almost came a few weeks ago, it will be because of the good work of this one time deputy director of the CIA. All of us who love America will miss this true patriot.

SUPPORT OF OVERRIDING VETO FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto of this conference report.

Putting this bill together has been a difficult process, and it's safe to say that no one gets everything they would like to see in the bill. But on balance, the conference report represents the best effort and fairest bill possible.

At the last meeting of the conferees, we made considerable movement to address the concerns about the measure expressed by the administration.

Among other things, we put back into the bill a clean mining patent moratorium; we increased funds for Indian tribes; we gave the Park Service funds for the Mojave Desert. All in all, we made considerable movement to alleviate the administration's problems with the bill. Nevertheless, the President vetoed it.

This bill includes real compromises. But apparently the President wants things his way or not at all. For instance, those of us who support responsible mining in our country have tried to move forward on mining law reform. We are willing to negotiate royalties and payment for patented land. So we have included a clean patent moratorium.

But we did not go far enough for the President.

Had he signed this conference report, the current shutdown of Interior Department offices would have been avoided. Unfortunately, despite our concessions, the President chose to reject the bill and close national pParks and recreation areas.

We have done our job. It's time to put people back to work. It's up to the President.

I support the conference report and urge my colleagues to vote "aye".

A TRIBUTE TO AN AMERICAN PATRIOT: BENJAMIN DONALD ROBINSON, JR.

HON. DAVID FUNDERBURK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 1996

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay special tribute to Mr. Benjamin D. Robinson, Jr., who was one of the greatest Americans I have known. He was a constitutionalist and an Americanist and he believed that we only have a short time to save this country—this Republic—and turn things around before it is too late.

I would not be in Congress today if it were not for Ben Robinson. He helped me get elected in many ways—financial contributions, FFC caps and signs, information, and most importantly, his visits, encouragement, advice, and counsel.

Ben Robinson loved children and young people and understood that the future of this country rested with them. He set up educational scholarships and provided literature for them.

Ben hoped that my election and that of others like me could help turn the tide toward constitutional government. He hoped and dreamed and acted tirelessly to do his part with no compromise on his principles. No one did more than Ben.

Betty and I and our daughter Deana loved Ben Robinson. His kindness, his consideration, his optimism, his love for his wife and his family was truly special.

We are grateful that we got to know Ben Robinson for as long as we did and consider ourselves blessed because we did. I thank God for Ben Robinson and only hope that I can live up to his expectations while I am in Congress. I don't represent St. Augustine's district in Florida, but I will always be Ben Robinson's Congressman.

Ben Robinson, a potato farmer in Florida, was a great American success story. He lived out the American dream, showing that one can accomplish with hard work, discipline, sacrifice, and faith in God. He was conservative and a patriot who knew the importance of history.

Ben Robinson was a gentle man with an unmatched vitality for life and for the truth. The world is a much better place because of this great American. Ben Robinson was my good friend and his spirit will walk with in the halls of Congress. I was honored that he participated in the swearing-in events for me in Washington last January. Today, on this first anniversary of Ben Robinson's death, we thank God for his fine example. I send my love, respect, and gratitude to his wife and lifetime partner, Mrs. Dorothy Robinson, and to his wonderful family. Thank you, Ben. We miss you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK PRINDLE

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 1996

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to a great American, a great Army officer, a great Hoosier, and a great soldier. Last month Frank Prindle completed over 21 years of dedicated service to our country. As a soldier, leader, and finally as a trusted member of the Army's Officer of Congressional Liaison, House Division, he has provided dedicated and distinguished service.

Today as we honor his retirement, we reflect on the outstanding career which Frank started in 1970 when he entered the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and where he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in Signal Branch in 1974. Over the course of the past two decades he served in a variety of exceptionally challenging troop and staff assignments in the United States, Canada, Germany, and Korea. His positions of leadership include signal platoon leader, aviation service platoon leader, aviation company commander, and battalion operations officer during an exchange tour with the Canadian Armed Forces.

As a staff officer he saw duty in many tough and challenging positions, validating the confidence the Army placed in his demonstrated abilities. After serving in the field with many aviation units, Frank Prindle demonstrated his superb organizational skills while serving as the senior service college education officer, the aviation branch assignments officer for majors and as the executive officer to the Director of Officer Personnel Management Division, U.S. Army Military Personnel Command. His selection as a Congressional Fellow in 1991 further demonstrated the high regard which Prindle is held by the leadership of the Army. This 1-year tour led to his final assignment as a Congressional Liaison Officer for the Secretary of the Army, House Liaison Division.

During Frank Prindle's tour in Army Legislative Liaison, he guided the Army's relationship with a wide variety of committees and individual Members of Congress. His ability to remain calm and focused during a period of tremendous change was demonstrated continually in his dealings with both Members of Congress, professional staff, and personal staff. Through Frank Prindle's involvement with the Veteran Affairs Committees, he ensured that the programs put in place during the downsizing of the Armed Forces continued to benefit the soldiers.

Frank Prindle's career reflects a commitment to our Nation, characterized by dedicated selfless service, love for the Army and a commitment to excellence. Lt. Col. Frank L. Prindle's performance, over two decades of service, personifies the traits of courage, competency, and integrity that our Nation has come to expect from its Army officers. On behalf of the Congress of the United States and the people of this great Nation, I offer our heartfelt appreciation and best wishes for a soldier who served his country so admirably.

SUPPORT PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF INTERIOR BILL

SPEECH OF

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to override the President's veto of the Interior Appropriations bill, H.R. 1977.

I appreciate the efforts of the Chairman, Congressman REGULA, to find common ground on some very difficult issues and pass this bill. As much as I appreciate his work and that of the Ranking Member, my colleague from Illinois Congressman YATES, I must still oppose this motion and support the veto of the President.

The cuts in this bill in energy conservation programs and in clean coal research are too much for people in my district to accept. Our coal mines have been all but shut down by the Clean Air Act of 1990, and without continued support for clean coal research, it will be very difficult to find new markets for that coal.

I support the President's veto and urge opposition to the override.

LAND EXCHANGE

HON. RANDY TATE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 1996

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a piece of legislation that would facilitate a land exchange between Fort Lewis Military Reservation and the Weyerhaeuser Real Estate Company [WRECO], located in Pierce County, WA, and in my congressional district. The land exchange allows the Army and WRECO to exchange parcels of land to the benefit of each party. The Army wishes to obtain ownership of a small parcel that provides access to a sewer treatment plant, and WRECO wishes to obtain ownership of an abandoned road right-of-way. Although total acreage of the lands under consideration is less than 2 acres, legislation to facilitate the exchange became necessary because the value of the property now exceeds the requirements of minor land acquisition rules that allow for administrative exchanges.

This provision I am introducing today has passed the Senate, and a similar provision passed the House as an amendment to H.R. 1530, the Defense authorization bill. However, as you know the authorization bill has been vetoed. The land exchange amendment is supported by the Army, and is noncontroversial. I am including a copy of a letter I received from Paul W. Johnson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army in support of the exchange. Swift passage of this legislation would be a fine example of Congress' ability to move unnecessary regulatory barriers—allowing responsible, noncontroversial projects to proceed.

I hope my colleagues will agree, and support this legislation.