

businessman. He expanded his family automobile dealership from a single Ford franchise to one of the most successful auto parks in the country. The Hillard dealerships have won nearly every customer satisfaction award in the industry for each of the franchises they represent.

He also was a community leader, lending his considerable energy and talent to numerous civic causes.

But to recall only his lifetime of public accomplishments misses a huge part of Charlie. He was loved by so many friends and family, and gave love generously in return. He was a devoted husband and father, leaving behind his wife Doreen and four children. We join them in celebrating the life of a truly remarkable man and mourning his untimely death.

To Doreen and all the children, we say thank you for sharing his life with us. We are all better for having known Charlie R. As race car legend Johnny Rutherford said at the funeral, he left a special footprint on the hearts of us all.

Charlie R. soared.

DEFENSE ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, while the cold war may be over, U.S. security interests endure. Unfortunately, many Americans do not fully appreciate this new dynamic. Indeed it is difficult to understand how emerging threats, may challenge future U.S. global interests.

Some examples are very clear: China's rise to power is increasingly marked by military posturing and coercive diplomacy in the Pacific rim. An unstable and fragmented Russia turns to aggressive nationalism to hold itself together. Economic ruin, ethnic violence, terrorism, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction pose serious threats to international stability.

We have asked our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines to protect our country and its vital national security interests, in this evolving international environment. Our military is our first, and often our last line of defense and we must be prepared to provide it with the technological edge to defeat any enemy on any battlefield.

I must remind my colleagues that the battlefield of the future has little resemblance to the battlefield of the past. Information warfare, wide availability of commercial off-the-shelf technology, and the proliferation of highly capable weapons systems, all contribute to a rapid evolution, in military tactics and doctrine.

Understanding how these new conflicts and demands are burdening our services is difficult to do from an arms length distance here in Washington.

So last Friday I went down to my district and spent time at Camp Lejeune. It was an opportunity to see

how the tremendous efforts our men and women in the Marine Corps can and will be increased with the support of adequate defense dollars.

Just last week, the House made a step in the right direction by passing H.R. 3230, the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997. The bill stems the tide of the administration cuts that would have weakened our national security, and placed our men and women in uniform at increased risk. I would like to commend Chairman SPENCE for carefully crafting a bipartisan bill that achieves four fundamental goals:

First, we promised to improve the quality of life for our military personnel and their families. A number of critically important provisions in this bill such as the 3 percent pay raise, the increase in military housing allowance by 50 percent over the President's budget, the funding of troop barracks and child care centers, goes a long way to maintain a decent quality of life, for our all-volunteer military.

Second, we promised to sustain short and long-term readiness. Despite funds added by Congress last year to maintain minimum readiness levels, and the high pace of ongoing military operations around the world, the President suggested reductions in a variety of readiness accounts, below current spending levels. Despite the administration's proposed cuts, H.R. 3230 has recommended an increase of \$1.6 billion in key readiness accounts to ensure U.S. military preparedness.

Third, the National Security Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997 addresses the growing modernization shortfalls that have resulted from a decade-long, 80 percent decline in real dollars in procurement spending. The President's fiscal year 1997 procurement budget is the lowest in 50 years, and is a frightening \$5 billion lower than the Pentagon planned just one year ago. This bill therefore devotes the bulk of the spending increases recommended in H.R. 3230 to procurement. This will shore-up a dramatically downsized industrial base, by adding funds to a number of under- and unfunded programs.

And fourth, we have continued our efforts to create a more agile and competitive defense management structure, by continuing to reorganize and reduce our defense bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is consistent with the Contract With America. It is consistent with our goals of achieving a balanced budget by 2002; and we can do it the right way—not on the backs of the men and women who serve in our military.

□ 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WICKER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL MIKE BOORDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today we said a sad farewell to one of the best our Nation has to offer. I know Mike Boorda was a friend, a very special friend. Last Thursday our colleague from Mississippi, General MONTGOMERY, spoke of him as a brother. I too regarded Mike Boorda as a brother. No one outside my immediate family has touched my life more than he.

When I first met Mike Boorda, he was newly assigned as chief of naval personnel, and I was the ranking member of the military personnel subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. I came to know firsthand the depth of his commitment to the Navy and his abiding devotion to the people who make our Navy the greatest Navy in the world.

Much has been and will be written about Mike Boorda and the tragedy his death represents. I cannot begin to understand the totality of what was involved in producing this tragedy. There are some things I do know, however, because it was my privilege to know Mike Boorda. As a frank, honest, straightforward witness and as an advocate for a better life for the people who make up our armed forces, the most respected segment of our society, he was superb.

From personal experience I know him to care enough to find time in an incredibly busy schedule to focus on individual personnel problems. He did so to insure that fairness was done to a member of the Navy family whom he believed had not been dealt with justly.

Much has been said about the V insignia he wore for a time in his decorations he pinned on his chest. I claim no expertise on the subject of military decorations and insignia. The only decoration I am sure I received after my service in the Air Force during the Korean conflict was a Good Conduct Medal. What I do know is that Mike Boorda would never, never seek to dissemble or pose as that which he was not. I not only do not know, I am not interested in pursuing, the arcane

question of was he or was he not technically entitled to wear a V on his ribbons under the terms of military regulations in effect at some point in time.

Also I am not interested in whether a former chief of naval operations was officially empowered to authorize the wearing of a V for all Navy personnel involved in combat operations during the Vietnam war.

What I do know, because I knew Mike Boorda, is that he would not have knowingly put on his chest anything to which he was not entitled to put there. The Mike Boorda I knew did not dissemble. He was truthful, so respectful of doing what was right, that the idea that he could falsely proclaim himself a hero is unthinkable.

Last Thursday, one of the most miserable days of my life, I could not come to the floor of the House and talk about the tragic end of Mike Boorda. At that time, and based on the information available, I just could not accept that my friend Mike Boorda, so full of energy and confidence, so sensitive to making life better for the sailors of the United States Navy, could have taken his life.

Dear Mike, a great poet spoke of one who loved greatly but not wisely. You were so wise, so devoted, so consumed with duty, honoring country, that in your sense of duty and propriety you took extreme measures that were not wise or even reasonable, but it was all out of your love for the Navy.

From those of us that knew you and knew your passion for protecting the interest of the people who make up our armed services, you would never have had to fear that we would not have defended your honor. My confidence in you and trust in your dedication to duty, honoring country, make it so difficult to either accept or understand the tragedy that took you from us.

God bless you, Mike Boorda, and your loving family.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to read the brief remarks of Jim Kincaid, news anchor of WVEC-TV in Hampton, VA, concerning Mike Boorda and the tragedy of his death. His words have great meaning, and I quote them now.

"When a person of great value leaves our midst, particularly voluntarily . . . we usually search for reasons . . . and we hardly ever find any that are really satisfactory.

"Admiral, Mike Boorda didn't need to take his own life . . . according to what we know of him.

"Those of us who did know about him, and his career, would not have thought any the less of him if questions had been raised about one or two of his military decorations. Particularly those of us who know the difference.

"Whether he was entitled, technically, to wear a decoration for valor, his record plainly shows that he was a valorous man, as brave as any of us, and far braver than most.

"But, in a world where we seem to feel that our heroes must be flawless, and where a certain sort among us hunts for flaws like a bounty hunter after a bank robber, some flaws will surface, even among the best of us. And Mike Boorda was one of the best of us.

"He was, through and through, a military man, a follower of the military code of duty, honor, country.

"Such men have, down through the ages, chosen to fall on their swords rather than dishonor their comrades. Today, the technology may have changed, but the passion remains.

"We don't know what brought him to yesterday's terrible decision.

"We can be sure that it was generated, at least in part, by our society's appetite for gossip, and scandal.

"And, like any appetite that is indulged to excess, it can have very unhealthy results, and very costly ones.

"The death of this fine sailor is just such a case."

Mr. Speaker, I now ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of today and an op-ed piece written by former Secretary of the Navy, John Lehman, respecting our dear and departed friend Mike Boorda.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, May 21, 1996]

THE NAVY'S ENEMIES

(By John Lehman)

In 1981 Capt. Jeremy "Mike" Boorda was my acting assistant secretary for manpower. He was so effective and such an advocate for sailors and their families that I pressed him to stay permanently on my staff. But the fleet was his life, and he pressed for orders back to sea. One of his many creative solutions in that period was a program of special bonuses for aviators, who had been leaving the Navy in droves during the Carter years of naval decline. Mike was their advocate, we adopted his idea, and it worked. He was first a sailor; he only came ashore to champion the sailors against the bureaucrats. He had "come up through the hawse pipe," the first enlisted sailor ever to become chief of naval operations. How such a great human being could be brought to the point of ending his life is a question of national magnitude.

THE TAILHOOK FIRESTORM

No one gives credence to the trivial issue of ribbons, which his Vietnam superior, Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, says he earned in any case. They may have been the final straw, but they were not the cause. With eerie parallels to the death of former Navy Secretary James Forrestal 47 years ago, Adm. Boorda was driven to his death by a relentless lynch mob that has hounded the U.S. Navy, especially for the past five years.

The triggering event was of course the Tailhook convention of 1991. The reported sexual harassment was a shameful aberration by some, perhaps dozens of individuals. But even the usual excesses of an annual party which began at a time when hundreds of Tailhook members a year were being killed in Vietnam, had become incompatible with a peacetime Navy struggling to include women aviators. What should have been at most a week's story instead ignited a firestorm that has been consuming the Navy ever since.

The Navy employs more than a million people, who perform their jobs all over the world around the clock. Naturally, this group reflects some of the failings of the population at large. There will always be a few bad actors and a lot of mistakes. Yet the rates of crime, cheating, drug abuse and other misconduct are far lower in the Navy than in civilian institutions, as one has a right to expect. And the endless media exposes have revealed nothing that has not happened in the other services in other times.

Why then has the Navy continued to be the center of the investigative media? Because it

is payback time. The Navy, its carriers and its aviators did indeed have a very high profile in the Reagan years, and as the movie "Top Gun" illustrated, naval aviators are not known for great humility. Many outsiders resented their bonuses, their glamour and their publicity and were glad to see Tailhook cut them down a few pegs. When the story broke in the middle of a presidential campaign in which the gender gap was already an issue, it was sure to ignite.

It was sure also to have faded after the election but for the fact that the new president, who in his younger days said proudly that he "loathed" the military, brought in an administration staffed by former war protesters who largely shared the prejudices of those in the anti-Navy lynch mob. Thus instead of dying out, the firestorm grew, fanned and encouraged at the highest level. The White House commissars of political correctness began enforcing standards for military promotion. Attendance at Tailhook, regardless of behavior, became sufficient to deny promotion. The Senate Armed Services Committee and especially its staff, full of Navy grudges and personal scores to settle, joined in the persecution. Add to these factions the more extreme wings of the feminist and gay movements. They piled on because the Navy has epitomized to them what they see as the homophobic, macho culture of the military, and they see a great opportunity to bring it down.

Henry Kissinger used to say that even paranoids have some real enemies. This adage aptly describes the Navy. There are important interest groups that wish to pull the Navy down. Take the organization that was sifting through Adm. Boorda's records, the National Security News Service, part of the left-wing archipelago of tax-exempt think tanks. The talking heads from these antidefense lobbies who are now attacking the character of Navy leaders were the very same talking heads who spent the 1980s extolling the Soviet economy, blaming America for the Cold War, and attacking the Reagan naval buildup.

Throughout those years Newsweek, the journal pursuing the recent story on Adm. Boorda, was ever a willing conduit for their bogus studies and mean-spirited attacks. It is not coincidental that the magazine published one phony expose after another—alleging that Tomahawk missiles wouldn't work, that Aegis cruisers would tip over, that aircraft carriers couldn't survive; anything and everything that would discredit the U.S. Navy. Newsweek's entire editorial crusade of the 1980s has been discredited by events. All those Navy programs did work, the Cold War was won, and Iraq was kicked out of Kuwait. Now Newsweek's editors seem bent on impugning the character of the Navy's leaders. They are sore losers indeed.

Add to the Navy begrudgers certain entrenched bureaucrats in the Defense Department. Their anti-Navy bias has permeated the Pentagon since before the Reagan era. They have been a steady source of tips to witch-hunting journalists. They have also used this period of Navy weakness to cancel most of the modernization programs for naval aviation: the A-12, the A6F, new engines for the F-14, and many others. Little wonder the aircraft accident rate has sharply increased.

As a result of this onslaught, 14 admirals have now been cashiered and more than 300 naval aviators have had their careers ended, all without even a semblance of due process. Thousands more are leaving the service in disgust. Fifty-three percent of postcommand aviator commanders resigned last year. These are the best of the best and won't be replaceable for a generation, yet the inquisition continues. Yes, terrible things happened

in Tailhook, and certainly those kinds of abuses have to be rooted out. But it is despicable to abandon due process, the chain of command and any sensible approach to fairness, ruining so many careers in the process.

The Stan Arthur case is a classic example, repealed hundreds of times at lesser and less visible grades. He flew more than 300 combat missions in Vietnam and led the Navy forces in Desert Storm. An impeccable career. A leader who really inspired young kids in the service. He was asked as vice chief to review a decision denying a female helicopter pilot her designation. He came to the conclusion that she could not meet the qualifications. For that he was cashiered, because everybody was afraid—afraid of Pat Schroeder and her McCarthyite slurs, afraid of the White House commissars, afraid of the media.

A DANGEROUS CALLING

The Navy is not just another bureaucracy in the government. Naval service is a dangerous calling that requires the highest professional standards to defend the U.S. and its interests. What an outrage that we are cashiering and promoting people based on reasons that have nothing to do with their readiness to fight the conflicts of this country.

Fifteen years ago and after, I came in for my share of abuse. But as a presidential appointee I was supposed to be politically accountable. Generally my successors and I give as good as we get: I for instance can afford libel lawyers. The new and ugly phase of recent years, however, has brought career officers into the line of fire for the first time—and a viciously personal fire it is. Career professionals are not prepared or trained for it, they lack the means to defend against it, and they don't deserve it. We can only hope that Mike Boorda's tragic death will awaken some basic decency in our leadership and the crusade will end before it does irreparable damage to our nation's defense.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday,
May 21, 1996]

MIKE BOORDA, RIP

We say "nuts" to the medals teapot; we're going to remember Admiral Boorda for what he did to the Serbs' jets.

Before he was called back to the Navy's CNO, Admiral Boorda was the commander of NATO forces in southern Europe, which is to say the top U.S. commander involved in the conflict in Bosnia. One day he found himself in authority, perhaps through some oversight at the U.N., just as Serbian jets were flouting the U.N.'s ban on their flights. So he ordered them shot down, just as they were starting bombing runs on population centers.

Similarly, when Cuban MiGs shot down American-owned planes over international waters, his first reaction, according to a good source, was: where are my Tomahawk shooters. In the end, of course, the U.S. did not launch Tomahawk cruise missiles at Cuban airfields, nor did the Boorda airstrike end the war in Bosnia. But shooting down four Serbian jets was the most vigorous action anyone at NATO or the U.N. took against a particularly disgusting aggressor.

Mike Boorda, in short, had more than the usual ration of political courage, which makes his suicide all the more perplexing and mysterious. By the weekend, the media had pretty much exhausted the tempest over the medals and got around to the main issue: Tailhook, and the pressures still radiating through the Navy under Commander in Chief Bill Clinton.

Good military officers don't shift blame for breakdowns on their watch, and Admiral Boorda bore the brunt for what the political furies of Tailhook did to the careers of Admiral Stanley Arthur, Commander Robert Stumpf and many others less prominent. The

legendary Admiral Arthur's promotion to the Pacific Command fell through on Admiral Boorda's watch. In an interview after he had agreed to pull the plug on the promotion, the CNO said: "Certainly Stan Arthur is paying a penalty. And the country's paying a penalty. He's not serving in a job where he would have been superb."

That incident is being revisited in the suicide's aftermath. The Navy command withdrew the nomination after Senator Dave Durenberger, of all people, made Admiral Arthur the target of feminists for supporting an instructor's decision that a female pilot was below standard and should not fly. In fact, the decision to wreck Admiral Arthur's career was assented to by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Joints Chiefs and the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

This is the same Armed Services Committee, under Sam Nunn, that held a secret session to waive through the nomination of John Dalton to be Secretary of Navy amid questions raised about Mr. Dalton's dealings during the 1980s in the Texas S&L industry. Mr. Dalton, who later worked for Stephens Inc. of Arkansas, vehemently denies any wrongdoing, and the solons of the Senate get red-faced at the suggestion that they gave Mr. Dalton special treatment. And indeed it's not a widely known story. But ask the next Naval officer you meet if he knows about it.

This year, with Tailhook's eternal bonfire still burning, Secretary Dalton withdrew the promotion of Commander Robert Stumpf, even after his own investigation had cleared the commander of any Tailhook taint. Admiral Boorda was on the bridge for that one, too. Earlier in the process, Admiral Boorda tried to help Commander Stumpf, but he couldn't. Instead he was directed to withdraw Commander Stumpf's nomination. When asked this Sunday morning about his department's handling of these personnel matters, Navy Secretary Dalton said, "I feel good about the decisions we've made.

The attitude within the Navy is no doubt captured by former Navy Secretary John Lehman in his article nearby. James Webb, another former Secretary, delivered a searing speech at the Naval Academy last month, speaking of "the destruction of the careers of some of the finest aviators in the Navy based on hearsay and unsubstantiated allegations." He wondered "what admiral has had the courage to risk his own career by putting his stars on the table, and defending the integrity of the process and of his people?"

For some reason, this country does not have a tradition of honorable resignation on principle, as exists elsewhere. America's government is a huge and hugely powerful force, and its high officials, even as they disagree bitterly, tend to let it sweep them forward. It might be healthier for all if on occasion they said what they truthfully felt, and quit.

Admiral Boorda left behind a single-page note addressed to "the sailors." The Pentagon's story is that releasing this note is a decision for the family, and sympathy for their tragedy is appropriate. The fact remains that the Navy as an institution has been rocked to its foundations, and if Mike Boorda had something to say about that, everyone serving in the Navy should be entitled to read it.

Today there will be a memorial service for Admiral Boorda, and President Bill Clinton will deliver the eulogy over his career and life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MICA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

EDUCATION CAUCUS OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, tonight I rise to talk about an issue that every person in America, every person in this Congress, has a great interest in, and that is the issue of education.

We often talk about the need to provide a college education to our children across this country, and Members of this Congress, about 72 in number, decided to come together to form something called an Education Caucus. Members of the House, as well as Members of the Senate, decided that for the first time in this Congress, we needed to concentrate our efforts on a group of people who believe that we should push education forward in this country, should meet as a caucus, and organize as a caucus, and push legislation and appropriations as relates to education in both the House and the Senate.

I am very pleased that so many Members of this Congress have decided to participate in this caucus and to move it forward, and tonight, I am just making a simple plea to all Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle to take an interest and to join a caucus that we consider to be one of the caucuses of the future of this Congress, a caucus that believes in bipartisanship because education is an issue that both Democrats and Republicans can agree on.

I would like to mention that Senator WELLSTONE will be chairing the caucus, co-chairing the caucus with myself. Senator WELLSTONE has been working very diligently in the caucus on the Senate side, and we have now organized such that we have even a whip operation in the caucus, and tonight I want to talk about some of those national organizations who are concerned about