IN MEMORY OF FRANK HEBROCK

## HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2000*

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay special tribute to Frank Hebrock, a Leesburg High School teacher and former Lake County Schools Superintendent candidate, who passed away on October 14, 2000. He leaves his wife, Bernie Hebrock, his son Scott and his brother Bill. Mr. Hebrock was a talented and committed teacher and was greatly loved and respected by his family, friends, students, and colleagues.

Born in Cambridge, OH, where he attended high school, Mr. Hebrock later went on to major in education at the University of Ohio. After leaving Cambridge, he taught in Tallahassee and for the past five years in Leesburg, FL, he taught American and world history. Revered for his dedication, Mr. Hebrock exhibited a selfless commitment to his students both in and out of the classroom. He was devoted to actively involving students in their history lessons, and at the same time, equally devoted to fostering the students' physical well-being through his work as assistant football coach and junior varsity baseball coach at Leesburg High School. In addition, Mr. Hebrock combined his interest in government with his conviction in providing the highest quality of education to our area's schools by running for superintendent of the Lake County school system.

Mr. Speaker, our community has truly suffered a great loss. We will all remember his outstanding contributions and are forever grateful for his shining leadership in the field of education. I would like to express my deepest condolences to his family, coworkers, and all of the students whose lives he so profoundly touched.

HONORING ANGELO TOMASSO, JR.

## HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2000*

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to recognize a milestone in the life of one of Connecticut's most treasured citizens. After serving for over 40 years in virtually every officer position and on every committee of New Britain General Hospital, Angelo Tomasso, Jr., has decided to retire from the Hospital's Board of Directors.

To read a list of Angelo's accomplishments and activities is to bear witness to a life spent in the service of others. Whether it was as a soldier, entrepreneur, parent, philanthropist, or dedicated volunteer, Angelo has brought to every phase of his life the caring and understanding of a man who embraces his responsibility to better the lives of his neighbors, community, and State.

Angelo's impact on New Britain General Hospital goes far beyond the work he did as a member of the Board of Directors. As the president of one of Connecticut's largest construction firms, Angelo set an example of the sense of responsibility business owners should have in keeping healthy the communities they serve. In being so generous with his time, Angelo has always showed that there is no one who can honestly say they are ''too busy'' to serve.

When we say that Angelo Tomasso helped build New Britain General Hospital, we mean so much more than the bricks and mortar of a new wing. Through his generosity, commitment and fine example of civic service, Angelo has proven himself to be a man who helped create the reputation of New Britain General as one of the finest hospitals in the area. I feel privileged to call him my friend and I thank him for all he continues to do for our hospital and city.

H.R. 4828

## HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2000*

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues my understanding of the land exchanges regarding the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Act of 2000 (H.R. 4828) that was debated on the House Floor on October 4, 2000.

I would like the record to indicate that the cash payments to the ranchers were designed to compensate the payees for severance damages to their remaining property. I want it to be clear that these payments are being made for economic losses that the ranchers are suffering from their dislocation as a result of the creation of this Wilderness.

H.R. 4828 was supported by the entire Oregon congressional delegation and is the product of a long and hard-fought battle to ensure that there was an Oregon solution to an Oregon issue.

THE MONOCLE RESTAURANT

## HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2000*

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to honor and recognize The Monocle restaurant in Washington, DC. The Monocle was founded in 1960 by ''Connie'' Valanos and his father, veteran restauranteur George Valanos. Today, the restaurant is owned and operated by Connie's son, John Valanos. This year The Monocle celebrates its 40th anniversary.

The Monocle is one of our nation's Capital's finest dining establishments. It has been one of the few restaurants that, year after year, helps set the standard for fine dining in Washington, DC. The food, ambience, and courteous staff all contribute to make a visit to The Monocle one to remember and cherish, as have so many of our nation's political leaders for 40 years.

The Monocle's location and building are further reminders of the unique history of which the restaurant has become a significant part.

I join many of my colleagues in recognizing the owners and the employees of The Monocle, as it celebrates 40 years of culinary excellence in Washington, DC.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL ROSLYN GLANTZ TROJAN

## HON. ROBERT L. EHRLICH, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2000*

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, my friend and former constituent, Colonel Roslyn Glantz Trojan, is retiring after 29 years of exemplary active federal service in the United States Army. She has served our country with dignity, honor, and integrity.

Colonel Glantz Trojan, a native of Annapolis, Maryland, is a 1971 graduate of Hood College in Frederick, Maryland, with a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in History and a 1981 graduate of George Washington University with a Masters of Business Administration. In 1972, she entered the Army through the Officer Direct Commission Program. After Officer Basic Training at Fort McClellan, Alabama, she was assigned to the Combat Surveillance and Electronics School at Fort Huachuca, Arizona as a administrative officer.

Soon thereafter, Colonel Glantz Trojan was selected to serve as an Operations Officer and Officer Recruiter at the Army District Recruiting Command in New Orleans, Louisiana. From 1976 to 1979, Colonel Glantz Trojan served in the 25th Infantry Division, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, first as a division logistician and then as a Company Commander in the Division Support Command.

Following her advanced military and civilian schooling, she was nominated to the Army Staff in 1981, where she served as Team Chief, Tactical and Non-Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Program. Colonel Glantz Trojan left the Pentagon in 1984 to join the staff of the 2nd Infantry Division in Camp Casey, Korea. She left Korea to attend the Armed Forces Staff College.

From 1986 to 1987, Colonel Glantz Trojan served a joint duty assignment at the United States Readiness Command, MacDill Air Force Base. As the first J–4 for a newly formed Joint Task Force, she planned the deployment of forces and the employment of logistics for the CINC's operational plan. Colonel Glantz Trojan served in Germany in the Army's legendary 3rd Armored Division. She first served as the Executive Officer of the 503rd Forward Support Battalion in Kirchgoens, later commanding the 54th Forward Support Battalion (FSB) in Friedberg, Germany. As Battalion Commander of the 54th FSB Colonel Glantz Trojan deployed her battalion to Desert Storm in support of the 3rd Armored Division. Her support of this Division during the Gulf War was truly outstanding. Following the War, Colonel Glantz Trojan attended the U.S. Army War College and after graduation was assigned to the Supreme Allied Command, Atlantic as the Logistics Plans and Operations Officer.

It was during her assignment as the Deputy Installation Commander and Garrison Commander, U.S. Army Garrison, Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), Maryland, that I personally came to know of Colonel Roslyn Glantz Trojan's considerable skills as a leader. I later learned of her deft diplomatic and political skills during her final assignment in the Army as the Chief of Legislative Liaison, U.S. Army Materiel Command from 1998 until now.

I am proud to report to my colleagues that Colonel Glantz Trojan's personal awards include the Bronze Star Medal, the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, as well as several Army meritorious and commendation medals and the Southwest Asia Campaign and Kuwait Liberation medals.

Mr. Speaker, this exemplary soldier, my friend Colonel Roslyn Glantz Trojan, deserves the thanks and praise of this grateful nation she has faithfully served for so long. I know the Members of the House will join me in wishing her and her husband all the best in the years ahead.

## ELECTIONS IN AZERBAIJAN

### HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 8, 2000*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, parliamentary elections were held in Azerbaijan. In anticipation of those elections, the Helsinki Commission—which I chair—held hearings in May, at which representatives of the government and opposition leaders testified. While the former pledged that Baku would conduct a democratic contest, in accordance with OSCE standards, the latter warned that Azerbaijan's past record of holding seriously flawed elections required the strictest vigilance from the international community and pressure from Western capitals and the Council of Europe—to which Azerbaijan has applied for membership.

Subsequently, I introduced a resolution, H. Con. Res. 382, which called on the Government of Azerbaijan to hold free and fair elections and to accept the recommended amendments by the OSCE's Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) to the law on elections.

From the start, there was pressure to withdraw the resolution from the Azerbaijani government and others. They argued that President Aliev had made, or would make, the necessary changes to ensure that the election met international standards, claiming to render the resolution either irrelevant or out of date. That pressure intensified as the election drew near; in fact, the resolution never came to a vote before Congress went out of session in early November.

It is worth recalling this brief history in light of what actually happened during Azerbaijan's pre-election period and on November 5. With respect to the election law, one of ODIHR's concerns was ultimately addressed by a decision of Azerbaijan's constitutional court, but on other important issues, Baku rejected any concessions and refused to incorporate ODIHR's suggested changes. From the beginning, therefore, the election could not have met OSCE standards, as ODIHR made plain in several statements.

During the registration period, the Central Election Commission (CEC) rejected several leading opposition parties. Claiming that government experts could tell which signatures were forged, fraudulent or otherwise invalid merely on the basis of a visual examination, the CEC maintained the Musavat and the Azerbaijan Democratic Party had failed to get 50,000 valid signatures. The same thing happened to Musavat in the 1995 parliamentary election. At that time, the OSCE/UN observation mission emphasized the need to amend or get rid of this obviously flawed method of determining the validity of signatures, but Azerbaijan's authorities did not heed that advice.

The exclusion of leading opposition parties drew strong criticism, both inside and outside the country, including the OSCE and the U.S. Government. In early October, in apparent reaction to international concern, President Aliev ''appealed'' to the CEC to find some way of registering excluded opposition parties. Some CEC members objected, arguing there was no constitutional basis for such a presidential appeal or a changed CEC ruling, but the Commission moved to include opposition parties. Though their participation certainly broadened the choice available to voters, the manner of their inclusion demonstrated conclusively that President Aliev controlled the entire election process.

ODIHR welcomed the decision by the CEC and urged a reconsideration of the exclusion of over 400 individual candidates—about half of those who tried to run in single-mandate districts. But the CEC did not do so, and only in very few cases were previously excluded candidates allowed to run. As 100 of parliament's 125 seats were determined in single mandate districts, where local authorities exercise considerable power, the rejection of over 400 candidates signaled the government's determination to decide the outcome of the vote.

Though coverage of the campaign on state media favored the ruling party, opposition leaders were able to address voters on television. They used the opportunity—which they had not enjoyed for years—to criticize President Aliev and offer an alternative vision of governing the country. Their equal access to the media marked progress with respect to previous elections, as noted in the ODIHR's election report.

However, the voting and vote count on election day itself, according to the ODIHR's election observation mission, failed to meet OSCE standards. That is the usual dry ODIHR formulation to characterize an election that was not fair—i.e., the conditions for the participants were not equal—and in which the official results are not reliable or credible. The November 6 statement elaborated: ''The elections were marred by numerous instances of serious irregularities, in particular, a completely flawed counting process.'' Moreover, ''observers reported ballot stuffing, manipulated turnout results, pre-marked ballots, and production of either false protocols or no protocols at all. . . . The international observers express their concern at what seems to be a clear manipulation of electoral procedures.''

This would be bad enough, considering that the election was the fourth since 1995 that failed to meet OSCE standards, even if some progress was registered in opposition participation and representation in the CEC. Much more interesting and disturbing, however, were the words used in a post-election press conference by two key international observers: Gerard Stoudman, the Director of ODIHR, who generally employs measured, diplomatic language, said he had not expected to witness ''a crash course in various types of manipulation,'' and actually used the phrase ''primitive falsification'' to describe what he had seen. Andreas Gross, the head of the observer delegation of the Council of Europe—an organization to which Azerbaijan has applied for membership and which is not particularly known for hard-hitting assessments of election shenanigans—amplified: ''Despite the positive changes observed in Azerbaijan in recent years, the scale of the infringements doesn't fit into any framework. We've never seen anything like it.''

Mr. Speaker, in the context of international election observation, such a brutally candid assessment is simply stunning. As far as I know, representatives of ODIHR or the Council of Europe have never expressed themselves in such terms about an election that they decided to monitor. One senses that the harshness of their judgment is related to their disappointment: Azerbaijan's authorities had promised to conduct free and fair elections and had long negotiated with the ODIHR and the Council of Europe about the legal framework and administrative modalities but, in the end, held an election that can only be described as an embarrassment to all concerned.

According to Azerbaijan's CEC, in the party list voting, only four parties passed the six-percent threshold for parliamentary representation: President Aliev's governing party, the New Azerbaijan Party; the Communist Party; and two opposition parties, the Popular Front [Reformers] and Civil Solidarity. Other important opposition parties allegedly failed to break the barrier and apart from a few single mandate seats won no representation in parliament.

In the aftermath of the election and the assessments of the OSCE/ODIHR and the Council of Europe, the international legitimacy of Azerbaijan's legislature is severely undermined. Within Azerbaijan, the ramifications are no better. All the leading opposition parties have accused the authorities of massive vote fraud, denounced the election results, and have refused to take the few seats in parliament they were given. Though some governing party representatives have claimed that opposition representation is not necessary for the parliament to function normally, others—perhaps including President Aliev—understand that a parliament without opposition members is ruinous for Azerbaijan's image. New elections are slated in 11 districts, and perhaps President Aliev is hoping to tempt some opposition parties to abandon their boycott by offering a few more seats. Whether opposition parties, which are bitterly divided, will participate or eventually agree to take up their deputies' mandates remains to be seen.

What is clearer from the conduct of the election and its outcome is that President Aliev, who is preparing the succession of his son as Azerbaijan's next president, was determined to keep opposition leaders out of parliament and ensure that the body as a whole is supportive of his heir. If the only way to guarantee the desired outcome was wholesale vote fraud, so be it. Prognoses of possible accommodation with the opposition, or possibly even some power sharing arrangements, to facilitate a smooth and peaceful transfer of power, have proved unfounded. Indeed, President Aliev reportedly has told the new UK Ambassador to Baku that Azerbaijan does not need to join the Council of Europe, indicating that he is not prepared to make any concessions when it comes to maintaining his grip on power and passing it on to his chosen heir, whatever the international community thinks.