

countless lives. This incredible act of kindness allows a stranger to celebrate another birthday, give birth to a child or share another Thanksgiving dinner with family and friends.

It is fitting, during American Red Cross month, to acknowledge not only the selfless efforts of Mr. Schiefer but also the efforts of the Sandusky Chapter of the American Red Cross and Red Cross Chapters across this country. Since 1960, this chapter has collected over 120,000 pints of blood.

Mr. Schiefer, volunteers of the Sandusky County Chapter of the American Red Cross and Red Cross Volunteers across the country, my colleagues of the 107th Congress and I salute you. Your selfless acts of volunteerism are an example for future generations.

TRIBUTE TO VAL ALVARADO

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize a man of great courage and bravery, a man that this country owes a great debt to. On December 7, 1941, the Japanese attacked a sleeping Pearl Harbor, killing over 2,400 sailors. 60 years later, Val Alvarado of Montrose, Colorado recalls the events that brought the United States of America into the Second World War. Val, who was 18 years old at the time, served aboard the USS *Maryland*. Val's job was to load gun powder into the war ship's 16 inch guns. This was often referred to as the "no warning" tinder box of instant death.

Val and his shipmates were lucky to survive the strike on Pearl Harbor, but those of the neighboring USS *Oklahoma* were not. But if it were not for the fact that the *Oklahoma* was anchored next to them, Val would not be here today. In less than two hours, the United States lost 188 planes, 159 planes and had 18 U.S. warships sunk or seriously crippled. But more than that, the U.S. lost over 2,400 service men, and another 1,100 were injured. One of the service men who died was a close boyhood friend of Val's. "On the fifth day we had time to check on our buddies. I found out that my good friend Jimmy Robinson had been killed. . . . We both came from Montrose, we had gone to Morgan School in Montrose. Jimmy was the first man from Montrose to be killed in the war," Val remembered.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, Val was transferred to the USS *McCalla*, whose war prowess is the stuff of legends. The *McCalla*, with Val in tow, returned to the Pacific where it would earn three battle stars.

During his time in the military, Val took part in the Armed Forces Olympics where he boxed in what the Armed Forces called the Nimitz Bowl. "I won the fight between all the army, marines, and navy in the Pacific theatre for my weight. I was pretty proud of that. . . . I was pretty happy about that," according to Val.

Mr. Speaker, over 50 million people died in World War II. It took the courage of 18 year olds like Val for America to eventually win the war. That is why I am asking that we take this moment to recognize and honor Val Alvarado for his service to this country, and to wish him good luck in his future endeavors.

Val is the embodiment of the values that characterized the "Greatest Generation". For his service in WWII, America is exceedingly grateful.

MINING CLAIM MAINTENANCE ACT OF 2001

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2001

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation aimed at giving the appropriate authorizing committee of the House an opportunity to do its job and resolve a matter that has had to be addressed by appropriations measures instead. In this regard, the legislation being introduced today would make permanent two provisions relating to the management of mining claims under the Mining Law of 1872.

First, the "Mining Claim Maintenance Act of 2001" would make permanent a provision first enacted into law on a temporary basis by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and then reauthorized through 2001 by the Omnibus Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999 requiring that holders of unpatented mining claims, mill and tunnel sites under the Mining Law of 1872 pay the Interior Department a \$100 per year maintenance fee in order to hold the claim or site, as well as pay a one-time \$25 location fee.

This provision is in lieu of the 1872 requirement that the holder of a claim or site conduct \$100 per year of "assessment work" in order to maintain the claim or site and the associated annual filing requirement under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

As with current law, provision is also made in this legislation to waive this requirement for holders of valid oil shale claims who must comply with a different regime as set forth under the Energy Policy Act of 1992, as well as for individuals holding 10 or fewer mining claims.

Since this provision has been in effect, speculation on public domain lands under the guise of the Mining Law of 1872 has been dramatically reduced. Indeed, in the year this requirement went into effect there were over 3 million mining claims located on the public lands. Today, there are about 253,000.

Further, as with the current practice, I would expect that the Appropriations Committee would utilize the receipts from the holding fee for the purpose of offsetting the cost of the Interior Department administering the mining law program.

Second, this legislation would make permanent a provision that was first included in the fiscal year 1995 Interior Appropriations Act placing a moratorium on the issuance of what is known as a "patent" for any mining claim and mill site claim except in those situations where "grandfather" rights may exist. The purpose of this provision is to eliminate the absurd practice embodied in the Mining Law of 1872 that allows corporations to receive a patent, which represents fee simple title, to public domain lands encumbered by valid mining or mill site claims at \$2.50 or \$5.00 an acre depending on the type of claim involved.

Mr. Speaker, both of these provisions have received overwhelmingly bipartisan support

when debated as part of the Interior Appropriations legislation over the past several years. I have wholeheartedly supported these actions, and would hope that the Appropriators will continue to include these provisions in the upcoming budget bills if the Resources Committee fails to act. Nonetheless, it is properly the duty of the authorizing committee, the Resources Committee, to address this issue.

These two provisions—the imposition of a maintenance fee and the end to patenting—are part of a larger issue relating to the need to reform the 1872 Mining Law. Unlike other extractive industries, such as coal, timber or oil and gas development, the hard rock mining industry enjoys a special status, provided under the 1872 Mining Law, that allows access and free use of our Nation's rich public domain lands.

As responsible stewards of the public domain and to meet our responsibilities to the American people, it is incumbent upon us to rethink and reform the Mining Law of 1872. To that end, in the near future I will again introduce comprehensive mining law reform legislation.

MILITARY MYTHS

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2001

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful analysts of the appropriate level for American military spending is Lawrence Korb, a former high ranking Defense Department official in the administration of President Reagan. Unlike many others who served in the Reagan administration and subsequently, Lawrence Korb does not believe that conservatives ought to suspend their skepticism about public spending simply because the requests come from the Pentagon. He has consistently applied his experience with defense matters, his keen intelligence and his knowledge of government to point out that we could fully defend our legitimate interests with a military budget smaller than the current one. Along with Dr. Korb, I am pleased that President Bush is refusing to be pressured into asking for billions of dollars in increased military spending before he and his staff have a chance to study the important issues that are raised by Dr. Korb and others. But I also agree with Dr. Korb that an accurate analysis of the defense budget requires discarding some of the points which President Bush himself made during the campaign.

In a recent article, Lawrence Korb set forward some of the principles that ought to guide such an investigation of our true defense spending needs. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Mr. Korb's first point, to some extent substantively, and also in the way in which he has phrased it. The fact that most military people aren't on food stamps does not mean that it is acceptable for even a small number of them to be in that situation. We owe the men and women who volunteer to face danger on our behalf better than this, and I am very supportive of proposals to raise the pay levels. Given the disruption of their lives and the danger they face, I do believe that our military personnel are underpaid.

But while I disagree with Dr. Korb's first point, I am an enthusiastic believer in the rest

of his essay. I was particularly pleased when he noted the absurdity of trying to fix the relevant amount to spend on defense simply by looking at the percentage which a defense budget represents of the gross domestic product. According to this, if we have significant economic progress, we are required to increase military spending even if the threats against which we deploy our military have decreased. Mindlessness has never been on more graphic display.

Lawrence Korb's clear thinking is a very welcome antidote to the efforts being made by some to panic us into busting the budget on behalf of unnecessary military spending. I ask that his thoughtful article be reprinted here.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 11, 2001]

BUSH'S FIRST BATTLE: HIS OWN MILITARY MYTHS

(By Lawrence J. Korb)

NEW YORK.—His campaign rhetoric notwithstanding, President George W. Bush has taken a good first step by not increasing the defense budget he inherited from President Bill Clinton until he completes a top-down review of strategy. Such a review will come to naught, however, if the new president does not reject the six oversimplifications about the state of our armed forces that he embraced repeatedly during the campaign.

Military people are not overworked and underpaid and, despite campaign rhetoric, most aren't on food stamps. During the 1990s, an average of 40,000 military people were deployed in various "operations other than war." This represents less than 3% of the active force and less than 2% of the total force, counting reserves. A greater percentage of the active force was stationed in the United States than during the 1980s. Certain units like Army civil affairs battalions, which help restore order in foreign countries torn apart by civil wars, or Air Force search and rescue units were over-utilized. But that is a management problem, not a revenue problem. As for pay, most men and women in the armed services make more than 75% of their civilian counterparts. And, if the compensation levels of military people were adjusted to reflect the fair market value of their housing allowances, fewer than 1% would be eligible for food stamps.

The problem is that the military still uses an anachronistic "one size fits all" pay system that rewards longevity rather than performance. Also, the military employs a deferred-benefit retirement system that costs twice as much as a deferred-contribution plan, while providing the wrong incentives for retaining the right people for the appropriate length of time. For example, to justify the training investment, pilots need to be retained for 13 years, but infantrymen only five. Yet, no military person is vested in retirement until he or she serves 20 years.

The military does not need to be rebuilt; it needs to be transformed. In the 1990s, the Pentagon invested more than \$1 trillion in developing and procuring new weapons. But much of it was wasted on Cold War relics—\$200-million fighter planes, \$6-billion aircraft carriers, \$2-billion submarines, \$400-million artillery pieces—that will be of little use in the conflicts of the 21st century.

The military is more than prepared to fight two wars. In fact, it is becoming more prepared each day as the military power of the likely opponents in these two conflicts, Iraq and North Korea, dwindles. Yet, while the capability of these states declines, the Pentagon has been increasing its estimates of the forces necessary to defeat these enemies. Moreover, the necessity of maintaining the capability to fight two wars simulta-

neously defies logic and history. During the Korea, Vietnam and Persian Gulf conflicts, no other nation took advantage of the situation by threatening U.S. interests elsewhere.

Calculating the size of the defense budget by measuring it against the gross domestic product is nonsensical. Yes, the U.S. spends a smaller portion of GDP on defense than it did during the Cold War, but the U.S. economy has grown substantially since the collapse of the Soviet Union while spending by adversaries has markedly declined. Even counting inflation, the \$325-billion defense budget—which includes the military portion of the Energy Department budget—that Bush inherits from Clinton is about 95% of what this nation spent on average to win the Cold War. In fact, the last Clinton defense budget is higher than the budget that Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld prepared for the outgoing Ford administration 25 years ago, at the height of the Cold War.

Carrying out peacekeeping missions, like Bosnia and Kosovo, is not undermining readiness. During the 1990s, peacekeeping operations accounted for less than 2% of Pentagon spending, and readiness spending per capita was more than 10% higher in the 1990s than in the 1980s.

In order to meet their recruiting goals, the armed forces have not lowered their quality standards below those of the Reagan years. The force that Bush inherits from Clinton has a higher percentage of quality recruits—that is, high school graduates and individuals scoring average or above on the armed forces' qualification test—than at any time during the Reagan years. Most of the retention problems that the services are having are self-inflicted. For example, 80% of the pilot shortage in the Navy and Air Force is caused by the fact that, in the early 1990s, the military made a serious mistake by reducing the number of pilots it trained. Likewise, the shortage of people on Navy ships is because the people are not in the right place.

If Bush and his national security team abandon these myths, they will have a much better chance of developing a coherent defense program—and may even be able to cut defense spending to an appropriate level.

WE NEED TO KEEP RULES TO PROTECT FOREST ROADLESS AREAS

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 2001

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the new Administration is reviewing a number of new rules and regulations proposed or adopted by the Clinton-Gore Administration last year.

I understand why a new Administration would want to undertake such a review. And there may be some areas where a change of course might be appropriate.

But there is definitely one set of new rules that should be retained as they stand—the new rules to protect the remaining roadless areas of our national forests.

Those rules make good sense as a way to protect natural resources, provide more diverse recreational opportunities, and preserve some of the undisturbed landscapes that make Colorado and other western States such special places to live and visit.

That is why the Mayor of Boulder, Colorado, has written to President Bush urging retention

of the roadless-area rules. It is why the Boulder City Council has adopted a resolution supporting those rules. And it is why I have written Secretary of Agriculture Anne M. Veneman, urging that the rules be kept in place.

For the information of our colleagues, I am including in the RECORD at this point my letter to the Secretary, the letter to the President from Mayor R. Toor, and the resolution of the Boulder City Council.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 13, 2001.

Hon. ANN M. VENEMAN,

Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY VENEMAN: I am enclosing a copy of a letter to the President from William R. Toor, Mayor of the City of Boulder, Colorado, regarding the new rules for management of inventoried roadless areas published in the Federal Register in January, 2000, and a resolution regarding those rules that was recently adopted by the Boulder City Council.

As you can see, Mayor Toor's letter and the City Council's resolution support these rules and urge their full implementation.

I join in that recommendation. I am convinced that these rules make good sense as a way to protect natural resources, provide more diverse recreational opportunities and preserve some of the undisturbed landscapes that are such a special part of Colorado and other Western states.

The new rules were developed through an extensive public process. They were the subject of both draft and final environmental impact statements. They were discussed at more than 600 public meetings and were the subject of more than 1.5 million public comments.

In my opinion, these rules reflect the highest standards of science-based public policy. Biologists tell us the inventoried roadless areas of the national forests are valuable for wildlife, and support ecosystem health and the full range of native species. They also are important sources of clean water for many communities like Boulder, in Colorado and other states, and provide a bulwark against the spread of invasive species, such as the many species of weeds that plague ranchers in our state and throughout the west.

And, above all, these special areas "possess social and ecological values and characteristics that are becoming scarce in an increasingly developed landscape," in the words of the final environmental impact statement.

The areas to be covered by the new rules were identified by detailed, on-the-ground studies that have been regularly updated and supplemented through the regular forest-planning process and additional studies focused on threatened and endangered species or other aspects of forest management.

For example, the Forest Service's latest Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest plan, developed with extensive public involvement, was completed in 1997. It identifies more than 300,000 acres of roadless areas—including some 40,000 acres in Boulder County alone. The new rules will apply to those areas and will simply mean that their roadless characteristics will be maintained. That forest is one of the closest to the Denver-metro area, so it is one of the most heavily used and affected. If we do not begin now to protect the unspoiled lands in that forest—and similar forests throughout Colorado and the West—we will lose forever the natural benefits and special qualities that they provide.

These rules will provide long-overdue protection for some of the most important parts