Estel England of Laurel County, Kentucky. Gunners Mate England served during the Second World War as a member of the U.S. Navy's Armed Guard. His first assignment was aboard the SS *West Cheswald*, which was charged with carrying arms, ammo and food to allied troops in Russia.

During his service, Gunners Mate England fought bravely and honorably. Like so many others who served on ships, in the air, or in the trenches during World War II, Robert England and his fellow servicemen saw battle and fought bravely. Unlike so many of his fellow servicemen, England and the other members of the Navy Armed Guard have never been properly recognized for their outstanding service.

The Armed Guard was created as a branch of the Navy during World War I to protect the merchant ships of the United States. During World War II the Armed Guard was reactivated in response to the German attack and sinking of merchant ships, event those of neutral countries, that appeared to be bringing goods to Allied Nations. The mission of the merchant ships was absolutely critical: they were the lifeline for many allied troops, delivering ammunition, food, weapons, clothing, and other badly-needed supplies.

The men of the Armed Guard who helped protect these ships were heroes in the true sense of the word. They made tremendous sacrifices, and many died in the hands of an unforgiving sea. They endured torpedoes, gunfire, and bombs. They were the target of enemy destroyers, submarines and bombers. They fought off Japanese planes and German U-boats. They fought for freedom and democracy, and they made our nation proud.

Mr. President, for too long the men of the U.S. Navy Armed Guard have not received the recognition they deserve, but, earlier this year the House of Representatives moved to correct this injustice. The Defense Authorization Act for 1999 contains a provision that recognizes the service, honor and bravery of the men who served in the Armed Guard. It expresses the appreciation of the Congress and American people for their service and their sacrifices.

During their service, the men of the Navy Armed Guard served with honor, dignity, and courage. Nearly 145,000 men served in the Armed Guard on 6,236 merchants ships during WW II. Nearly 2,000 of these men made the supreme sacrifice by giving their lives in the defense of their country.

It is time these men—men like Robert England—receive the appreciation of a grateful nation. It is time that these men receive the recognition they deserve.

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP DAY GREETINGS

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Guam Organic Act was signed into law by President Harry S. Truman on August 1, 1950. As this law granted citizenship to the people of Guam, August 1 is celebrated on the island as "Citizenship Day." I would like to share with my colleagues my statement for this year's observance. I have also included a speech presented by a former Guam legislator. Carlos Taitano, was a member of the Guam Congress and the Speaker of the 8th Guam Legislature. For his contribution towards the passage of the Guam Organic Act, he was invited to witness President Truman sign the bill into law.

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP DAY GREETINGS (By Robert A. Underwood)

As we commemorate the centennial anniversary of the Spanish-American War, it is most appropriate to reflect on this, the 48th Anniversary of the Organic Act of Guam and the grant of U.S. citizenship. The dawning of the American Era in Guam in 1898 brought with it the promise of the freedoms, rights, duties and responsibilities of American Democracy, and the birth of the Chamorro quest for political justice, equality and self-governance under the American flag. Though couched differently at various times, this has been our unchanging theme for nearly a hundred years.

In 1901, just three years after Guam became an American possession, our grandfathers and great-grandfathers sent a petition to Washington, calling on the Federal government to clarify the political status of Guam and its people. Subsequent efforts were geared toward the acquisition of U.S. citizenship as a means of political rights and protection. The passage of the Organic Act in 1950 satisfied the Guamanian desire of citizenship and civilian governance, but we still have unfinished business in the political status of Guam. Our desire for greater selfgovernment is undaunted, even as we continue the quest. The struggle of the Chamorro people has been long and arduous, the triumphs have been hard-won, but our cause is steadfast and our faith in America remains steadfast.

Today, as we celebrate nearly half a century of U.S. citizenship, enjoying the rights and privileges therein, I humbly restate the undying commitment of the people of Guam for political recognition, equality and greater self-government, in memory of all of Guam's political pioneers who surely must be with us in spirit, happy to know that their efforts were not in vain.

(By Carlos Taitano)

At the end of the past century, The United States almost simultaneously took possession of the Philippines, Guam, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The full or "plenary" powers of the U.S. Congress were extended to these new possessions. Fifty years later, all these territories, except Guam, had received some attention from the U.S. Congress resulting in some changes from their initial status. Hawaii, for example, was made an incorporated territory and its people were granted U.S. citizenship. Later, it would become a U.S. state.

In the Philippines, the military government which began with the U.S. occupation after the end of the Spanish-American War, was replaced by a civilian government. The Philippines was granted independence in 1946.

In Puerto Rico, the military government that was established after the island was acquired from Spain in 1898, was replaced by a civilian government only two years later. An organic Act for Puerto Rico was enacted by Congress in 1917, including a grant of U.S. citizenship.

The treaty ending the Spanish-American War required the United States to determine the civil and political rights of the Chamorro people. By failing to act on this provision of the treaty, the U.S. Congress allowed autoc-

racy to exist within the American democracy. Two generations of Chamorros lived under a U.S. military government in which a single person, a naval governor, exercised absolute control over all Chamorros on Guam and every aspect of their lives. During the 50 years that Guam was under military government, the Chamorros sent several petitions to Washington for U.S. citizenship. All were denied.

After 50 years living under conditions of inequality and without regard for the rights of the individual . . .

After 50 years of military occupation in which virtual martial law applied . . .

After 50 years of a government policy of discrimination in our own homeland, resulting in the loss of our dignity, self respect, and freedom . . .

After a series of congressional legislation providing opportunities for many people around the world to become U.S. citizens . . . opportunities extended to Chinese, Fili-

pinos, and others . . . but not to Chamorros. By 1949, we were a restless people. We decided to demand in an aggressive, but peaceful manner, some action from the U.S. Congress hopefully, leading to some fundamental reforms in the way we were governed.

I was a member of the House Assembly of the Guam Congress at that time. This body decided to stage a "walkout" on March 5, 1949 and to stay out of the halls of the Guam Congress until we saw some evidence that some reforms were in the making. This was the first revolt by the Chamorros against an occupying power since the Spanish-Chamorro wars at the end of the seventeenth century.

Unlike most other people under colonial rule, the Chamorros were not seeking independence from the colonial power. On the contrary, they had been petitioning all along for closer association with the United States. The "walkout" received nation-wide pub-

The "walkout" received nation-wide publicity, made possible by two newsmen that I had met three months earlier . . . one from the United Press, the other from the Associated Press. Influential newspapers and individual citizens across the nation were now calling for fundamental reforms in the Governance of Guam.

President Harry S. Truman quickly took over and ordered the transfer from a military government to a civilian government of Guam. The President successfully convinced the leaders of the U.S. Congress that organic legislation for Guam could no longer be ignored.

The Chamorros were finally granted U.S. citizenship. This could have been the only grant by the U.S. Congress and the Chamorros would have been happy and grateful. Citizenship would open many doors leading to economic opportunities. But, most important, the Chamorro was now an American.

The government created by the Guam Organic Act was not exactly self-government for Guam. It was limited Home Rule. The people did not constitute a sovereign power. All political authority was derived from the federal government.

Nevertheless, when one considers the 50 years of political neglect, these gains were substantial. 1950 is the most important year in the history of Guam's Chamorro people over the centuries since they lost their independence to Spain in 1693 at the end of the Spanish-Chamorro wars. Nothing that has happened to them since that time can compare with the dramatic reforms contained in the Guam Organic Act. Because of the role I played in the 'walk-

Because of the role I played in the "walkout," I was invited to be present at the signing ceremony of the Guam Organic Act at the White House on August 1, 1950. Also present at the signing ceremony were senators and congressmen who guided the Guam bill through Congress and the two men who would carry out the mandate of the Congress . . . the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior.

While waiting in the Oval Office of the White House with these dignitaries, I recalled the statement made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt by radio to the nation in this same Oval Office about a decade earlier. At that time, President Roosevelt proclaimed that one of the post-World War II goals of the United States would be to decolonize the various territories under colonial powers around the world. As a member of the U.S. Army at the time, and as a Chamorro, I was overjoyed and encouraged. For me, it was another good reason to serve in the military during that world conflict.

Although the signing of the Guam Organic Act at the White House took place five years after the end of World War II, I thought at the time that it was the beginning of the decolonization of Guam. Unfortunately, almost half a century after the signing of the Guam Organic Act, the Chamorros are still trying to set up an island government without the bounds or restraint of colonialism.

It is our hope that before another 50 years have passed since the signing of the Guam Organic Act, we would see the passage of the Guam Commonwealth Act, now before the U.S. Congress.

I took President Roosevelt's statement about decolonization as a promise to me. I surely hope that the decolonization of Guam would happen while I'm still around. Si Yu'os Ma'ase'.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KENDALL MEDICAL CENTER

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 25th anniversary of Kendall Medical Center, an institution which has been responsible for providing South Florida with the best medical care possible. The facility, which provides full-service, state of the art care in a wide variety of medical specialties and has nearly 100 doctors on staff, has been honored for three consecutive years as one of America's "700 Top Hospitals" and is currently "Accredited with Commendation" by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare organizations.

Among the 1,000 plus employees at Kendall Medical Center, I would like to honor the following thirteen individuals who have worked toward the evolution of Kendall Medical Center throughout the last 25 years: Teresita Beiro, Angela Carrodeguas, Rosa Cerulia, Marta Cortes, Rosa Crespo. Elizabeth Mirone, Jo An Plumlee, James Rosenzweig, Elizabeth Sollogub, Patricia Stiers, Nancy Tablada, Judith Williams and Victor Maya.

Victor, whom I have known for many years, has been with the hospital since its inception and has served as its Chief Executive Officer Center since 1987. It has been through his leadership, vision, and determination, combined with the efforts of his employees, which have led to the outstanding achievements of Kendall Medical Center.

On the date of its 25th anniversary, I extend my thanks and my congratulations to those 13 individuals who have dedicated their lives to a quarter of a century of continuous care. You have provided South Florida with an excellent medical facility.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, On August 6, 1998, I was not present to vote on rollcall vote 403 because of a pressing family matter in my home State of Delaware. Had I been here, I would have voted "no" on the Doolittle substitute.

When we started this debate, there were many sound proposals on how to improve our current framework of campaign finance. However, only one of these proposals has emerged as a realistic approach to significantly improve our election system.

My opposition to this substitute does not reflect a negative opinion of the author's hard work or ideas, but rather my opinion that the Shays-Meehan bill is the best method for reform.

Reformers who want to see significant changes to our election system signed into law must rally around the one bill that has the best chance of passing—that bill is the Shays-Meehan substitute.

DOMESTIC KAOLIN COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1998

HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce the "Domestic Kaolin Competitiveness Act of 1998." This legislation will revise the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 (The Jones Act) to ensure that laws meant to protect U.S. shipbuilding jobs will not hurt U.S. kaolin jobs.

Currently, the Jones Act requires all shipping between U.S. ports to be conducted exclusively by American built, owned, and crewed vessels. However, it does not apply to import/export shipments.

My legislation specifically targets the domestic shipping of kaolin, a fine clay found primarily in middle Georgia. Kaolin is used in a variety of industrial applications, such as producing the glossy finish on magazines, as well as the manufacture of porcelain products.

Currently, there are no American barges available that are suitable for shipping kaolin. Accordingly, Georgia clay producers are forced to use more expensive truck and rail transportation to supply American manufacturing customers, giving Brazilian kaolin producers a price edge in delivered costs. Mr. Speaker, when it is less expensive to transport kaolin from Brazil to Maine than it is from Georgia to Maine, something is not right.

This legislation would allow kaolin producers to request a waiver of the Jones Act, but only if there are no available American barges to transport the clay. In other words, if there are American barges available, clay producers would still be required to use them in order to ship by water, regardless of the price.

Mr. Speaker, this is a prime example of allowing federal regulations to strangle domestic industries, while granting de factor waivers to foreign competitors. It is also a case in point of the need for Congress to review past legislation to determine if it is still accomplishing the goals it was originally intended to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that the kaolin industry is put on equal footing and can compete fairly with its foreign competitors.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, AND JUDI-CIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4276) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kucinich amendment.

Some of my colleagues oppose this amendment because they believe it is a fig leaf for protectionist impulses. Others support the amendment because they believe it is necessary to preserve basic American values from encroachment by an evil international trade bureaucracy.

These attitudes are typical of the way we debate trade in this town. We choose up sides, either as "free traders" or as "economic nationalists," and throw epithets.

But it's never that simple.

This amendment raises a legitimate issue. We visited this issue during negotiations on the World Trade Organization. A major impact of the creation of the WTO was that the United States, and all of the other members, lost what was in essence a veto power over decisions of WTO trade panels. At the time, we raised questions about the relationship between federal and state law in the context of our membership in this trade organization.

This amendment focuses on the impact of the WTO on state efforts. These are not simple issues with simple answers. They deserve our thorough and thoughtful consideration.

But an amendment to a funding bill does not provide an appropriate forum for this reasoned discussion. The implication of the amendment is that state laws affecting trade and international trade agreements are immune from action by federal authorities. While there has never been such federal action in the past, it is not wise—without very serious discussion to immunize state laws, whatever their nature, from any such challenge in the future. Would our next step be to prohibit the use of federal funds to implement the decision of a WTO dispute settlement panel perceived to be adverse to federal laws? Doing so nullifies our prerogatives for involvement in trade organizations.

I took a lead position in trying to raise and resolve issues of interaction between WTO decisions and our federal and state laws when