

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RONALD REAGAN NATIONAL  
AIRPORT

**HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 1998*

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I had my way Ronald Reagan would not only have the key airport in Washington named after him, he'd have his face on Mt. Rushmore.

But for now, renaming the airport will do. His birthday comes in a few days, and this would be a fitting present. A few years ago, Mr. Speaker, we sent President Reagan another fitting present, passage of the line item veto, which he championed so vigorously during his administration. Why such honors for the former President? In all due respect to the current and previous occupants of the White House, Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan left a positive stamp on the political life of this country that even present and future presidents will never erase.

It was my great privilege, Mr. Speaker, to serve as one of Ronald Reagan's group of core congressional advisors, along with such outstanding leaders as former Congressman Bob Walker, and present Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT. And it was a singular honor to carry President Reagan's water on foreign affairs in the House, because it was his leadership that led to the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the Soviet Empire.

His leadership was equally effective in economic policy. Recently, a survey of leading American businessmen attributed today's strong economy precisely to Reaganomics. Those businessmen made it clear that although President Clinton is the beneficiary, he is by no means the cause, of that prosperity.

And finally, Ronald Reagan set a moral tone for this country solidly rooted in traditional American virtues. His personality, his sense of humor, his ability to distill complex issues into language everyone understood, and finally, his total lack of guile and malice disarmed his critics and made us all feel good once again about being Americans.

The political landscape was littered with the bones of critics who underestimated him until the very last moment in 1989, when he climbed aboard the helicopter carrying him away from Washington for the last time. It was not the same Washington that greeted him in 1981. Ronald Reagan changed the very vocabulary of this city. And when we finally balance the budget and dig Americans out from the mountain of debt built by Ronald Reagan's critics, it will be the greatest birthday present of all.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying, "Mr. President—and for me Ronald Reagan will always be 'Mr. President'—I miss you, your country misses you, and we all wish you the happiest of birthdays with many returns."

IN HONOR OF ROBERT J. FROST

**HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 1998*

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like for my colleagues to stand with me today to pay tribute to Officer Robert J. Frost of New York for his bravery and selflessness.

He is already called the "Christmas Angel" by the Pareja family. He had simply made the decision to stay late at work one night, and on his usual walk home is when he noticed the strong smell of smoke. Because he followed his hunch that something was terribly wrong, he is credited with helping a family of 9 escape from their burning home. You could say it was fate that brought together Transit Officer Frost and the Pareja family. I would say, like them, that it must have been a miracle.

Gathering here today to acknowledge the heroism of Robert, reminds us to continually pay heed to the local heroes of our communities. Recognizing Robert Frost will allow us all to take stock in our actions and reflect on how we too can make a difference in our neighbor's lives. Robert did not have to run up to the burning house. He did so because he cared enough and perhaps because like all of us, he would like to believe that someone would do the same for him if he ever needed their help. Let us take this moment to thank all the Officer Frosts out there and pray that we can be fortunate enough to have an "angel" like him around. I wish Robert Frost and his family all the success in future endeavors.

PROMOTING DEMOCRACY AROUND  
THE WORLD

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 1998*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the euphoria that greeted the end of the cold war, and the authoritarian regimes around the world that drew their strength from it, is fading as we face the reality of how difficult it is to instill democratic ideals and processes in emerging nations. Some critics have argued that elections have not brought freedom to many of these countries. Some have even gone so far as to suggest that a new kind of authoritarian government might be preferable to an elected one.

I am not so pessimistic. In my judgment, what is useful at this point in the U.S. and international experience with democracy-building programs is to analyze which programs have proven useful in the long-term process of reforming institutions and citizens' demands on their governments. Instead of giving up on democracy, we should support the democratic leaders—in government and civil society—who will lay the foundation for reforms in their countries.

I would commend to my colleagues a January 26, 1998 Wall Street Journal article on this subject by Marc F. Plattner and Carl Gershman of the National Endowment for Democracy. The Endowment works creatively with non-governmental organizations in the U.S. and around the world to help build lasting democratic institutions that can protect fundamental freedoms. I am proud to be one of its strongest supporters.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 26, 1998]

DEMOCRACY GETS A BUM RAP

(By Marc F. Plattner and Carl Gershman)

Two recent articles—by Fareed Zakaria in Foreign Affairs and by Robert Kaplan in The Atlantic Monthly—have given voice to a growing pessimism about the global fortunes of democracy. This gloom is no more well-founded than the euphoria about democracy that prevailed just a few years ago. For serious students of democracy have always known that it is a difficult form of government to sustain: Setting up a new democracy is much easier than getting it to perform well or to endure.

Two decades ago the world had only a few dozen democracies, predominantly in Western Europe or countries populated primarily by the descendants of Western Europeans. Citizens of these countries enjoyed not only free and competitive multiparty elections but also the rule of law and the protection of individual liberties. Nearly all (India being the most notable exception) had advanced industrial economies, sizable middle classes and high literacy rates—characteristics that political scientists typically regarded as "prerequisites" of successful democracy. Meanwhile, what were then called the Second and Third Worlds were dominated by other kinds of regimes (Marxist-Leninist, military, single-party, etc.) that rejected multiparty elections.

REGIMES CRUMBLING

By the early 1990s this situation had changed dramatically, as Marxist-Leninist, military and single-party regimes crumbled and were mostly succeeded by regimes that at least aspired to be democratic. Today, well over 100 states can plausibly claim to have elected governments, including most countries in Latin America, many in the post-Communist world and a significant number in Asia and Africa.

Outside Africa, surprisingly few of these regimes have suffered outright reversions to authoritarianism. At the same time, it has become clear that many of them, even among those that hold unambiguously free and fair elections, fall short of Western standards in protecting individual liberties and adhering to the rule of law. As Larry Diamond, co-editor of the Journal of Democracy, puts it, many of the new regimes are "electoral democracies" but not "liberal democracies." Mr. Zakaria puts a more pessimistic spin on a similar diagnosis in his article, entitled "The Rise of Illiberal Democracy."

The difference is more than semantic. Calling the emerging democracies "illiberal" suggests that they constitute a new threat to freedom. In fact, compared with the old regimes, they represent a major gain for freedom, a new opening that makes possible

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the gradual institutionalization of democratic practices and liberties. The new pessimists criticize the simplistic view that elections are sufficient to make a country free. But they commit the same fallacy, failing to recognize that democratization is a process of transition, not an instant transformation to a new order.

The new pessimists seem inclined to rush to the judgment that elections are the primary cause of the problems besetting the new democracies, and to believe that the holding of all those elections is a product of U.S. policy. Both these propositions are false.

The problem with elections, it is said, is that they empower majorities that may favor policies motivated by ethnic or religious intolerance or by short-term economic interests. This is a danger, but what is the alternative? The critics tend to suggest some version of what might be called "liberal nondemocracy"—an unelected government that preserves political stability, promotes economic development, observes the rule of law and generally respects the rights of its subjects.

In theory such a benevolently authoritarian government might be preferable to a corrupt and illiberal democracy. But where can we find one in the real world? The critics cite very few contemporary examples. Mr. Kaplan lavishes praise on the temporary, technocratic government of Pakistan's appointed premier Moeen Qureshi, named to the post after the army forced out his elected predecessor in 1993. Mr. Qureshi served for just three months—hardly a model for long-term stability or widespread emulation. Mr. Zakaria's prime examples are 19th-century European constitutional monarchies that restricted suffrage and Hong Kong under British rule—not exactly a practical vision as we look toward the 21st century.

Proponents of liberal nondemocracy fail to recognize that there is a reason why electoral democracy and liberalism, though sometimes at odds, usually tend to be found together. Liberalism derives from the view that individuals are by nature free and equal, and thus that they can be legitimately governed only on the basis of consent. The historical working-out of this principle inevitably "democratized" Europe's constitutional monarchies, just as it later undermined colonialism. Even if "first liberalism, then democracy" were the preferred historical sequence, today a nondemocratic government would be hard put to find a solid basis for its legitimacy—and thus also for its stability—while it goes about the task of liberalization.

Moreover, the new pessimists overlook the close connection between elections and rights. Elections, if they are to be free and fair, require the observance of a substantial body of rights—freedom of association and expression, for example, and equal access to the media. The pessimists fear that elections will undermine rights by legitimizing illiberal regimes. But elections, if they are truly competitive, tend to arouse citizens to insist upon their rights and upon the accountability of elected officials. The process makes government more subject to public scrutiny.

The spread of democracy abroad is the result not of American policy or propaganda, but of demands by peoples worldwide. Whether this demand springs from human nature or from global communications and the unparalleled current prestige of democracy, people almost everywhere want to have a say about who their rulers are. On what basis shall we deny them? Mr. Kaplan suggests that electoral democracy is somehow responsible for the problems of places like Russia, Afghanistan and Africa today. This is plainly

absurd. If democracy is the problem, why wasn't Africa flourishing during the 1970s and 1980s, when the continent had but a handful of democracies?

#### ELECTIONS ARE NOT ENOUGH

None of this is meant to deny the important—though hardly unfamiliar—insight that elections are not enough. Many of the new democracies have performed poorly with respect to accountability, the rule of law and the protection of individual rights. Helping electoral democracies become liberal democracies is certainly in the interests both of the U.S. and of the countries that we assist.

But we are more likely to provide such assistance if we view elections as an opportunity to work for the expansion of rights, rather than an obstacle to it. As countries lacking the usual prerequisites attempt to liberalize and improve their democracies, it would be foolish not to expect serious problems. But it would be even greater folly to believe that authoritarianism is the solution.

#### TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM RUSSELL KELLY, FOUNDER OF KELLY SERVICES

#### HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 1998*

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mr. William Russell Kelly, founder of Russell Kelly Office Service, and founder of this modern temporary help industry. Mr. Kelly died Saturday, January 3 at his home in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. He was 92.

In 1946, single-handedly, Russ Kelly founded a new industry in a Detroit storefront. It began as an accommodation to employers to fill in for vacationing or sick employees, and also to supplement regular staff during short-term workloads. In the early days most of the temporary employees were women secretaries, hence the name "Kelly Girls" soon became a trademark around the world. Society has moved far beyond this confined role for women and so has the company; today, tens of thousands of professional and technical women and men have joined others in Kelly Services.

Beginning as a fledgling company totaling \$848.00 in sales in its first year, Kelly Services has grown today to a Fortune 500 and a Forbes 500 company, with annual sales approaching \$4 billion. Annually, this Troy, Michigan-based company provides the services of more than 750,000 of its employees through more than 1500 company offices in 50 states and 16 countries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the ingenuity and the memory of this entrepreneurial pioneer. Indeed, when Russ Kelly was asked how he wanted to be remembered, he said, "Only as a pioneer."

I extend my sincere sympathy to Russell Kelly's wife, Margaret, his son, Terence E. Adderley, who joined the company in 1958 and became its President in 1967 and who has now succeeded Mr. Kelly as Chairman of the Board of the Company, his daughter-in-law, Mary Beth and his six grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

#### A TRIBUTE TO DAVE MOORE

#### HON. JIM RAMSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 1998*

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a true pioneer in broadcasting and television journalism.

These are very sad days in Minnesota, as a true legend has passed from our midst. No one who has called Minnesota home for the past half century will ever forget Dave Moore of WCCO Television in Minneapolis, who died on Wednesday, January 28, 1998.

Dave Moore was much, much more than a television news anchor. His standard-setting ethics, keen wit, astute observations, lyrical prose, sheer longevity, inspiring work ethic and unique, curmudgeonly demeanor helped to define Minnesota for all of us who absolutely had to be home for the 6 and 10 p.m. news. His background in theater gave him a special talent few of today's journalists possess: the ability to touch viewers by conveying his feelings.

Mr. Speaker, Dave was a humble man, full of self-effacing humor, never one to overrate his importance in our lives. "I am a very lucky guy . . . I have one marketable talent," he once said, "reading out loud."

For 47 wonderful years on Channel 4, WCCO-TV, Dave gave us the news. On newscasts from 1957 until 1991, he was there every day.

Late on Saturday nights, you were absolutely un-Minnesotan if you weren't home for Moore's late-night "The Bedtime Nooz," a show full of cutting-edge humor that poked fun at current events and politicians.

An outsider trying to gauge Dave Moore's significance to Minnesotans needed only look at the front pages of newspapers last week. The tributes to Dave Moore have been poignant and powerful: grown people searching and yanking deep to pull up childhood memories—and producing tears mixed with laughter in our newspapers and on broadcasts across the dial.

Mr. Speaker, if you went back to just about any day—from television news' infancy in the 1950s to its slick, digitalized, distant relative here in the 1990s—you would find Moore dominating conversations, too. You would hear at lunch counters the ubiquitous query: "Did you hear what Dave said last night on the news?"

The Star Tribune wrote that, with Moore, it was "not a question of credibility, or expertise, or looks—certainly not looks. It's simply that Moore had a presence that inspired calm, trust and good will." The Pioneer Press said Dave Moore "was a kind of Midwestern comfort food—the meatloaf and mashed potatoes of broadcast . . . the heart behind the headlines."

Dave Moore was anything but slick, and that's why we loved him so much. He was trust personified, substance over style. His credibility was beyond reproach. But if you saw him at one of his favorite places out in public—a play, baseball game, movie—he was easily approachable. His diverse and widespread charitable efforts were inspiring. A truly fitting favorite was reading the newspaper to the blind.

This week, a Vietnam veteran called a radio station to pay his tribute to Dave Moore. This