

soft money, the fact that these days candidates don't have to worry about a \$1,000 limit because soft money is so prevalent and so available and because of, in my judgment, recent misguided Supreme Court decisions that allow political parties to do political ads—we all know they are political ads; simply because they don't say vote for candidate X, they are not classified as political ads—makes our system a joke, makes our system a mockery.

What we are doing here is simply returning to the status quo of a year ago before these 527 accounts were founded. We have a very long way to go. The only confidence I have is that we do have leaders such as the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Wisconsin to help us move forward.

If we were to rest on our laurels, if we were to think we had now cleaned up the system because we passed this legislation, we would be sadly mistaken. It is very much needed because this is the part of campaign finance that remains under a rock with all the worms and critters crawling undiscovered. At the same time, we need to go much, much further. I will be glad to follow the banner of Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD to try to help make that a reality.

I thank the Chair and the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for everything he has done on this matter. I ask the Chair how much time remains on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, let me note that there is no constitutional argument against this bill because these organizations receive a tax exemption. The public is entitled to this information in exchange for the substantial tax benefit these groups receive. I am so pleased this matter will be demonstrated in the courts because this bill is going to actually become law.

I would like to use the remaining time to remind my colleagues and the public of the scope of the loophole we are about to get rid of. This has been called the "mother of all loopholes." If left unchecked, literally millions upon millions of dollars originating from foreign governments, foreign companies, and even, theoretically, organized crime could be spent in our elections without a single solitary bit of reporting and accountability—totally secret money in unlimited amounts, and no one would know where the money was coming from. It is hard to imagine anything that would be worse for the health of our democracy.

We have a chart here containing, word for word, what is essentially an

advertisement by one of these groups. It is as plain as day. This group solicits contributions from extremely wealthy individuals and groups. Contributions, it says, can be given in unlimited amounts. They can be from any source. They are not political contributions and are not a matter of public record. They are not reported to the FEC, to any State agency, or to the IRS.

Today, we are wiping out what might be the most important part of this advertisement, that the contributions are not a matter of public record. From now on, these groups will disclose their contribution to the IRS. The public will be able to see where their money is coming from and understand what is behind the message.

I do want to mention a number of people who have been central to this effort. Of course, my friend and colleague, Senator MCCAIN, deserves a huge amount of the credit for putting forward our original amendment to the DOD bill and tenaciously continuing to push until it became law. Senators LIEBERMAN and LEVIN developed the original bill on 527s, recognizing the huge threat these stealth PACs posed. Their work over the past few weeks to make sure we finish the job has been extraordinary. Senator SNOWE, who has long been concerned about getting disclosure of phony issue ads run in the last days before an election, was a key supporter, as was Senator SCHUMER and many others. On the House side, Representative SHAYS, who is in the Chamber now, as well as Representatives MEEHAN, HOUGHTON, CASTLE, DOGGETT, and MOORE were crucial to getting the bill passed there, over the strong opposition of the House leadership. I am proud of how we worked in a bipartisan and bicameral fashion to get the bill done and close this loophole. This effort bodes well for the future of campaign finance reform.

This is my final point, Mr. President. This is not the end of the fight, as we have said. It is just the beginning. Now that we have cracked the wall of resistance to any reform at all, I think we are ready to move forward on truly cleaning up the corrupt campaign finance system. Now that we have disclosure of the unlimited amounts that are going to outside groups, I think we are ready to address the unlimited contributions from corporations, unions, and wealthy individuals that the soft money loophole permits to be given to the political parties.

Mr. President, I should have also mentioned Senator JEFFORDS, who is present in the Chamber, for his help on this issue.

I know that many of my colleagues want to clean up this system and are willing to work in good faith to find a way that we can do that.

In the few seconds I have remaining, I thank a number of staff for their incredibly hard work and dedication to the campaign finance issue and to this 527 disclosure bill. We have not had many wins, and they are the ones re-

sponsible for keeping us in this fight. Mark Buse, Ann Choinere, Lloyd Ator of Senator MCCAIN's staff, Laurie Rubenstein of Senator LIEBERMAN's staff, Linda Gustitus with Senator LEVIN, Jane Calderwood and John Richter from Senator SNOWE's staff, Andrea LaRue with Senator DASCHLE, and Bob Schiff of my own staff worked very long hours to make sure that we got to this point, and we appreciate all of their efforts and look forward to future victories together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back his remaining time?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4762) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 2001—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 4577, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Tennessee is recognized to call up an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3654

(Purpose: To increase the amount appropriated for the Inter-agency Education Research Initiative)

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] proposes an amendment numbered 3654.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 18, line 7, insert before "": *Provided*, " the following: "(minus \$10,000,000)".

On page 68, line 23, strike "\$496,519,000" and insert "\$506,519,000".

On page 69, line 3, strike "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

On page 69, line 6, insert after "103-227" the following: "and \$20,000,000 of that \$50,000,000 shall be made available for the Interagency Education Research Initiative".

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I have a modification to my amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment (No. 3654), as modified, reads as follows:

On page 68, line 23, strike "\$496,519,000" and insert "\$506,519,000".

On page 69, line 3, strike "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

On page 69, line 6, insert after "103-227" the following: "and \$20,000,000 of that \$50,000,000 shall be made available for the Interagency Education Research Initiative".

Amounts made available under this Act for the administrative and related expense of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Education shall be further reduced on a pro rata basis by \$10,000,000.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, it is my understanding that a vote will be scheduled on my amendment tomorrow morning. Therefore, I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise tonight to offer an amendment that I think goes to the heart of so many of our debates here on the Senate floor regarding education. My amendment would fully fund the Department of Education's share of the Interagency Education Research Initiative (IERI)—a collaborative effort of the Department of Education's research arm—the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)—the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD). The primary objective of the IERI is to support the development and wide dissemination of research-proven, technology-enabled educational strategies that improve K-12 education.

We debate many new program ideas here in the Senate that have little to no research to back up them up. Members offer new program after new program in a mad attempt to cure what ails American education. I ask my colleagues, "wouldn't it be better to know what works before we spend billions of dollars trying out things that may, in fact, not only not work, but harm student achievement?" Reading is a good example of this. We tried many fads before the scientifically-based research evidence came in that you've got to have phonics.

As we all know, advances in education, as in most other areas, depend in no small part on vigorous and sustained research and development. Indeed, state and local policymakers, as well as school level administrators, are clamoring for information about "what works" to guide their decisions. However, historic investments in such educational research have been woefully inadequate, and the small federal investments that have been made through the Department of Education have not always resulted in the high-quality, scientifically credible research that we have come to expect from many other research agencies. Much of research that has come out of the De-

partment of Education in years past has been politically driven and not always of the highest quality. IERI is a first step on the road to changing that. Teaming up with highly respected research institutions like NSF and NICHD, OERI is improving its research processes. In the 1997 PCAST "Report to the President on the Use of Technology to Strengthen K-12 Education," an advisory panel of technology, business, and education leaders strongly urged that a significant Federal research investment be undertaken in education, with a focus on educational technology. The report pointed out that in 1997, we invested less than 0.1 percent of the more than \$300 billion spent on K-12 public education each year to examine and improve educational practice; by contrast, the pharmaceutical industry invests nearly a quarter of its expenditures on the development and testing of new drugs. In addition to the President's 1997 Technology Advisory Report, the Budget Committee Task Force on Education's Interim Report, and this year's Republican Main Street Partnership Paper on "Defining the Federal Role in Education, A Republican Perspective," both call for more spending on Education R&D. At our Budget Committee Task Force on Education hearing on education research, we learned that one of our main Federally funded research institutions was operating with a budget that was smaller than what a seed company expended in a facility devoted solely to breeding petunias down the road.

Dr. Robert Slavin, the Co-Director of the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At-Risk (CRESPAR), one of the Department of Education's research centers, likened our current expenditures in federal education research to health research that was limited to "basic research and descriptions of how sick people are, but never produced any cures for anything." Additionally, another proponent of education research warns that "poor research often leaves us with inadequately tested and replicated fads, masquerading as innovations, penetrating the system, frustrating the teachers, administrators, parents and, most importantly, the children, and leaving us all worse off than before." Unfortunately, it is often difficult to discern good research from bad.

The precursor to the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) was the National Institute of Education (NIE). Modeled after the National Institutes of Health, which is widely respected, the NIE never realized the same success as its role model. A Budget Committee Education Task Force heard in 1998 that progress at OERI was stymied by inadequate peer-review processes and a lack of good quality control measures. Recognizing these problems, OERI—most recently under Dr. Kent McGuire's leadership—has embarked on a number of prom-

ising reforms, including an overhaul of its peer review system in partnership with NIH. However, it is clear we must do more.

In response to the calls of practitioners and experts, the Federal government launched the Interagency Education Research Initiative (IERI) in FY1999. The ultimate objective of the IERI is to accelerate the translation of robust research findings into concrete lessons for educators to improve student achievement in preK-12 reading, mathematics, and science. To achieve this goal, the National Science Foundation, Department of Education, and National Institute of Child Health and Human Development are supporting a fundamentally new character of research in education that builds on the research portfolios of each agency while filling a gap no one agency could address alone. This research features interdisciplinary collaborations across learning-related disciplines, is sub-stantively focused on key aspects of preK-12 education, and is conducted on a scale large enough to learn generalizable lessons about what works and why. Witnesses at hearings related to educational research in both the Senate and the House over the past year (e.g., June 1999 in the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, and October 1999 in the House Basic Science Subcommittee) have urged the Congress to build upon and support the IERI model.

Calls for all levels of the educational system to be accountable for student learning are escalating at the same time that technologies offer exciting new ways to help all students meet high standards of excellence. Now more than ever is the time to elevate the role of rigorous, peer-reviewed educational research—with a focus on technology—in addressing the urgent challenges of educational reform. With \$30 million in FY1999 funds, the IERI team has already laid the groundwork for this innovative research program with 14 new research awards averaging \$2 million per year. Another joint program solicitation for \$38 million in FY2000 funds has recently been released. My amendment will fully fund the Department of Education's share in order to continue to grow the IERI to leverage potentially vast gains in student achievement with a relatively modest investment in finding out "what works."

Education R&D is a young discipline. While the taxonomy for medicine has been in development for millennia, engineering for centuries, and biology for a few hundred years, the widespread public education of children has occurred for barely more than a century. Consequently, education R&D is even younger than that.

The Interagency Education Research Initiative will help expand our knowledge base and will be money well spent.

The amendment is fully offset, and I urge my colleagues to support this very worthwhile investment in our children's education.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, a majority of this body—myself included—just voted to table both the Landrieu and Jeffords amendments, each of which have the laudable goals of increasing funding for disadvantaged and special education students. The problem with both amendments is that they rob Peter to pay Paul. Both amendments reduce the amount of funding in Title VI, which has been substantially increased this year. The distinguished Chairman, the Senator from Pennsylvania, has indicated that the \$2.7 billion allocated for Title VI this year is for the continuation of our class size reduction efforts and for funding, for the first time since the 1950's, a massive school modernization effort. The effect of these amendments is simply to reduce the number of new teachers schools can hire or reduce the money they'll have available to fix fire code violations or upgrade old schools with new technology. That's not the answer. What we ought to be doing is making a greater overall investment in public education.

I have co-sponsored a bill to increase the amount of Title I funding from \$8 billion to \$12 billion in this year alone, and I have co-sponsored a bill that puts us on track to fully fund our federal commitment to IDEA within ten years. Our economically disadvantaged and special needs students deserve more of a commitment from the federal level, but they also deserve small class sizes and safe, modern schools. It's simply wrong to pit these objectives against each other, because in the end, our children are the ones that suffer and that is why I voted to table two amendments that I would otherwise support.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to express my disappointment that this bill does not provide \$125 million for supportive services for caregivers under the Older Americans Act (OAA). As an appropriator, I understand the difficult funding constraints under which Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN operate. However, I also know that providing and funding supportive services for caregivers has strong bipartisan support and would meet a compelling human need.

Many of us have had personal experiences caring for parents or other loved ones and understand firsthand the stresses and strains caregivers face. Last year, the Subcommittee on Aging heard the compelling testimony of Carolyn Erwin-Johnson, a family caregiver in Baltimore, Maryland. Ms. Johnson has been caring for her mother who has Multiple Sclerosis for sixteen years. She left Chicago and her work on a second Masters degree to come to Baltimore and care for her mother at home, rather than put her mother in a nursing home. She found a community-based care system that was fragmented, underfunded, and overburdened. After months of frustration and trying to find help, Ms. Johnson took to hiring nursing aides off the street and training them to care for her

mother while she worked a forty hour work week. Even then, she could only afford to pay for eight hours of help when her mother needed 24-hour care. She and her mother ended up paying on average between \$17,000 and \$20,000 annually in out-of-pocket costs to care for her mother at home.

Caregiving has taken its toll on Ms. Johnson. Today, she has been diagnosed with two incurable, stress-related illnesses, changed jobs, and seen her income drop to levels that mean she can no longer afford to hire private aides. Ms. Johnson is helped by the 164 hours of respite care she receives annually from the Alzheimer's Respite Care Program. In the words of Ms. Johnson, "Respite care programs are the key to the survival and longevity of family caregivers."

Mr. President, currently about 12.8 million adults need assistance from others to carry out activities of daily living, such as bathing and feeding. One in four adults currently provides care for an adult with a chronic health condition. Many caregivers struggle with competing demands of paid employment, raising a family, and caring for a parent or other relative. Caregiving can take an emotional, physical, mental, and financial toll. A recent study found that on average, workers who take care of older relatives lose \$659,139 in wages, pension benefits, and Social Security over a lifetime. Further, the estimated national economic value of informal caregiving was \$196 billion in 1997.

The National Family Caregiver Support Program, originally proposed by the President, would provide respite care, information and assistance, caregiver counseling, training and peer support, and supplemental services to caregivers and their families. Full funding of \$125 million would provide services to about 250,000 families. Senators DASCHLE, GRASSLEY and BREAUX, DEWINE, and I have all sponsored legislation in this Congress to establish this program. Twenty four Senators joined me earlier this year in urging the Labor/HHS Appropriations Subcommittee to fully fund these supportive services for caregivers. I know other colleagues of mine have also voiced support for funding these worthwhile services. This is truly a step we can take that will meet a compelling human need. It gets behind our Nation's families and helps those who practice self-help.

As this bill moves to conference, I strongly urge the conferees to re-evaluate the current decision not to fund caregiver support services. As the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Aging, I am working with my colleagues on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee to reauthorize the OAA this year. I hope that we are able to reach agreement on outstanding issues to reauthorize the OAA this year. While we are working on reauthorization, I believe that we must also move forward on funding

caregiver support services. American families are counting on us to act.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues are aware, cancer has played a prominent role in my family's history. Some in our family—me, my wife Priscilla, our daughter Debbie—have been lucky enough to have fought cancer and won. Others in our family have not been so lucky. My father died of esophageal cancer, my mother died of kidney cancer and my younger brother Michael died of melanoma at the very young age of thirty-five.

As a result, Priscilla and I have become very active in the fight against cancer and in spreading the message that early detection saves lives. It's a part of who we are as a family.

And there are other families with their own stories. Michael J. Fox and his family are waging war against Parkinson's disease. Mary Tyler Moore and her family are fighting diabetes. Christopher Reeve and his family are searching for a cure to paralysis. And millions of other families across the United States are fighting their own battles against AIDS, sickle-cell anemia, Lou Gehrig's disease, Alzheimer's and the many, many other diseases that take our loved ones away from us.

What I've come to realize in my fight against cancer is the crucial role the federal government plays in funding basic medical research at the National Institutes of Health, and how important basic research is to finding breakthroughs not just for cancer but for all of the diseases which affect our families.

For several years now, doubling funding at NIH has been a primary goal of mine in the Senate. The Federal Government, mainly through the NIH, funds about 36 percent of all biomedical research in this country, and plays an especially large role in basic research.

Recently, the Joint Economic Committee, released a first-of-its kind study: "The Benefits of Medical Research and the Role of the NIH," which examines how funding for the NIH cuts the high economic costs of disease, reduces suffering from illness, and helps Americans live longer, healthier lives. And I'd like to take a moment, Mr. President, to share with my colleagues some of the findings in this extensive report.

According to the JEC, the economic costs of illness in the U.S. are huge—approximately \$3 trillion annually, or 31 percent of the nation's GDP. This includes the costs of public and private health care spending, and productivity losses from illness. Medical research can reduce these high costs. But, the NIH is fighting this \$3 trillion battle with a budget of \$16 billion. That's just half of a percent of the total economic cost of disease in the United States.

In addition to lowering the economic costs of illness, advances in medical research greatly help people live longer and healthier lives. A recent study found that longevity increases have created "value of life" gains to Americans of about \$2.4 trillion every year. A

significant portion of these longevity gains stem from NIH-funded research in areas such as heart disease, stroke and cancer. If just 10 percent of the value of longevity increases, \$240 billion, resulted from NIH research, that would mean a return of \$15 for every \$1 invested in NIH.

Also according to the JEC, NIH-funded research helped lead to the development of one-third of the top 21 drugs introduced over the last few decades. These drugs treat patients with ovarian cancer, AIDS, hypertension, depression, herpes, various cancers, and anemia. Future drug research holds great promise for curing many diseases and lowering the costs of illness by reducing hospital stays and invasive surgeries. In fact, one study found that a \$1 increase in drug expenditures reduces hospital costs by about \$3.65.

We know that past medical advances have dramatically reduced health care costs for such illnesses as tuberculosis, polio, peptic ulcers, and schizophrenia. For example, the savings from the polio vaccine, which was introduced in 1955, still produces a \$30 billion savings per year, every year.

Medical advances will help cut costs by reducing lost economic output from disability and premature death. For example, new treatments for AIDS—some developed with NIH-funded research—caused the mortality rate from AIDS to drop over 60 percent in the mid-1990s, thus allowing tens of thousands of Americans to continue contributing to our society and economy.

And medical research spending isn't just about reducing the enormous current burdens of illness. The costs of illness may grow even higher if we fail to push ahead with further research. Infectious diseases, in particular, are continually creating new health costs. The recent emergence of Lyme disease, E. coli, and hantavirus, for example, show how nature continues to evolve new threats to health. In addition, dangerous bacteria are evolving at an alarming rate and grow resistant to every new round of antibiotics.

This report extensively shows the benefits of medical research and reaffirms the enormous benefits we achieve from funding the National Institutes of Health in our fight against disease. But there is still a lot more work to be done. I am hopeful my colleagues will take a few moments to look at this report and recognize the important work done by the scientists and researchers at the NIH. It can be read in its entirety on the JEC website at: jec.senate.gov.

Funding for NIH is really about—hope and opportunity. The challenge before us is great, but America has always responded when our people are behind the challenge. America landed a man on the moon. We pioneered computer technology. America won the Cold War. Now it is time to win the war against the diseases that plague our society. We have the knowledge. We have the technology. Most impor-

tant, we have the support of the American people.

I ask my colleagues to join me in the effort to double funding for the National Institutes of Health. It's good economic policy, it's good public policy, and most importantly, it's good for all Americans.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROFILE OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE'S KOREAN WAR SERVICE

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor my friend John Chafee. On Sunday June 25, 2000, an article appeared in Parade Magazine entitled, "Let Us Salute Those Who Served". The article chronicled John's service in the Korean War. I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE WAS THE MOST ADMIRABLE MAN I'VE EVER KNOWN

(By James Brady)

(The author, a Marine who served in the Korean War, remembers his comrades in arms—and one extraordinary young leader in particular.)

Is Korea really America's "forgotten war?" Not if you ask the foot soldiers who fought there, Marines and Army both. How could any infantryman ever forget the ridgelines and the hills, the stunning cold, the wind out of Siberia, the blizzards off the Sea of Japan? How do you forget fighting—and stopping—the Chinese Army, 40 divisions of them against a half-dozen U.S. divisions, plus the Brits and some gallant others? And how can anyone forget the thousands upon thousands of Americans who died there in three years, in that small but bloody war?

Korea began 50 years ago today—a brutal, primitive war in what Genghis Khan called "the land of the Mongols," a war in which I served under the most admirable man I've ever known, a 29-year-old Marine captain named John Chafee.

Most of us who fought the Korean War were reservists: Some, like me, were green kids just out of college. Others were combat-hardened, savvy veterans bloodied by fighting against the Japanese only five years before—men like Chafee, my rifle-company commander, who would become a role model for life. I can see him still on that first November morning, squinting in the sun that bounced off the mountain snow as he welcomed a couple of replacement second lieutenants. Mack Allen and me, to Dog Company. He was tall, lean, ruddy-faced and physically tireless, a rather cool Rhode Islander from a patrician background with a luxuriant dark-brown mustache. "We're a trifle understrength at the moment," he said, a half-smile playing on his face. "We're two officers short." I was too awed to ask what had happened to them.

Chafee didn't seem to carry a weapon, just a long alpine staff that he used as he loped, his long legs covering the rough ground in

great strides. "Got to stay in the trench from here on," he said as he showed us along the front line. This sector of ridge was jointly held by us and the North Koreans, the trenches less than a football field apart. Chafee questioned the Marines we passed—not idle chat but about enemy activity, addressing each man by his last name, the troops calling him "Skipper." No one was uptight in the captain's presence, and the men spoke right up in answering. When enemy infantry are that close, both the questions and answers are important.

When I got there as a replacement rifle-platoon leader on Thanksgiving weekend of 1951, the 1st Marine Division was hanging on to a mountainous corner of North Korea along the Musan Ridge, about 3000 feet high. It took us a couple of hours to hike uphill, lugging rifles and packs along a narrow, icy footpath to where the rifle companies were dug in. As fresh meat, not knowing the terrain and nervous about mines, we followed close on the heels of Marines returning to duty after being hit in the hard fighting to take Hill 749 in September. In Korea they didn't send you home with wounds. Not if they could patch you up to fight again. These Marines, tough boys, understandably weren't thrilled to be going back. But they went. Dog Company of the 7th Marine Regiment needed them. There was already a foot of snow on the ground. When I think of Korea, it is always of the cold and the snow.

Yet the fighting began in summer on a Sunday morning—June 25, 1950—when the Soviet-backed army of Communist North Korea smashed across the 38th Parallel to attack the marginally democratic Republic of Korea with its U.S. trained and equipped (and not very good) army. Early in the war, Gen. Douglas MacArthur had bragged: "The boys could be home for Christmas." But "the boys" would be in Korea three Christmases—courtesy of the Chinese Army.

Every soldier thinks his own war was unique. But Korea did have its moments: proving a UN army could fight; ending MacArthur's career with a farewell address to Congress ("Old soldiers never die. They just fade away. . . ."); helping elect Eisenhower, who pledged in '52, "I will go to Korea"; demonstrating that Red China's huge army could be stopped; insulating Japan from attack; and enabling the South Korean economic miracle. But the war's lack of a clear-cut winner and loser may have set the stage for Vietnam.

As a junior officer, I had little grasp of such strategic matters. I commanded 40 Marines, combat veterans who had fought both the Chinese and the North Koreans. Captain Chafee led us: Red Philips was his No. 2; Bob Simonis, Mack Allen and I were his three rifle-platoon leaders.

Guided by Chafee, I saw my first combat. Mostly it was small firefights, patrols and ambushes, usually by night. I learned about staying cool and not doing stupid things. When darkness fell, we sent patrols through the barbed wire and down the ridgeline across a stream, the Soyang-Gang, trying to grab a prisoner or to kill North Koreans. Meanwhile, they came up Hill 749 and tried to kill us.

The second or third night I was there, the Koreans hit us with hundreds of mortar shells, then came swarming against the barbed wire, where our machine guns caught them. At dawn there were six dead Koreans hanging on the wire. Except for Catholic wakes at home, I'd never seen a dead man. That morning we tracked wounded Koreans from their blood in the snow. The following day, a single incoming mortar hit some Marines lazing in the sun. Two died; one lost his legs. I hadn't been in Korea a week.

Sergeants like Stoneking, Wooten, and Fitzgerald, and a commanding officer like