future of the National Park System. This bill, however, would also create a closure commission to recommend which of our nation's park units should be closed or privatized. Among the likely targets of such a commission would be hundreds of small, but important parks across the country.

One such park is the Roger Williams National Memorial in Providence, RI. This park is very small, both in its area and its demands on Federal funding, but it meets a large need of many Rhode Islanders. Each year, nearly 150,000 people visit the park, which, like its namesake, represents the best of our country. Roger Williams, who founded my home State, remains a proud example of our Nation's commitment to religious freedom. The park bearing his name honors his contribution to our Nation's history and provides Rhode Islanders with a needed recreational and environmentally preserved area in our State's capital city.

The status of the Roger Williams National Memorial and the hundreds of parks like it nationwide is a critical issue that deserves full and open debate. However, by bringing H.R. 260 to the floor under suspension of the rules, the Republican majority prevents open debate on this issue. Today, the House will not even consider H.R. 2181, despite the fact that this well-crafted measure is sponsored by distinguished members of both parties.

I urge my colleagues to stand for open debate on the future of our national parks. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 260.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM REFORM ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. RICK LAZIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1995

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 260, the National Park System Reform Act. Though there is a need to review the viability and status of national parks, in this era of fiscal constraint and increasing demand on the park system, the issues of park reform and review are not simple ones. This type of legislation should not be brought up under the suspension of the rules. The gravity of this bill calls for further debate and the possibility of offering amendments to this bill.

H.R. 260 would establish an 11-member Natural Park System Review Commission, which would make recommendations to Congress regarding which parks should be closed or managed differently. This commission does not have the authority to close or modify parks of its own accord and only presents non-binding recommendations to Congress. Nevertheless, we need to ensure that these recommendations are not simply rubber-stamped by Congress, but are, indeed, thoroughly reviewed.

Coastal areas are unique in character, and our national seashores should not be grouped along with the land-locked national parks when a review is made. My specific concern is for the preservation of the Fire Island National Seashore in its present form. This barrier island stands defiantly facing the Atlantic Ocean while protecting the waters of the Great South Bay and the mainland of Long Island. Fire Island residents have created 17 separate communities not only for summer recreation, but also to preserve the island's natural heritage. Congress was wise to grant Fire Island its current status as a National Seashore. A determination of this importance should not be reserved without proper safeguards. In order to continue to preserve our coastline's natural heritage, we need to ensure that Fire Island is protected in its present form. Bringing this bill up under the suspension of the rules without the opportunity to offer amendments or for additional debate will not ensure the proper protection for the Fire Island National Seashore or other coastal parks. I urge my colleagues to defeat H.R. 260 under the suspension of rules. This is not the right legislative procedure for a proper review of our national parks.

HONORING JAZZ GREAT BARRY HARRIS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1995

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor jazz pianist, composer, and teacher, Barry Doyle Harris. Barry was born gifted, and started learning piano at the age of 4 from his mother. He followed in her footsteps and played for his church, but soon became fascinated by jazz. He played in his hometown of Detroit throughout the 1950's, the time when I was first awestruck by his shows. In those years, his piano genius took him from the bowling alleys to the Blue Bird Inn, the Motor City's most prominent jazz club. Already, he had as much a passion for imparting his knowledge of music as he had for performing it.

He put out his first album in 1955 at the age of 25 under the direction of Donald Byrd. That same year he worked for several months with Miles Davis. By 1957, he was widely acclaimed in bebop circles and he began teaching formally that year. In 1960, he took his act to New York City where he played with Cannonball Adderley, Yusef Lateef, and Coleman Hawkins for many years. In the early 1980's, he played with a 75-piece orchestra, performed at Carnegie Hall, and then founded the Jazz Cultural Center, an educational institute and club in Manhattan.

From the day that Barry Harris started teaching, he knew that talent was really a torch to pass on to the next generation. This brought him to a lifelong commitment to getting young people exposed to jazz, keeping music in the schools, and defending the larger role of the arts in our society. He once said, ''Teachers should teach where they come from, not where they are. They tell you life is complex and you have to suffer to give of yourself, and that's not true. Life is very simple, and if you simply live and simply learn to play, you'll really give.'' Today, with these words, I hope to reciprocate Barry's spirit of giving with a token of gratitude for his inspiring contribution to jazz, a great national treasure, just like him.

INTRODUCTION OF BIF/SAIF BILL

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1995

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, today, I, together with my colleagues are introducing legislation that will have a monumental impact on the financial services industry. Its purpose is to provide a comprehensive reform of the deposit insurance funds and will merge the bank and thrift charters. This BIF/SAIF legislation reflects the hard work of a bipartisan working group of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, which I chair, that was developed over the last several months.

Since the spring, the subcommittee has held three hearings on BIF/SAIF. The last of these hearings brought forth strong support for a comprehensive approach to the problem, which this legislation being marked up today represents.

In brief, the legislation provides a financial solution to the problem of the insurance funds similar to that proposed by the administration. It recapitalizes the SAIF and through the use of a one-time special assessment of SAIF members. It spreads the FICO costs proportionately among all members of the FDIC as of the date of enactment. In addition, it merges the BIF/SAIF.

What is critical here, is that it goes beyond the administration-sponsored financial fix and merges the bank and thrift charters on January 1, 1998, requiring thrifts to convert to banks. It tackles the complex tax treatment of bad debt reserves by advocating a fresh start approach, to avoid giving thrifts another lump sum obligation that would amount to billions of dollars. Finally, it provides for refunds for FDIC funds in excess of the designated reserve ratio.

It is my intention, given the requirements of the reconciliation process as determined by Banking Committee Chairman LEACH, that the movement of the BIF/SAIF legislation will be a two-track process. A markup of a similar provision in the Full Committee's markup of its budget reconciliation package is based on staff recommendations and is revenue-driven. My legislation will move in regular order and is based solely on crafting good public policy. In this regard, it is my commitment to continue to refine this legislation through a markup at subcommittee and hopefully at the full committee as it moves through the process in regular order to insure that there is a final legislative solution during this congressional session.