His military background which dates back to 1961 was given a further boost by a direct appointment in March 1982 to the Guam Army National Guard. He received a commission to the rank of major and resumed working on press and public affairs until 1989 when he was picked to be assistant adjutant general for the headquarters of the territorial area command of the Guam National Guard. He later attained the highest possible position in the Guam Guard when he was appointed by former Governor Joseph Ada to office of the adjutant general of the Guam National Guard.

For over 30 years, General Duenas has distinguished himself as one of Guam's premier public servants. The body of work that he has done as a journalist, legislator, and military commander has contributed greatly to the positive direction that the island is currently taking. Therefore, I commend Brig. Gen. Edward Ramirez Duenas for having been the consummate public servant and congratulate him on his well earned retirement.

I also suspect that General Duenas will continue to serve the people of Guam through active participation in civic and political matters. Si Yu'os Ma'ase' Ed.

TRIBUTE TO THE GLADWIN LIONS CLUB

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I rise today to recognize an outstanding organization in the State of Michigan. The Gladwin Lions Club in Gladwin, MI, and its many members have demonstrated their commitment and dedication to helping others for the past 25 years. By sponsoring philanthropic events throughout the year, they have illustrated their desire to improve Gladwin, MI, and positively impact their community and its residents.

It is the spirit of giving that makes the Gladwin Lions Club such a special organization. The Lions Club calls on its members to pool their resources in order to facilitate programs that benefit local citizens. It is this selfless donation of time and energy that makes Gladwin a kind and caring city and sets an outstanding example for other communities to follow.

The Gladwin Lions Club and its members have worked tirelessly to improve their city and the surrounding areas and enrich the lives of residents. They established collection centers at local optical stores to allow those purchasing new glasses to donate their old frames to those less fortunate. All have benefited from their service, from the families who need assistance, to residents who enjoy the improved quality of life in the area.

The United States was founded on the good nature of its citizens and excelled under their willingness to assist neighbors and friends. It is this sense of community that motivates the Gladwin Lions Club to accomplish all they can and to promote this caring nature in others. Mr. Speaker, I know you will join my colleagues and I in honoring the Gladwin Lions Club, the rewarding philanthropic events they sponsor and the sense of community their actions foster. I wish them continued success and look forward to another 25 years of giving.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MARCELINO SERNA

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to posthumously honor Mr. Marcelino Serna of El Paso, TX. My bill would make the late Mr. Serna eligible for the award from the Army of the Congressional Medal of Honor by stipulation that the regulation which says that a nomination for that award must be filed within 2 years of the acts above and beyond the call of duty should be waived in this case. In my judgment, Mr. Serna deserves that medal just a surely as anyone who has ever been so honored.

Marcelino Serna served in the U.S. Army from 1917 to 1919. He was born in Chihuahua City, in the Mexican State of Chihuahua in 1896. He died February 29, 1992 at the age of 95. He had held his U.S. citizenship since 1924. Seventy-one years ago, Mr. Serna was awarded the Army's second highest award for valor in combat, the Distinguished Service Cross. He was decorated with the highest military medals of Italy and France. The descriptions of his exploits on the battlefields of Belgium and France read like casebooks of heroism. In recovering from wounds suffered toward the end of the war, he was personally decorated by General John ''Black Jack'' Pershing.

Some have speculated that Mr. Serna was not awarded the Medal of Honor because he was a buck private for most of the war, because he was not a citizen of this country at the time or because he could not speak English well. I hope that none of these reasons were ever given by anyone in a position of authority in these matters. They are insulting and they have no basis in law.

This bill, once enacted, would begin to right a wrong, and to correct an oversight. I urge the committee of jurisdiction to take up the legislation as rapidly as possible so that the Army may look at the merits of this case.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the time limitations specified in section 3744(b) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor under section 3741 of such title to the late Marcelino Serna of El Paso, Texas, for acts of heroism performed while serving as a private in the United States Army during World War I.

TRAGIC LOSS OF FOUR SEATTLE FIREFIGHTERS

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a few words in memory of the four firefighters who tragically lost their lives while serving the people of Seattle, WA on January 5, 1995.

Although I did not know firefighter James T. Brown, Lt. Walter D. Kilgore, Lt. Gregory Shoemaker, or firefighter Randall R. Terlicker personally, I appreciate their work in service with the Seattle Fire Department. The dangers they daily encountered to protect the residents of the Seventh Congressional District did not deter them, and I share the community's expressions of admiration, gratitude, and sorrow at this time.

All four firefighters exemplified the courageous tradition of their profession. Their implacable bravery and devotion to their work must not go unnoticed in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you join me in extending my condolences to their families, friends, and colleagues in the Seattle Fire Department.

SCHOOL CHOICE

HON. MARTIN R. HOKE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we all know that a quality education is the greatest investment we can make in our children as well as in our Nation's future. It is often remarked that a Nation's most valuable asset is its youth, and as the father of three young children, I know full well the truth of that observation.

School choice is an innovative and overdue idea. At present, the public schools have a monopoly in education because their consumers, students, and their parents, are forbidden to choose which school to attend unless they can afford private or parochial schools. Not surprisingly, this Government monopoly has failed to provide a quality service to its captive consumers.

School choice would allow parents to take the money they already spend on taxes for education and invest that money in the school they believe will best educate their child. Essentially, the funds go where the child goes. The child would be able to go to a public or private school, including a religious one. By putting power in the hands of parents, schools would be forced to compete for students. Competition, in turn, will force school administrators to make much needed reforms in order to attract even more customers.

Father Anthony Pilla of the Catholic Diocese of Cleveland has undertaken an insightful study of the issue and has written a report which I believe will be of great interest to you, which I will submit to the RECORD.

IT'S GOOD PUBLIC POLICY

(By Bishop Anthony M. Pilla, Catholic Diocese of Cleveland)

In recent years at the local and national level discussion and debate about educational vouchers have become more and more prevalent in many and varied circles of society. As discussions occur and subsequently are covered by the media, misconceptions about nonpublic schools are frequently presented as factual (especially by those opposed to vouchers). Clearly the promulgation of misinformation is a disservice as committed citizens, parents, educators, and civic, church and business leaders seek to consider issues and reach valid, just and informed decisions to benefit all children of the United States.

Through this paper I would like to address the imperative that policy makers understand who would benefit most from public policies which would create and finance a system of education vouchers. This statement speaks to the possible ways in which education reform could truly enhance the lives and future of the children whose parents would like to send them to nonpublic schools. I invite citizens, parents, legislators, and leaders who desire to consider with integrity the issue of vouchers to read and refer to the information provided as future discussions take place.

WHO WILL BENEFIT?

There can be no mistaking the fact that it is truly the poor who will gain from such legislation. To assume that education vouchers will benefit only the wealthy is unfounded, based on little fact and much speculation. The people for whom an education voucher will really mean something are the people for whom these dollars will enable them to make choices about the education of their children. This, of course, is the basic economic principle of marginal economic utility. Therefore, to measure the true value of education vouchers, legislators must not only consider the dollar amount, but the value of those dollars in terms of what they can accomplish and for which people.

The assessment of who will benefit in the case of education vouchers is clear and substantiated by hard evidence. In a report titled ''Public and Private Schools,'' issued a decade ago, James Coleman and others, specifically addressed the issue of the impact of public policy changes which would facilitate nonpublic school enrollment. The researchers developed the hypothetical situation of increasing family income and analyzed the effect of such an increase. The report clearly indicates that few students would shift from the public to the private sector, but of those that would a significant number would be minorities and/or from families with incomes at or below the national average. To be more specific such a policy change would mean the following:

1. Only a small proportion of public school students would shift to nonpublic schools;
2. The greatest shift would be among minorities, particularly Hispanics; and
3. The racial and ethnic composition of the groups that would shift to nonpublic schools includes more minorities that are currently in these schools.

To quote the Coleman study itself, ''Because a tuition tax credit or a school voucher would even more greatly facilitate private school enrollment for students from lower income families relative to students from higher income families, we can expect that either of those policies would increase the proportion of blacks or students from low-income backgrounds in the private sector.''

Nowhere has such a detailed and comprehensive analysis been done to see specifically who would benefit most from public policies such as education vouchers or tuition tax credits. Although exact outcomes are impossible to predict, the analysis contained in the Coleman study should allay the fears that such policies would destroy the public schools by encouraging the wealthiest students to move to the private sector. In effect, both the private and public sector should benefit through the equalization of the numbers of poor and minority students in both sectors.

The results of the Coleman study were confirmed in a survey done in 1982 by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) at the U.S. Department of Education. This study, ''Private Elementary and Secondary Education: Congressionally Mandated Study of School Finance,'' estimated that over 50% of public school parents would not even consider leaving the public school system even if all tuition costs were covered. The study also reported that Black and Hispanic families were much more likely than White families to switch their children to a nonpublic school if they were given some financial assistance. For instance, under a $500 tuition tax credit 53.0% of Hispanic and 47.2% of Black parents with children in the public schools said that they were ''likely or somewhat likely'' to switch their children to nonpublic schools, while only 26.8% of White parents with children in public school said they were ''likely or somewhat likely'' to switch their children to nonpublic schools.

More recently, there has been a great deal of research on the impact of public policy changes on nonpublic school enrollment which has even more strongly supported the validity of Coleman's claims. According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching only 19% of public school parents would consider sending their children to a nonpublic school. The Carnegie Foundation study also shows that most parents—87 percent—are satisfied with their children's public school. Furthermore, in those places where local governments have experimented with education vouchers, their has not been a mass exodus from the public schools. The full-scale voucher program recently implemented in Puerto Rico demonstrates that such a fear is unwarranted. During the two years of the operation of the Puerto Rican education voucher program, more school children in Puerto Rico chose to leave nonpublic schools to go to public schools than chose to leave public schools for nonpublic schools.

ARE NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS ELITIST?

So the evidence, both theoretical and empirical, is clear: an education voucher system will not leave the public schools empty; and, of those students whose families will use vouchers to choose nonpublic schools a disproportionate number will be minorities or from poor families. But what about these people who would use education vouchers to go to a nonpublic school? Will education vouchers really benefit participating students educationally? There are several misconceptions about the parents who choose to send their children to nonpublic schools and about the quality of nonpublic education. These misconceptions have been used by opponents of education vouchers to argue that nonpublic schools do not serve children from families who need financial assistance in order to continue to afford their school's tuition, and to argue that it is not good public policy to help parents have a choice about what kind of school their children are going to attend.

First, some people picture nonpublic schools as being white, wealthy and highly selective. These generalizations about nonpublic schools are highly inaccurate. Several recent studies published by the U.S. Department of Education demonstrate that nonpublic schools are not predominately attended by the wealthy. The National Center for Education Statistics recently issued a report which estimated that in 1985, 47% of students in church-related schools and 32% of students in nonsectarian schools were from families with incomes of between $15,000 and $35,000, while 42% of the students in public schools were from families within that income range.

According to research produced by the National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA), there are not significant differences between the income levels of public and Catholic school families. NCEA estimates that in 1992, 6% of Catholic high school families had an income level of under $15,000; 17% had an income level of between $15,000 and $25,000; 26% had an income level of between $25,001 and $35,000; 28% had an income level of between $35,001 and $50,000; and 23% had an income level of over $50,000. Using 1990 Census Data, the percentages nationwide for families of four were not significantly different: 17% of families had an income level of under $15,000; 16% had an income level of between $15,000 and $25,000; 18% had an income level of between $25,001 and $35,000; 20% had an income level between $35,001 and $50,000; and 30% had an income level of over $50,000.

To quote NCEA, ''These data provide additional evidence to refute persistent and pernicious stereotypes of Catholic schools as a refuge for the wealthy. Clearly, many families who choose Catholic high schools for their children must strain to find money for tuition within limited budgets.

Research on elementary schools is even more telling in this regard. For the 1992–93 school year, NCEA estimates that 11.6% of Catholic elementary school families had an income of less than $15,000; 21.5% had an income of between $15,001 and $25,000; 25.1% had an income of between $25,001 and $35,000; 23.4% had an income of between $35,001 and $50,000; and, 18.3% had an income of more than $50,000. What may be more significant than this, is the fact that over 92% of all Catholic elementary school families had dual incomes in 1992–93. These statistics demonstrate that many Catholic school parents make significant sacrifices to send their children to a nonpublic school. In light of this evidence it is difficult to understand how anyone could claim that nonpublic school parents are wealthy, and therefore, not deserving of a share of the tax funds to which they contribute in order to assist them in the educational choice they are making for their children.

Inner-city nonpublic schools, in particular, demonstrate a remarkable willingness and ability to serve the needs of urban students from disadvantaged families. Research indicates that these schools draw from the same populations as the local public schools. According to data from the 1990 Census, there are over one million families living in our country's inner-cities—13.4% of all inner-city families with school age children—who send their children to nonpublic schools. These figures indicate that there are many parents in our cities and urban areas who are in desperate need of a public policy which says to them, ''You may educate your children in the schools of your choice as guaranteed by the Constitution. And furthermore, you will be able to do so even though you may be poor or disadvantaged—whether or not you live in the cities or the suburbs or the rural areas of this country.''

Consistent with the results of the Coleman study, the U.S. Department of Education's 1985–86 study on Private Schools demonstrates that the nonpublic school community has indeed been able to achieve a higher degree of integration relative to the racial backgrounds of their students than the public sector. It is also important to note that the percentage of minorities enrolled in all nonpublic schools has significantly increased over the last decade. Catholic schools, in particular, have performed particularly well in this regard. According to the National Catholic Educational Association, the percentage of minorities in Catholic schools has more than doubled since 1970–71. In 1993–94, the percentage of Black, Hispanic and Asian students made up 22.5% of students in Catholic schools. In light of these figures and of the trends indicated in the Coleman report, can anyone reasonably suggest that nonpublic schools do not serve children from a wide range of economic, racial and ethnic backgrounds?

All of this raises a simple point. Any public policy precluding or denying freedom of choice in education on the assumption that nonpublic schools are racist or elitist is public policy based on misconception. If anything, the facts indicate that a statement of public policy in the form of education vouchers would serve to further improve the racial and economic mix in both nonpublic and public schools.

The second general misconception about nonpublic schools concerns the quality of nonpublic schools and, in particular, as it relates to selectivity. Opponents of education vouchers often argue that nonpublic schools do a better job of educating children because they can be more selective in whom they accept and are free to expel the children they don't want. This viewpoint is quite simply not based on the facts.

Once again, let us consider this misconception in the case of the performance and policies of Catholic schools which, of course, educate over 50 percent of all nonpublic school children in the United States. The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights conducted a study on inner-city nonpublic schools based on an analysis of randomly selected schools in eight major cities around the country. The data from this study indicates that after giving preference for admission to parishioners, approximately 90 percent of these schools exercise open admission policies and rarely expel students. This data is further supported by research done by Dr. Vitullo-Martin. He states, ''No researcher has found any extensive use of expulsion sufficient to explain the statistical differences in achievement rates between public and Catholic schools.'' This is not to say that nonpublic schools never expel nor dismiss students for various reasons, but that such action is not taken lightly, nor is done very often, as some opponents on nonpublic education would have us believe.

WHAT ABOUT QUALITY?

The misconceptions about the selectivity of nonpublic schools should not prevent the provision of education choice to parents and neither should misconceptions about the quality of nonpublic schools. In fact, the quality of nonpublic schools is at least as good as that found in the public sector and in many instances better. Once again, the Coleman data provides conclusive evidence:

1. Given the same kinds of students, nonpublic schools create more contact for students with academic activities. For example, attendance is higher, students do more homework and they take on average more vigorous subjects;

2. There is greater scholastic achievement in nonpublic schools than in public schools, brought about by a more ordered environment;

3. The growth rates in achievement between the public and nonpublic schools differ, with strong evidence that average achievement among nonpublic school students is ''considerably'' greater than in the public sector; and

4. In discussing Catholic schools, in particular, the Coleman report concludes that Catholic schools most closely resemble the ideal of the ''common school.'' That is, they educate children from different backgrounds and obtain greater homogeneity of student achievement.

These conclusions have been supported by more recent examinations of the relative achievement levels in nonpublic and public schools. In his above mentioned book on Catholic schools, Anthony Bryk reported that in 1988, 64% of Catholic school students in grade 10 compared with 45% of public schools students in grade 10 stated that they had plans to attend college. More importantly, Bryk's research showed conclusively that the distribution of academic achievement is more equalized across class, race and ethnic lines in Catholic schools than in the public schools. In other words, the average level of achievement in mathematics, for example, is not only higher in Catholic high schools, it is less strongly related to social class and racial and ethnic background.

The impact of an education in Catholic school clearly has long term benefits as well. For example, the U.S. Department of Education reported that by the spring of 1986, 36% of White Catholic high school graduates, 25% of Black graduates and 25% of Hispanic graduates went on to receive a BA, BS or MA, while only 19% of White Public Schools graduates, 9% of Black graduates and 9% of Hispanic graduates had received one of those degrees.

I do not point out these things to accentuate the differences between public and nonpublic education. More than two-thirds of Catholic school-age children in this country attend public schools, and I remain committed to and supportive of the public schools in this nation.

For too long the nonpublic schools in this country have been accused of being racist, elitist and of inferior quality. Past attempts to establish a public policy which would truly give parents educational freedom of choice have been defeated using these misconceptions as reasons against granting equity to parents, especially the poor parents of our nation. Hard evidence is now available and it reveals these misconceptions for what they are. The evidence tells us that poor parents will benefit most from a system of education vouchers and that the schools to which they would send their child can no longer be considered a priori to be racist or elitist. The evidence also tells us that the quality of nonpublic school education is certainly not inferior. None of the misconceptions which have been attributed to nonpublic schools in the past should stand in the way of the establishment of an education voucher system as a matter of public policy. There should be no doubt that justice and equity demand such public policy, for to be poor without educational choices is in itself a greater poverty. Policy makers have an opportunity to provide that justice and equity, by providing educational choices to minorities and poor of this country. The time to act on education vouchers is certainly at hand. I urge you to support a system of education vouchers—a policy which will bring educational justice and freedom to the people of this country.

TRIBUTE TO DICK AUSTIN

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, Dick Austin's decades of public service deserve more than the typical testimonial accolades.

His career has indeed been unique. In his own quiet but determined fashion, Dick has truly been a pioneer, breaking through a number of barriers in the State of Michigan.

He has represented an important embodiment of the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.—that we be judged by the content of our character rather than the color of our skin. He has been an ambassador of good will among us as citizens of Michigan, in every corner, indeed virtually every nook and cranny of our State.

He has done so by bringing high competence and full integrity to a major office affecting the lives of us all. From our physical security or our highways to honesty in the voting booth, Dick Austin has stood up for Michigan's interests.

Twenty-five years ago, I had the privilege of campaigning statewide with Dick Austin. Our earlier friendship deepened with that experience and has increased with each year's passing. May Dick continue in good health, so that we will continue to be blessed with his good cheer, warn friendship, and usual talents.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN FRIERSON

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. John Frierson, who is retiring this month after a dedicated career of 26 years to the citizens of Los Angeles. On Friday, January 20, 1995, in Los Angeles, John's many friends and colleagues will gather at a retirement dinner in his honor at the Continental Plaza Hotel. In recognition of his service to the community, I am pleased to highlight just a few of his career and community service accomplishments for my colleagues.

Born in Harlem in New York City, John graduated from George Washington High School, and studied history at the City College of New York. He moved to Los Angeles in 1957, and has completed courses in law enforcement and history at the University of California, Los Angeles.

During his career in the U.S. Navy, John served aboard the U.S.S. *Little Rock.* In 1948, he was assigned as a personal 1st Class Steward to Adm. Richard Glassford, commander of the 3d Atlantic Fleet. A highlight of his assignment was a trip to Odessa, Russia—location of the 1947 summit meeting of President Harry S. Truman, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Premier Joseph Stalin.

Following his honorable discharge from the Navy, John embarked on a career in public service that would span nearly three decades. His career in law enforcement includes service as a deputy sheriff for the County of Los Angeles, and as the sergeant in charge of West Los Angeles traffic for the Los Angeles Police Department and the Department of Transportation.

For the past several years, John has served as the senior deputy to 10th district city councilman Nate Holden.

In addition to his public service, John has been actively involved in community affairs. He is a member of the Urban League, NAACP, Service Employees International Union, Local 347, and the Committee to Support Dial 911. He serves on the board of the Oscar Joel Bryant Police Association, and is a charter member of the Harlem Negro Theater. He also served as a member of Los Angeles city attorney James Hahn's Small Business Advisory Committee.

John's commitment to public service and his community is exceeded only by his commitment and enthusiasm for political activism. He is a past president of the New Frontier Democratic Club; former regional director, region 11