

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

KILLINGS OF U.S. DIPLOMATS IN KARACHI, PAKISTAN

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my condolences to the families of the two Americans killed Tuesday in a terrorist attack in Karachi, Pakistan. United States personnel in Pakistan have long faced extremely dangerous and difficult conditions, especially in Karachi. Despite these obstacles, Americans have worked bravely and loyally.

I also wish to voice my outrage at this brutal murder of the two American diplomats and the wounding of a third. This tragedy is made worse in that it was not a random attack, but targeted American consulate personnel. The perpetrator is still at large.

Last month, a major suspect in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing fled to Pakistan. Because of the assistance of U.S. authorities, he was captured and extradited to face trial in New York. Extremist and terrorist groups with the mission of spreading violence through South Asia and other parts of the world continue to operate training centers in northern Pakistan, and apparently feel comfortable in seeking refuge there.

We must press the government of Pakistan to apprehend and prosecute the perpetrators of this crime. Pakistan's Government must also take more effective measures to control outlaw terrorist groups with training centers based in Pakistan. When Prime Minister Bhutto visits the United States next month, I urge the administration and Members of Congress to raise these issues in the strongest possible ways.

Given the existence of terrorist training centers in Pakistan, the question arises as to the charges that the Islamabad Government is "looking the other way," and why Pakistan should not be placed on the United States list of "State Sponsors of Terrorism." I urge Secretary of State Christopher to review our relations with Pakistan in light of these ongoing problems and in response to yesterday's horrible attack.

H.R. 1142—CODE OF CONDUCT FOR U.S. BUSINESSES IN CHINA: NEW LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues legislation I have introduced with three of our distinguished colleagues that would require United States businesses operating in China to adhere to internationally recognized labor stand-

ards. Its purpose is to ensure that the United States corporate presence in China promotes better working conditions and thereby contributes to political liberalization and respect for human rights inside that country. The bill's three original cosponsors, NANCY PELOSI, CHRIS SMITH, and GERALD B.H. SOLOMON, reflect the broad, bipartisan support for a tougher United States stance toward China.

When President Clinton decided last May to renew most-favored-nation trade status [MFN] for China and to delink human rights performance from trade benefits, I predicted that this action would not lay to rest this divisive issue, but only postpone our coming to terms with the brutal Chinese regime.

The recent crisis over China's blatant violation of United States intellectual property rights [IPR] proves my point, and demonstrates that it is not possible to compartmentalize our relations with a state that has a total disregard for the rule of law. We are foolish to believe that the same Chinese Government that rejects the entire corpus of international human rights law will dutifully uphold international trade agreements. The truth, as the IPR dispute so clearly shows, is that a government that disregards international law in one area is going to do so in any area where it perceives an interest in following its own rogue course. Thus, the Chinese routinely violate arms control and trade agreements.

Moreover, China's human rights performance has worsened since the President renewed MFN for China, as documented in State Department and Human Rights Watch/Asia reporting. Obviously, the Chinese Government feels that Washington will exact no price for its abysmal human rights record, and the continuing ruthless repression exposes the fallacy of the argument that trade provides an avenue for construction engagement with repressive regimes.

Nevertheless, as the trips to China of Secretaries Brown and O'Leary demonstrated, the United States business community is eager to pursue promising opportunities in China, and enhanced United States-Chinese commercial relations will no doubt greatly benefit both countries.

However, in the mad dash to get a piece of the action, let us at least ensure that United States companies do not inadvertently contribute to the maintenance of the intolerable status quo for hundreds of millions of Chinese workers. The foreign business community's ultimate value comes from its good example, not its mere presence. It must adhere to internationally recognized standards of labor law in order to be a catalyst of progress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation with my three distinguished colleagues that would require United States businesses operating in China to follow internationally recognized labor standards. This code of conduct is not burdensome or unreasonable. It does not impose heavy reporting requirements or advocate labor practices as stringent as those found in the United States,

but its adoption by the United States business community would spur political liberalization in China by making the workplace a safer, more humane environment where coercion, repression, and intimidation have no role.

It is important for the Chinese Government, the American business community, and the administration to know that the Congress is serious about seeing progress on human rights in China. If voluntary action does not bring results, then binding legislation is required.

The Sullivan principles were a major catalyst for change in South Africa, and it is my strong feeling that these principles can play the same role in China.

If United States business truly wants to promote positive change in China, then adherence to this code of conduct offers an excellent vehicle for the implementation of that agenda without in any way harming United States competitiveness in the international marketplace. Demonstrating that the U.S. corporate community believes that good ethics and good business go hand-in-hand would send an unmistakable signal to the Chinese Government and provide powerful support to Chinese workers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE USAF AIR COMMANDO 50TH AN- NIVERSARY

HON. JAY KIM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere congratulations to the Air Commandos of World War II, which celebrated its 50th anniversary in October 1994. The Air Commandos were originally founded by Col. Phil Cochran, who was forever immortalized by Milton Caniff in his Terry and the Pirates cartoon as Steve Canyon.

This organization represents the heart and soul of what our Armed Forces are all about. Through unfaltering dedication and spirit, the men of the Air Commandos of World War II set the standard for today's U.S. Air Force [USAF] special operations units. Their fearless giving of themselves for the good of the United States during World War II is a testament to the intestinal fortitude they have displayed over these 50 years in keeping the memory of their fallen companions alive.

This dedication to protecting U.S. interests abroad, no matter what the cost, are best exemplified by the motto—Please be assured that we will go with your boys any place, any time, anywhere—which has become the motto of the USAF special operations groups today. I extend a heart felt gratitude to these men for their efforts and hope that their tradition carries on for years to come.

• 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.

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT MARC E. HALL AND COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two Sacramento community assets: Cosumnes River College and the man who has led the college's remarkable growth and success, president Marc E. Hall. This year marks the 25th anniversary of Cosumnes River College and the end of Dr. Hall's tenure as president.

Cosumnes River College opened in 1970, in a storefront in south Sacramento. In the beginning, student enrollment was slightly over 2,000 and in the 25 years which have passed, the college has attracted an average semester enrollment of 9,000 students at their main campus alone.

Since its first year, the college has served more than 152,000 students, illustrating a growth which has necessitated the college's newly expanded El Dorado Center and the Folsom Lake Center.

During the last 25 years, the college's curriculum has expanded and contracted to reflect the region's job and economic markets. A statewide leader in partnerships, CRC has joined with other educational institutions and business and industry leaders such as Ford Motor Co., Sacramento Educational Cable Commission, PacWest Cable, Citizens Telecommunication and several allied health agencies, all in an effort to bring quality education to the region's students.

With the benefit of strong leadership, the college has become an active participant in community affairs and has led a movement in establishing educational goals for its service area.

An example of the college's success is the foodservice production and control program to the area in the 1989-90 school year. The program includes a special cooperative effort with the Sacramento Area Community Kitchen, training unemployed workers for careers in the foodservice industry while simultaneously preparing nutritious meals for the area's homeless shelters. This cooperative effort took 80 percent of the students enrolled in this special food preparation course off the public assistance rolls and put them to work in a variety of jobs. The college has implemented many other partnership programs, reflecting a model approach to serving both students, workers and employers in this region.

Three of the four presidents of CRC are still active in the local education and business communities. Oliver Durand, founding president, Vincent "Pete" Padilla, emeritus and Dr. Marc E. Hall, current president. All three were recently recognized by the college's foundation for their excellent leadership and commitment to education.

Dr. Hall, has chosen to close his tenure as president in June of this year

and will return to the scene of his first love, the classroom. He will be sorely missed by the staff and the students who followed his leadership through the shared governance process, during one of the community's largest growth periods.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the outstanding contributions Cosumnes River College has made to the region and also in thanking Dr. Hall for his remarkable leadership.

TRIBUTE TO TOGO TANAKA

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Mr. Togo Tanaka on the occasion of his receipt of the Spirit of Wellness Community Award from the Wellness Community in Santa Monica, CA.

As an active member of the Wellness Community Board of Directors, Mr. Tanaka has made a tremendous contribution to realizing the goal of the Wellness Community.

Togo Tanaka is one of the most prominent members of the large Los Angeles Japanese-American community. A political scientist by training, Mr. Tanaka has also served as a newspaper editor, publisher, and leading figure in the field of real estate. In addition, he served 10 years as a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco and on the advisory council of the California World Trade Commission.

During World War II, like virtually every other individual of Japanese ancestry, Mr. Tanaka was interned at a remote rural relocation center. Tanaka, who is a native-born American citizen, has never been bitter about the great injustice he and others of Japanese ancestry suffered from the unconstitutional and unconscionable forced relocation program.

Despite Mr. Tanaka's busy professional life and strong commitment to his family, he has found the time and energy to become deeply involved in numerous philanthropies. Among those to which he is most dedicated are the Wellness Community, the Crippled Children's Society, the American Red Cross, and the Japanese Cultural and Community Center.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and all of our colleagues to congratulate Togo Tanaka and to wish him continued happiness, good health, and success in all future endeavors.

INTRODUCTION OF PIPELINE SAFETY LEGISLATION

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation, at the request of the pipeline industry, to reauthorize our pipeline safety programs. This legislation represents the consensus view of both the natural gas and hazardous liquid pipeline industries on the future direction of pipeline safety programs and will be considered at a Surface Transportation Subcommittee hearing to be held next week.

TRIBUTE TO PHIL ZIMMERMAN

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100 years of living by one of our community's most endearing constituents, Mr. Phil Zimmerman of Toledo, OH. Mr. Zimmerman, born on March 16, 1895, married his wife Eva, 70 years ago. Together they have reared 3 daughters, 7 grandchildren, and 13 great-grandchildren, all of whom join our community in congratulating this centurion of a man on his 100th birthday.

One of the founding fathers of Toledo's Old Newsboys Goodfellow Association, Mr. Zimmerman serves now as the organization's honorary president, the only person ever to hold the post. A life member, he remains actively involved in its good works—providing scholarships to talented students and winter outerclothes to needy children—by serving as a cochairman of the finance committee.

Phil Zimmerman has been active in our community in other ways as well. He is a 32d-degree Mason, a Shriner, member of B'nai B'rith, and past president of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. He was a business leader as well and owned the Diamond Jewelry Co., and served as vice president of the Toledo Blueprint Co.

The actress Helen Hayes has said, "Old age is not something at which I have arrived reluctantly, it is something which I have achieved." His family, friends, and community honor and applaud Phil Zimmerman on his rare and remarkable achievement of a lifetime with 100 years and more.

SETTING RECORD STRAIGHT ON ALAR

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, conventional wisdom now claims that the so-called alar scare was overblown, and that the chemical sprayed on apples posed no real threat to children, as had been reported on "60 Minutes" from a Natural Resources Defense Council study.

This mistaken impression that alar was never dangerous is sad testimony to the skillfulness of a highly financed disinformation campaign by the agricultural chemical industry.

Six years later, and with this false story fueling the debate to overturn current regulations, it's time to set the record straight.

On two occasions after the "60 Minutes" broadcast—in July 1991, and again in September 1992—further scientific studies prompted EPA to reaffirm alar as a probable human carcinogen. EPA set a zero tolerance for alar, meaning no foods can contain any residues of the chemical whatsoever.

These findings were reached after EPA's scientific advisory board, under the Bush administration, considered further animal tumor data. This data showed that alar was even more dangerous than originally believed. In

apple juice and other processed foods, the studies show alar breaks down into nitrosamines—a highly potent carcinogen according to all mainstream, responsible science.

Indeed EPA staff had been pressing to ban alar since 1985, under the Reagan administration, because of the scientific evidence. Massachusetts and New York had already banned alar long before the NRDC report, and the American Academy of Pediatrics had urged such a ban at the Federal level.

Final vindication came in 1993 when the National Academy of Sciences released a landmark report affirming the basic premise of NRDC's study—that infants and young children are more susceptible to cancer causing agents in food. Yet to date no Federal exposure standards have been recalculated to compensate for the increased sensitivity of children.

Said the chairman of the National Academy of Sciences report, Dr. Philip Landrigan, "NRDC was absolutely on the right track when they excoriated the regulatory agencies for having allowed a toxic material such as alar to stay on the market for 25 years."

Meanwhile, the apple industry has prospered without alar, earning record revenues. The banning of this chemical based on real, sound, mainstream, nonideological science in the long run hurt this industry not one bit.

By distorting the facts and blurring the real issues, I'm afraid some of my colleagues aim to condition the public to reject future reports of pesticides hazards as invalid, as another alar. Yet the record proves alar was dangerous to children, and the Republican administration of George Bush was absolutely correct to remove it from all foods altogether.

JACK SCARANGELLA: A PUBLIC SERVANT WHO WENT THE EXTRA MILE

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Jack Scarangella—a resident of the 18th Congressional District of New York—for his enduring commitment to our Nation's senior citizens, and for his extraordinary service to the best traditions of public leadership. On January 20, Jack Scarangella retired as the District Manager of the Social Security Administration for the New Rochelle, NY area, which I proudly represent. Jack has dedicated the last 46 years of his life to Government service, overseeing tens of thousands of Social Security claims each year. He began his career with Social Security as a claims examiner in 1951, and 5 years later became the New Rochelle District Manager, a post he then held until the day he retired.

Jack's inspired leadership, creative decision making, and insistence on reevaluating the way the Social Security Administration conducts business have improved the efficiency of the Social Security Administration and helped enhance service to Social Security beneficiaries. He has been recognized for the improvements in operational procedures he has helped implement over the years through the receipt of numerous awards for performance

and service. The fact that Jack received another such award just last year is testament to the fact that he was as ambitious and dedicated at the end of his career as he was when he first joined the Social Security Administration almost five decades earlier.

Jack was not content to help only those recipients who came through his doors or whose problems crossed his desk. That is why he enlisted the support of prominent citizens and local celebrities in information campaigns, hosted a weekly radio show on WVOX featuring questions and answers on topical agency issues, and hosted a community access show on TCI cable. Initiatives and public forums such as these have allowed Jack to expand public knowledge and, in turn, assist countless older Americans and their families with the Social Security system.

Mr. Speaker, these years of service alone would have been enough to merit recognition. Jack Scarangella, however, has been more than a dedicated worker. Jack has felt committed to his entire community, not just those in need of assistance with Social Security. He has been active in civic life through his work with Westchester 2000, the Chamber of Commerce, the Boys' and Girls' Club, the American Heart Association, Legal Awareness of Westchester, and several other local service organizations. I am confident that his service will continue for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the friends, colleagues, admirers, and family of Jack Scarangella, I hereby express heartfelt appreciation for his years of service and recognize the joyous occasion of his retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. MIKE MOSES

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has for many years devoted himself and his talents to the community of Lubbock, TX. Dr. Mike Moses is now in his sixth year as superintendent of the Lubbock Independent School District.

Recently, Dr. Moses was selected by Governor George W. Bush to become the State commissioner of education. This prestigious appointment is certainly deserved by Dr. Moses for his efforts, not the least of which is that his management expertise and business abilities kept LISD financially viable after he inherited an almost bankrupt district in 1989.

Dr. Moses was named "Educator of the Month" in the July/August 1994 issue of Texas School Business. In the summer of 1993 he served as a member of the Select Committee for Sunset of Texas Education Agency, and was awarded the first ever "Good Scout Award" in December, 1993.

In addition to his tireless efforts to strive for better educational opportunities for our young people, he is a Rotarian and a member of the First United Methodist Church. He is also involved in the chamber of commerce, Boy Scouts, and United Way.

Mr. Speaker, it is a honor for me to recognize such an involved and devoted citizen of west Texas. I salute Dr. Mike Moses for willingness to freely give of his own time, energy,

and talents. He has positively affected the lives of many in Lubbock, TX, and has dedicated himself and his life to a better education for our young people.

LIABILITY LAW REFORM

HON. BRIAN P. BILBRAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article from the Washington Post because it encapsulates a unique perspective that I believe I bring to the debate we are having today on product liability reform.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1995]

GETTING PERSONAL ON PRODUCT LIABILITY—TWO LAWMAKERS' OPPOSING VIEWS STEM FROM THEIR OWN PAINFUL EXPERIENCES

(By Caroline E. Mayer)

To Rep. Brian P. Bilbray (R-Calif.), product liability legislation is "a personal blood and guts issue"—a measure needed to protect women and children who otherwise wouldn't be able to get the drugs they need.

"It's actual flesh and blood that we're talking about," said the freshman lawmaker, who saw his wife go into shock during a pregnancy 10 years ago because a drug she needed to help her deal with severe morning sickness had been pulled off the market by its manufacturer for fear of product liability suits.

But to Rep. Patsy T. Mink (D-Hawaii), legislative efforts to make it harder to sue for damages from defective products is "a great offense" to women and children, especially DES mothers—among them herself—who, by taking a drug thought to prevent miscarriages, exposed her child to a greater risk of cancer.

"Having had the personal experience, I want to make sure the people who are voting for the bill will understand that justice is being thwarted for millions of Americans," said Mink, who collected a \$250,000 settlement from a lawsuit over the medication.

It should be no surprise that these two lawmakers—on different sides of the political aisle—have divergent views about the product liability legislation before the House this week. But it is the personal experience and intensity each brings to the debate that makes their positions stand out in the battle to overhaul the nation's tort laws.

Mink's vociferous opposition stems from her use of DES, diethylstilbestrol, when she was pregnant 43 years ago. "Knowing the agonies that women in other kinds of product liability lawsuits went through, I have a special responsibility to speak out," she said.

Approved by the Food and Drug Administration in 1947 to prevent miscarriages, DES was discovered, decades later, to cause significant damage to the babies born to mothers who used DES. In some cases, DES children have severely deformed sexual organs, cannot have children, have impaired immune systems or a high risk of developing a rare form of cancer.

Mink was given DES as part of an experiment testing the drug's effectiveness, but did not know it until 25 years later, when she received a "blunt letter" from the university where she had been treated. The university asked if she or her daughter had developed cancer.

Mink sued the university and company that supplied the DES, winning a \$250,000 settlement. In addition, the university promised to care for all DES daughters of mothers

it treated at no cost if the daughters developed a certain type of cancer of the vagina or cervix at any time before they are 70.

"Under the legislation under consideration, it is unlikely that any DES mother or child would have been able to recover any damages," Mink said.

Bilbray has not been as eager to discuss his experience. "It's not something I prefer to talk about," he said after a House Commerce Committee meeting last month. But that's what Bilbray did when the committee drafted its version of the product liability bill.

"Women and children are dying as a result of existing laws," Bilbray told his colleagues at the drafting session. "Products that are needed are being pulled off the shelves because of lawsuits." Some people may think lawsuits may make all the pain better, he said. But, he added, "please do not think there's any amount of money that's ever going to pay a parent back by never being able to hug their child."

"Listening to all these members stand up and talk about how consumer products have done all these terrible things, it was like a knife cutting into me * * * Sometimes you just have to stand up and scream," he said in an interview afterward.

KEY FACETS OF THE LEGISLATION

Product liability legislation to be considered by the House would:

Preempt state laws and set a national standard for product liability lawsuits.

Bar any lawsuit for damage incurred from products more than 15 years old unless they cause a chronic illness, such as cancer caused by asbestos or DES.

Limit punitive damages to the greater of \$250,000 or three times the economic damages.

Require "clear and convincing evidence" that a manufacturer either intended to cause harm or acted with conscious, flagrant indifference for punitive damages.

Bar damages if the person bringing the suit was intoxicated or under the influence of drugs when the harm occurred and if alcohol or drug use was the principal cause of the accident.

Make retailers liable only if they engaged in intentional wrongdoing, negligence or if the product failed to comply with an express warranty made by the retailer. The retailer also would be liable if the manufacturer went bankrupt or could not be sued in the claimant's state.

Sanction attorneys for filing frivolous pleadings in product liability actions.

Separate legislation would require the loser of any lawsuit to pay the winner's legal costs if the loser rejected a settlement before the jury verdict. Even if a jury found in favor of the person bringing the suit, that person could still be required to pay the other side's legal fees if the jury award is less than a rejected settlement.

Ten years ago, Bilbray's wife had to go into the intensive care unit "when she couldn't get access to the drug she desperately need," he said.

In three earlier pregnancies in a previous marriage, Karen Bilbray had taken a drug called Bendectin to control severe morning sickness. But in 1984, when she was pregnant with Bilbray's child, Bendectin was no longer available.

The manufacturer, Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals Inc., had removed the drug from the market after several women successfully sued the company, alleging that the drug produced birth deformities. Even though scientific data never proved it was harmful, Merrell stopped selling the drug.

"My wife was not allowed to make a decision on what she wanted to put into her body; it was made by a lawyer suing, maybe

well-intentioned but misguided and very critical to her well-being," Bilbray said.

Without Bendectin, Bilbray's wife became so sick she went into shock, he said. "If it wasn't for a doctor willing to take the risk [and give her some Bendectin], I probably would have lost her." A son, Brian, was born several months later, to live only three months before he died of crib death. Bilbray is convinced that the trauma of his wife's first three months of pregnancy contributed to the child's death.

"People are going to suffer no matter what you do" to reform the civil justice system, Bilbray said. But Congress "needs to be more sensitive to the damage that these lawsuits create by denying benefits" to people who may need them.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 8, 1995, I was meeting with a group of high school students—who traveled to Washington, DC, from the State of Hawaii—in a part of the Capitol where the voting bells could not be heard and missed roll-call vote No. 210. I want the RECORD to show that had I been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 210, the Cox substitute amendment to the Eshoo amendment.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM MEEHAN

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to pay tribute to Mr. William Meehan, a native Californian who has devoted his professional career to the preservation and growth of labor's health in this great State.

In the many years Mr. Meehan has been a major force in the labor realm, both of our offices have relied on his expertise and counsel. We join with the scores of colleagues who salute the outstanding leadership you have given to the Sacramento-Sierra's Building and Construction Trades Council and to the Sacramento Central Labor Council.

In an era of shrinking resources, Mr. Meehan has been one of Sacramento's great defenders, ensuring jobs for thousands of men and women throughout the region.

Not only has Mr. Meehan been an outstanding defender of the labor force, but we would be remiss in not commending his steadfast support of this entire community. The list of political, charitable, and labor related organizations with which he has aligned himself reflects the great character all leaders strive to achieve. An abbreviated list of organizations who are indebted to his leadership and hard work include the Greater Sacramento Area Plan, Labor and Business Alliance, Sacramento Water Intelligently Managed, Private Industry Council, Auburn Dam Council, Friends of Light Rail, American Red Cross,

Sacramento Employment Training Agency, Harps, National Toxics Coalition, United Way, Hundred Dollar Club, Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, and the Sacramento Fire Board.

Truly, Sacramento is a better place to work and live thanks to what we hope is only the first half of Mr. Meehan's career. As he begins to undertake his latest challenge for the Painter's International, we ask our colleagues to join us in wishing him continued happiness and success.

HOPALONG CASSIDY FAN CLUB PROCLAMATION—THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE IN THE STATE OF OHIO

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation from the city of Cambridge in the State of Ohio.

Whereas, the Hopalong Cassidy Fan Club has contributed untold volunteer hours in building character, citizenship, and leadership in this community; and,

Whereas, the Hopalong Cassidy Fan Club is celebrating the 100th birthday of Hopalong Cassidy on June 5, 1995; and,

Whereas, members have made in kind contributions of service, financial contribution to the Cambridge area, contribution to the Park School, and to other important needs of the community; and,

Whereas, the local Hopalong Cassidy Fan Club has extended the interest of Hopalong Cassidy within this community; and,

Whereas, the members of schools, churches, service clubs, union organizations, and others have been members of the Hopalong Cassidy Fan Club; and,

Whereas, the city of Cambridge and all the surrounding areas of Ohio are better places to live because of Cambridge's Hopalong Cassidy Fan Club, we join in the celebration of the 100th birthday of Hopalong Cassidy on the fifth day of June in 1995.

SECURITIES LITIGATION REFORM ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1058) to reform Federal securities litigation, and for other purposes.

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to state my reluctant opposition to this bill, for I had hoped it would be adequately amended so that I could support it. Instead, I must comment on several serious issues that yet remain to be addressed with this legislation.

This week's so-called tort reform legislation consists of three bills, addressing in turn civil litigation, securities litigation, and product liability. In each case, I believe the proponents of the bill have recognized a real problem, but have attempted to write into law remedies that

far exceed those needed to address the problem, and far exceeding those that are desirable.

Today's bill, H.R. 1058, is the least problematic of these bills. It addresses a discrete but serious issue—the filing of frivolous securities fraud class action lawsuits. As the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission agrees, this problem clearly exists and may be growing. A very small group of overzealous attorneys pursue these lawsuits, often within hours of a significant change in the price of a stock or security. These attorneys keep on hand stables of professional plaintiffs for these suits, and prey on high-technology companies whose stock prices are naturally volatile. In many cases, companies are forced to settle out of court, rather than endure a lengthy and expensive trial on the merits.

The evidence indicates that such lawsuits are often baseless. However, the costs of defending such suits places a significant drag on high-technology and startup companies, not to mention their directors, officers, and accounting firms.

Without a system of proportionate liability—such as that proposed in H.R. 1058—accounting firms, for example, justifiably fear the prospect of being named as codefendants in these class action lawsuits. As a result, some now choose not to perform accounting and auditing services for this growing sector of our economy.

For these reasons, I had hoped to be able to support a bill that would address the specific problem of securities fraud class action lawsuits in a responsible way. Instead, like so many other bills seeking to enact the so-called Contract With America, we have today considered a bill that far overreacts and far overreaches.

H.R. 1058 did improve somewhat as it moved through the Commerce Committee, both at the subcommittee and the full committee level. Unfortunately, House leaders chose to circumvent the Legislative process in the Judiciary Committee, where further improvements could have been made. Today on the House floor, several valuable amendments to the bill were offered, including one by my colleague from New York [Mr. MANTON]. These amendments were not even considered seriously. I am forced to conclude that proponents of this bill do not intend to pursue reasonable compromise. I hope that the Senate will be more deliberate, and that any future conference agreement might weigh these difficult issues in a more responsible manner.

But at this time, H.R. 1058 contains numerous flaws, including: an unduly burdensome loser pays provision, prohibitive fact pleading requirements, an onerous bond requirement for the filing of class action suits, the need to show scienter rather than recklessness in order to prove securities fraud, et cetera. These are serious defects, which must be responsibly and deliberately addressed. For these reasons, I must now oppose passage of H.R. 1058, but hope it will be moderated significantly in conference with the Senate, so that I could then support final passage of the conference report.

ATTORNEY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 988) to reform the Federal civil justice system.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 988, the Attorney Accountability Act of 1995. While I am aware of the current excitement in the Congress to do anything perceived as promoting the interests of the rich, and big corporations, I am also mindful of my duty as a Member of Congress to act in the best interest of the all the people I represent and in the best interest of the U.S. Constitution I have sworn to uphold.

We cannot and should not, in an attempt to decrease the amount of frivolous lawsuits, shirk our responsibility to act in the best interest of poor and hard working Americans by disrespecting the Founding principles of the American justice system—over 200 years of common law. This shortsighted and rushed legislation will not only fail to reform or enhance the legal system in the United States, but will endanger the delicate balance of power between rich and poor, powerful and weak, so skillfully and wisely crafted over 200 years of development in the courts of this Nation.

The bill before us today, the Attorney Accountability Act of 1995, will not only attempt to curtail unwanted lawsuits, but will also make it impossible for regular Americans to have access to the Federal courts. Such an assault on American citizens' rights to access to the courts is an outrage. This restrictive bill will certainly undermine many of our most important efforts to provide a forum that promotes equality for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the stated purpose of the Attorney Accountability Act is to require one party to pay the other's attorney fees and other legal costs if that party rejects a settlement offer, and then receives less in the judgment at trial. Republican proponents have stated that this provision is intended to discourage frivolous lawsuits, and encourage parties to settle disputes prior to trial. This bill also establishes new restrictions on the use of scientific evidence, by establishing a presumption of inadmissibility. Finally, the bill requires judges to impose sanctions on attorneys for making frivolous arguments.

This legislation, which would result in limiting citizens' access to our Federal courts, warps the American justice system to such an extent that the motives of the drafters of this legislation should be seriously questioned. While I agree that Congress should continue to make significant strides to improve the quality of litigation in this country, this proposed measure goes well beyond the legitimate objective of balancing the interests of regular working people and corporate America. In fact, this bill will inhibit the will of the people by transferring all of the power of rendering justice in the courts to the wealthy, well-connected, and privileged.

The clear result of the imposition of a lower pays rule would be to destroy Americans' con-

stitutionally guaranteed right to have access to the Federal courts through diversity jurisdiction. Article III of the U.S. Constitution guarantees diversity jurisdiction and unequivocally states: "The judicial power shall extend to all cases * * * between citizens of different States * * *." The 14th and 15th amendments declare that no State "shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of laws." The 14th and 15th amendments were clearly intended to ensure all Americans access to the courts of this country for the protection of their persons and property, to redress wrongs and to enforce contracts. Without free access to the courts, Americans' constitutional rights will be abrogated. By imposing on working Americans what could be substantial costs for bringing an unsuccessful claim, H.R. 988 locks the Federal courthouse doors, and gives the rich the key.

Mr. Chairman, not only would transferring the power in litigation to the wealthier party be clearly contrary to the course of 200 years of American common law, the reasoning behind this unfair and unjust bill is not supported by the facts. So-called frivolous lawsuits actually make up a minute portion of all lawsuits litigated in this Nation. Under current law, the Federal rules of civil procedure give judges the opportunity to hold attorneys accountable for bringing frivolous lawsuits. Rule 11 of the Federal rules of civil procedure presently authorize Federal courts to impose sanctions upon attorneys, law firms, or parties for engaging in inappropriate conduct or for bringing frivolous or harassment lawsuits. The facts clearly show that despite the fact that there were thousands of cases filed last year, in less than 1 percent of those cases did Federal judges determine that rule 11 sanctions were justified.

H.R. 988 would remove from the wise discretion of a Federal judge the determination of how to impose rule 11 sanctions. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have often claimed that they favor retracting the tentacles of the Federal Government from local people, who best know and understand the issues they face. Yet, this bill flies in the face of this often touted Republican ethic. H.R. 988 removes from a Federal judge who has heard the evidence, knows the parties, and lives in the community, the discretion to make a determination of when to impose rule 11 sanctions. This modification of the Federal rules is unjustified, ill-advised and will lead to injustice for working and middle-class Americans.

For over 200 years, the American legal system has developed a system that keeps frivolous suits to a minimum. The free market has established contingent fee arrangements that create an enormous disincentive for plaintiffs who seek to initiate frivolous lawsuits. Contingent fee cases permit working- and middle-class Americans to have access to attorneys whose fees they could not normally afford. This does not mean that these plaintiffs currently incur no costs or risks. Plaintiffs are often faced with substantial court costs and attorney expenses that must be paid up front and are often nonrefundable, win, or lose.

The reality of the economics of contingent fee arrangements make it economically ill-advisable to bring, support or litigate frivolous claims. H.R. 988's so-called attack on frivolous

lawsuit is, in fact, an attack on the access of regular Americans to the courts, and subverts the economic realities of contingent fee litigation that already discourages frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is unsurpassed in its compromise of the balance of powers between litigants in our Nation. With very little opportunity for open hearing, and with limited debate, this measure has been placed before us. A measure of this kind requires detailed analysis of the impact it may have on the American people, and one of the greatest pillars of the American Republic: The people's access to the courts—but no such review has, or will, take place. In the current rush to force this bill through the House, the interests of the American people and the American justice system will certainly be compromised on the altar of corporate greed. I urge my colleagues to join with me, and vote against this bill.

ATTORNEY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT
OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 988) to reform the Federal civil justice system.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, our society is consumed by lawsuit fever—sue the producer, sue the manufacturer, sue the seller. Frivolous lawsuits clog our courts and impose tremendous costs on American workers and consumers. Americans want a legal system that promotes civil justice, not greed.

The only winners in the game of lawsuit abuse are the lawyers. Consumers lose and workers lose. Lawsuit abuse scares away jobs and stifles innovative new products. Consumers pay the tab for excessive litigation costs and jury awards through higher prices and outrageous insurance premiums. These litigation taxes cost Americans \$130 billion a year. Fairness no longer exists in our current civil justice system. Hardworking consumers should not pay the tab for legal tactics and judicial abuse.

Our Republican commonsense product liability and legal reform bill, H.R. 988, works to restore national fairness and common sense to a judicial system spinning out of control. H.R. 988 puts an end to frivolous, excessive lawsuits by capping damages at \$250,000 or three times the amount of economic damage. Furthermore, it requires plaintiffs to prove that harm was flagrantly intended by the defendant.

The commonsense product liability and legal reform bill restores accountability and responsibility. H.R. 988 provides a remedy for America's litigation fever, while ensuring that justifiable claims will be fairly tried and rewarded. Americans are tired of supporting a civil justice system that abuses their rights and freedoms as workers and consumers.

TRIBUTE TO THE DISTINGUISHED
ELECTED WOMEN OFFICIALS IN
EDUCATION OF CALIFORNIA'S
14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Women's History Month to salute the remarkable women of California's 14th Congressional District who have been entrusted with the honor and sacred duty of educating our youth.

This year, as we celebrate the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage, it is fitting that we honor the women who devote their time and talents to preserving and enhancing our public education system. The efforts and public service of these remarkable women provide our district with extraordinary leadership, and our excellent school systems benefit from their unique ideas and skills. While we take time during this month to commemorate historic women and their achievements, we also take this opportunity to honor the contributions women in education are currently making to our communities.

The 14th Congressional District's distinguished women elected officials in education are: Boardmember Helen Hausman of the San Mateo County Community College District; Boardmembers Mary Mason, Judith Moss and Dolly Sandoval of the Foothill/De Anza Community College District; Boardmembers Susan Alvaro and Beverly Willis-Gerard of the San Mateo County Board of Education; Boardmembers Maria Ferrer, Anna Kurze and Andrea Leiderman of Santa Clara County Board of Education; Boardmembers Nancy Gisko, Francesca Karpel and Nancy Kehl of the Belmont Elementary School District; Boardmembers Toni Foster, Mary Freeman-Dove, Ruth Palmer and Marina Stariha of the Cabrillo Unified School District; Boardmembers Debbie Byron, Sandra James and Emily Lee Kelley of the Cupertino Union School District; Boardmember Nancy Newton of the Fremont Union High School District; Boardmembers Tracey Demma, Janet Gomes-Simms, Erika Perloff and Connie Sarabia of the La Honda-Pescadero Unified School District; Boardmembers Kerry Bouchier and Elyce Haskell of the Las Lomas Elementary School District; Boardmembers Gerri Carlton and Terri Sachs of the Los Altos School District; Boardmembers Karen Canty, Margaret Draper and Valerie Rynne of the Menlo Park City Elementary School District; Boardmembers Donnal Larson, Ann Lewis and Leslie Pantling of the Montebello School District; Boardmembers Marta Clavero-Pamilla, Rose Marie Filicetti, Nancy Mucha and Susan Ware of the Mountain View School District; Boardmembers Lynn Alvarado, Ann Baker, Sue Graham and Judy Hanneman of the Mountain View-Los Altos Union High School District; Boardmembers Julie Jerome, Diane Reklis and Susie Richardson of the Palo Alto Unified School District; Boardmembers Holly Meyers, Kathryn Reavis and Pat Steuer of the Portola Valley Elementary District; Boardmembers Lois Frontino, Donna Rutherford and Keisha Williams of the Revenswood City Elementary School District; Boardmembers Terri S. Bailard, Patricia

Brown and Magda Gonzalez-Hierro of the Redwood City Elementary School District; Boardmembers Joy L. Ferrario and Beth Hunkapillar of the San Carlos Elementary School District; Boardmembers Beverly Scott, Allene Seiling and Sarah Stewart of the Sequoia Union High School District; Boardmembers Linda Kilian, Pamela Kittler, Ellen McHenry and Margaret Quillan of the Sunnyvale School District; Boardmembers Fran Kruss and Sanda Jo Spiegel of the Whisman School District; and Boardmembers Heidi Brown, Ann Nolan and Abby Wilder of the Woodside Elementary School District. Appointed leaders include Colleen Wilcox, Superintendent of the Santa Clara County Office of Education, Martha Kanter, President of DeAnza College, and Bernadine Fong, President of Foothill College.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these remarkable women whose leadership, expertise and commitment have made California's 14th Congressional District a wonderful place to live and learn. These great leaders are fitting representatives of the many women who make history every day and are the shapers of the young women who will make history in the future.

H.R. 510, THE MISCLASSIFICATION
OF EMPLOYEES ACT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say a few words about the job classification of workers, and to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 510, the Misclassification of Employees Act.

Small business men and women have contacted many of us to explain some of the important reasons why Congress should take another look at how workers are classified for Federal income and employment tax purposes, as well as for many non-tax purposes. We know that confusion with employee classification rules can lead to costly disputes with the IRS with devastating effects on small businesses. These costs include, among others, assessments of back taxes, interest and penalties for businesses which misclassify workers as independent contractors, as well as the legal costs involved with coming into compliance with or defending against an IRS audit.

There are other issues relating to the misclassification of workers that arise out of the current procedures for determining who is an employee and who is an independent contractor, including the effect of misclassification on the unsuspecting worker, the effect of misclassification on the honest businessman trying to compete with a competitor who has misclassified his workers, and the effect of misclassification on the Federal budget deficit. H.R. 510 would remedy some of the unintended effects that arise out of the current procedures for determining who is an employee and who is an independent contractor.

I would like to make clear from the outset, however, that I agree with and recognize the appropriate and valuable roles of those who work as independent contractors. This country has benefited greatly from the spirit and independence of the self-employed individual and

I do not think there is anyone who wants to stifle the creativity of these individuals. It is the misuse of the independent contractor status and its serious adverse effect on both employer and worker that concerns me.

My colleague, CHRIS SHAYS, and I became interested in the classification of workers several years ago when we served together on the Employment and Housing Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee. We found that the current means of determining employment status has had several negative effects: First, it results in similarly situated employers being treated very differently under tax law; second, it allows—and actually encourages—businesses to undercut competitors through unfair practices; third, it leaves some workers exploited and unprotected; and fourth, it deprives the Federal Government of significant revenue.

Under current law, workers are classified as either employees or independent contractors in one of three ways. First, some workers are explicitly categorized as either employees or independent contractors by statute. Second, workers may be classified as independent contractors under statutory "safe harbors" enacted in section 530 of the Revenue Act of 1978. Third, if a worker is not classified statutorily, and cannot be classified under the statutory "safe harbor," then the worker is classified by applying a very subjective common law test. Most workers fall under this third category.

Current law allows some employers to misclassify workers if they have a "reasonable basis" for classifying employees as independent contractors. Thus, an employer may rely upon a prior IRS audit, including audits not made for employment tax purposes, in holding a reasonable basis for classifying workers. It makes no sense to permit the wrongful classification of workers based on a previous audit which may have had nothing to do with the issue of worker classification. Our legislation eliminates the "safe harbor" provisions which allow the misclassification of employees to continue. We thus restore a level playing field and eliminate the unfair competitive advantages which arise due to the misclassification of workers.

Because the common law test is extremely subjective, employers have trouble in properly determining worker classification, and revenue agents often classify workers differently even where the underlying circumstances of their employment are the same. Since a large part of the misclassification of workers is due to a lack of understanding of the laws, clearer rulings and definitions will eliminate a tremendous amount of uncertainty in this area. Our legislation eliminates the restrictions on the IRS to draft regulations and rulings on the employment status of workers for tax purposes.

Employers who have unintentionally misclassified workers should be given the incentive to come into compliance. Therefore, our legislation offers a 1-year amnesty to employers who have misclassified workers on the basis of a good faith interpretation of common law or of section 503. This provision removes the devastating possibility of large assessments for back taxes, interest and penalties and insures compliance in the future.

Misclassification can have a devastating effect on the unsuspecting worker. As a contractor, he or she may receive a higher take-home

pay and may be allowed to deduct more business expenses from income taxes. But the loss of financial benefits and of the many protections which are provided to employees can be catastrophic in cases of illness, unemployment and retirement. For example, there is no unemployment compensation for the independent contractor to fall back on between jobs. Health insurance is an individual responsibility and is usually far more costly than an employer's group policy. In the case of work-related injury or illness, there is no worker's compensation available. Our legislation would require prime contractors to notify legitimate independent contractors of all their tax obligations and other statutory rights and protections.

Mr. Speaker, our investigation found that the economic incentives for businesses to misclassify workers as independent contractors are huge. An employer who misclassifies a worker as an independent contractor escapes many obligations, including paying social security taxes, unemployment taxes and workers compensation insurance, withholding income taxes and providing benefits such as vacation, sick and family leave, health and life insurance, pensions, et cetera. Most employers are honest, but the law abiding employer is put at a serious disadvantage since he or she cannot compete on a level playing field with those who illegally cut their labor costs. Law abiding employers will not be able to compete fairly until we provide more clear, objective standards by which businesses and the Government can determine whether an individual is an employee or an independent contractor.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, billions of dollars in Federal and State tax revenues are being lost as a result of the intentional misclassification of workers. This is one of the few remaining areas where we can help balance the Federal budget deficit without further cutting Government services or levying new taxes. A recent Coopers and Lybrand study found that at least \$35 billion in legitimate tax revenue over the next 9 years will be lost by the Federal Government due to the misclassification of employees. At a time when critical services are on the chopping block, we can no longer allow this waste and abuse to continue. We must take steps to curb the continued misclassification of employees.

H.R. 10

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10 will strip American citizens of their ability to hold wrongdoers accountable and, when necessary, to punish reckless or other outrageous behavior on the part of manufacturers of dangerous products.

There is no explosion in punitive damages claims. In fact, such claims are extremely rare. In one comprehensive study conducted by the U.S. Supreme Court, only 355 punitive damage awards in product liability cases have been awarded over the last 25 years, and a number of those involved asbestos.

Mr. Speaker, Americans would be much worse off if they were unable to hold wrong-

doers accountable. Punitive damages make Americans safer and have removed from the market products like flammable children's pajamas, asbestos, and the Dalkon shield. H.R. 10 is unwise and unnecessary.

TRIBUTE TO THE DISTINGUISHED
WOMEN ELECTED OFFICIALS OF
CALIFORNIA'S 14TH CONGRES-
SIONAL DISTRICT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Women's History Month to salute the remarkable women of California's 14th Congressional District who have been elected to govern it.

This year, as we celebrate the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage, it is fitting that we honor those women who devote their time and talents to local and State government. The efforts and public service of these remarkable women provide our district with extraordinary leadership. While we take time during this month to commemorate historic women and their achievements, we also take this opportunity to honor the contributions women in government are currently making to our communities.

Our region is blessed with superbly capable women leaders. These distinguished women are: State Assemblywoman Jackie Speier; Mary Griffin of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors; Blanca Alvarado and Dianne McKenna of the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors; city council members Nanette Chapman and Mayor Dianne Fisher of Atherton; Nancy Levitt, Pam Rianda, and Mayor Adele Della Santina of Belmont; Barbara Koppel and Lauralee Sorenson of Cupertino; Mayor Rose Jacobs Gibson, Myrtle Walker, and Sharifa Wilson of East Palo Alto; Mayor Naomi Patridge and Deborah Ruddock of Half Moon Bay; Patricia Williams and Margaret Bruno of Los Altos; Toni Casey and Mayor Elayne Dauber of Los Altos Hills; Bernie Nevin of Menlo Park; Susan Ayers, Suzanne Hayes-Kane, and Angela Meyer of the Midcoast Community Advisory Council; Dena Bonnell, Mayor Patricia Figueroa, and Maryce Freelen of Mountain View; Liz Kniss, Jean McCown, Micki Schneider, and Lainie Wheeler of Palo Alto; Beverly Fields, Maeva Neale, and Meredith Reynolds of the Pescadero Municipal Advisory Council; Nancy Vian of Portola Valley; Judy Buchan, Mayor Daniela Gasparini, Georgia LaBerge, Diane Howard, and Janet Steinfeld of Redwood City; Sally Mitchell of San Carlos; Robin Parker, Frances Rowe, and Mayor Barbara Waldman of Sunnyvale; and Susan Crocker, Carol Fisch, and Barbara Seitle of Woodside.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting these remarkable women and the extraordinary contributions they are making to their communities and our country. These gifted leaders are fitting representatives of the many women who make history every day, and their efforts on behalf of the people of California's 14th Congressional District are invaluable and appreciated by all.

THE HEALTH CARE LIABILITY
REFORM ACT OF 1995

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Health Care Liability Reform Act to establish fundamental tort system reforms.

This legislation will: set a \$250,000 cap on noneconomic and punitive damages; limit attorneys fees to 25 percent of the first \$100,000 and reduce the allowable percentage as the award increases; eliminate the collateral source rule that allows for double recovery; abolish joint and several liability, so only defendants who are actually at fault are liable; require periodic payment of damages over \$50,000; establish a 1 year reasonable discovery rule and 3 year statute of limitation with special exceptions for minors; and require pretrial dispute resolution to encourage reasonable settlement.

Our current medical malpractice system is not effective in compensating injured individuals or at improving the quality of health care. It is a system with powerful incentives for wasteful spending. Plaintiffs are allowed to sue even if the facts do not merit a lawsuit and cash payments of 3 to 4 times claimants' medical bills are awarded. The median verdict in medical liability claims, according to a Jury Verdict Research report jumped by almost \$200,000 in one year from an all time high in 1991 of \$450,000 to \$646,487 in 1992. The General Accounting Office reported that over half of total health care liability costs are spent defending against claims that result in no payment. A RAND Corp. study found that 57 percent of the money spent in health care liability litigation does not reach the injured patient.

Physicians and hospitals are forced to provide care, not for the well-being of the patient, but to protect themselves from lawsuits. Our physicians are the best trained and equipped, yet they are also the most often sued. Claims against doctors rose from 2-per-100 in the 1960's to 16-per-100 in the late 1980's. Physicians fearing malpractice suits are increasingly opting out of high-risk specialties and medicine altogether. Those hurt most are disadvantaged pregnant women, rural communities and senior citizens.

Medical malpractice liability adds at least \$15 billion a year to the cost of health care, according to a recent study by the Competitiveness Center of the Hudson Institute. It is driving up the cost of treatments, services, medical devices and pharmaceuticals and inhibits the research and development of new products. It is a detriment to patients, providers and taxpayers. If we allow this litigation explosion to continue unrestrained, any effort to bring down health care costs and increase access to care will surely fail.

MURDER OF TWO AMERICAN DIPLOMATS IN PAKISTAN LATEST
EXAMPLE OF LAWLESSNESS IN
KARACHI

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an article in today's Washington Times entitled "Blood on Karachi Streets Flows From Multiple Feuds." The article, written by John Stackhouse, discussed how Pakistan's largest city has degenerated into a lawless urban battlefield where innocent citizens are killed while the government and the police stand by idly. The latest victims of this sectarian and religious bloodshed were two American diplomatic employees who were brutally murdered yesterday by masked gunmen who ambushed their consular van in broad daylight.

Mr. Speaker, Pakistan for many years has been at the center of terrorism. Islamic militants have operated training camps, where young men have been trained and violence has been exported to many countries, including to India, Egypt, Israel and the United States. Pakistan was the country where those accused of the World Trade Center bombings were recruited and trained. Pakistan was the country where the terrorist who killed five people in front of the CIA fled to. Now, Pakistan has shown that it cannot protect U.S. diplomatic personnel on their way to work in that nation's largest city.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the Washington Times article. It provides an excellent summary of the reasons behind Karachi's fall into the abyss of lawlessness, violence and terrorism.

I join with all my colleagues in this body, and all Americans, in expressing my deepest sympathies to the families of our diplomats who served their country with great distinction and courage.

BLOOD ON KARACHI STREETS FLOWS FROM
MULTIPLE FEUDS POLITICS, RELIGION, ETHNICITY
FUEL VIOLENCE

(By John Stackhouse)

KARACHI, PAKISTAN—With martyrs, guns and killing sprees, Karachi is no longer simply Pakistan's biggest city and commercial capital. It is a city at war.

The two American diplomatic workers gunned down yesterday were among 164 persons killed in Karachi in the past month in a spiral of violence that is a complex swirl of political, religious, ethnic and criminal currents.

A recent attack on two mosques has pitted the city's Shi'ite and Sunni Muslim sects against each other. Most of the fighting, however, has been between the two main factions of the Muhajir Qaumi Movement, Karachi's leading political force, which represents Urdu-speaking migrants, or "muhajirs," originally from India.

Many fear that if the two battles—one sectarian, the other ethnic—overlap, Karachi will slide toward anarchy.

Already mosques, normally symbols of peace and security, are bolted shut with steel doors, opened only long enough for worshippers to pass weapons checks. At night, the streets have mere trickles of traffic. Many residents are even talking of not celebrating the coming Muslim festival of Eid.

Day after day, in a city once renowned for its seaside tranquility and cosmopolitan

night life, the killings continue, each seeming to set a new standard for senselessness.

In December, seven artisans were shot dead in their shop as they crafted lacework. The same month, on one of Karachi's main roads, seven persons were burned to death in a bus in the early evening. Last week, a passing motorist sprayed bullets in a tailor's shop, killing three persons.

Much of the city's crisis has been laid at the feet of Karachi's police force, which has been both ineffectual and, in some places, linked to criminal gangs.

Although the army ruled the streets of Karachi from 1992 to 1994 in a special operation against urban violence, it pulled out in December—and 437 persons have been killed since.

"I would advise the government to go to the extent of disarming the police," said Nizam Haji, a local businessman who heads a liaison committee between police and civilians. "The police have gone rotten in Karachi. Totally corrupt, incompetent and politicized."

Last month, gunmen opened fire on a crowd across the street from one of Karachi's main police stations, killing 11. Despite several police near the scene, no one fired at the assailants or gave chase. Nor have there been any arrests for the attack, although five police officers were charged with dereliction of duty.

With little law and no order, drug lords and criminal gangs also have taken to Karachi's streets, launching robberies, extortion and retribution killings.

In Pakistan's most international city, the rise of sectarian violence has raised concern about foreign involvement, perhaps even proxy battles.

Sherry Rhemam, managing editor of the Herald, Pakistan's leading newsmagazine, said that Shi'ite factions in the city appear to be backed by Iran, while Sunni gunmen receive money, weapons and training from Saudi Arabia.

There also are concerns that official agencies, perhaps the government itself, has sponsored the terror. Many observers believe the army, during its rule in Karachi, armed and trained a new muhajir faction to launch a fratricidal war among the migrant population.

The new faction is now seen to be supported by the country's infamous intelligence agencies, the same bodies that backed the Afghan mujahideen in the 1980s.

For any Pakistani government, support of the muhajirs is a key to political survival. With about half of Karachi's 10 million people, they hold sway over the country's biggest economic center, as well as the influential southern province of Sindh.

Despite their numbers, though, the muhajirs feel they are marginalized by Sindh's powerful rural elite, which includes the Bhutto family.

"These 2 percent of the population control 98 percent of the country," said Shoaib Bokhari, a muhajir member of the Sindh assembly.

Mr. Bokhari did not deny the muhajir ambition for a new province of Karachi. The city now is administered by the Sindh government, and while the federal government relies heavily on Karachi and its port for tax revenue, it spends little on the thriving commercial center.

The Sindh government also keeps 15 percent of Karachi's property tax, the city's main source of revenue, as a service charge for collecting it. And the province reserves the majority of government jobs, on a quota system, for rural Sindhis, who tend to be less educated than the muhajirs.

While the muhajirs once controlled Karachi's city council, their government was dismissed in 1992. The party's top officials either were arrested or went underground, and the muhajir leader fled to London, where he lives in self-exile.

When the army withdrew from Karachi in December, Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto appointed her helicopter pilot as city administrator and stacked the rest of the city council with members of her Pakistan People's Party.

U.S. ASSISTANCE FOR POSSIBLE
NATO EFFORT TO HELP
UNPROFOR WITHDRAW FROM
BOSNIA AND CROATIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, last year President Clinton made the commitment to deploy United States forces to assist in a NATO effort to withdraw U.N. peacekeeping troops from Bosnia if this becomes necessary. On March 31, we are approaching a deadline imposed by the Government of Croatia for the beginning of the withdrawal of UNPROFOR from Croatia, to be completed by the end of June. The President still has not committed United States forces to assist in a possible withdrawal from Croatia, in part so as not to prejudice delicate on-going negotiations with the Croatian government.

Given the seriousness and the implications of the President's commitment of United States forces for these possible missions and the dangerous situation in Croatia, I wrote to Secretary Christopher in February setting forth my concerns. I received a response to my letter today. I am including both in the RECORD in order that my colleagues can be informed about the important, serious issues before us.

In the response to my letter Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, Wendy Sherman, emphasizes that in assisting the possible pull-out of UNPROFOR, "NATO has no intention of engaging in offensive combat in Bosnia and/or Croatia, or of remaining in the region following the UNPROFOR pull-out."

Assistant Secretary Sherman also stresses that to give our diplomatic efforts a chance to succeed, the administration is not yet making a public case for assistance with the UNPROFOR withdrawal from Croatia. But if there is no alternative, the President will explain to the American people what is at stake, which above all, is "our collective security, as exemplified by mutual commitment to Allies."

In testimony today before the International Relations Committee, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, Richard Holbrooke, gave assurances that United States troops, if they are ever deployed in Bosnia or Croatia, will do so only to help UNPROFOR troops leave, period.

The exchange of letters follows:

COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, February 22, 1995.

HON. WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On January 3, I wrote to you regarding the President's decision in principle to commit U.S. ground

forces to a future NATO-led operation to support UNPROFOR withdrawal from Bosnia. I appreciated your reply of January 19.

I am writing again because my policy and process concerns about this decision persist. Indeed, they have been sharpened, as a result of: (1) the increasingly fragile situation in Bosnia; (2) information provided to the Committee that the first contingency steps to implement a withdrawal of UNPROFOR from Bosnia are now going forward; and (3) the decision of the Croatian government to terminate the mandate of UNPROFOR in Croatia after March 31, 1995.

I would like to ask a number of questions about U.S. policy:

1. Does the President's commitment to assist in the withdrawal UNPROFOR from Bosnia extend to a withdrawal of UNPROFOR from Croatia as well?

If such a commitment has not been made, is it under active consideration at this time?

What would be the U.S. troop and cost requirements of such an additional commitment?

2. How would a prior withdrawal of UNPROFOR from Croatia complicate an UNPROFOR withdrawal from Bosnia?

How would an UNPROFOR withdrawal from Croatia change the U.S. troop, cost and logistics requirements of a NATO-led operation to support UNPROFOR withdrawal from Bosnia?

3. How does the possibility of renewed fighting in both Bosnia and Croatia affect your estimates of the U.S. troop and cost requirements of a NATO-led operation to support UNPROFOR withdrawal?

If fighting resumes, do you believe that U.S. forces participating in a NATO-led withdrawal of UNPROFOR will be able to keep out of the conflict?

4. I appreciate the Department of State's reply of January 19th, "that the Administration has no intention of keeping U.S. ground forces in Bosnia following a withdrawal operation." I agree with that policy limitation, but I remain concerned about the strong pressures on U.S. ground forces—during and in the aftermath of an UNPROFOR withdrawal—to intervene in the conflict:

To provide humanitarian assistance;

To protect civilian populations; or

To respond to military provocations by parties to the conflict.

How do you address each of these issues, from the standpoint of keeping U.S. forces focused on their mission, and preventing mission creep?

I also want to reiterate my concern, which I know you share, that a commitment to put U.S. ground troops in harm's way is the most serious undertaking a President can make.

To my knowledge, the President has yet to make a public case for sending U.S. ground forces to assist in UNPROFOR withdrawal from Bosnia. Unless or until the President makes the case directly to the American people, I believe there will be little support for his decision in the Congress or among the public at large. I strongly urge the President to state the policy and explain the commitment.

I appreciate your attention to this letter, and I look forward to your answers to the several questions raised.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Ranking Democratic Member.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, March 9, 1995.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: Thank you for your letter of February 22 to Secretary Christopher, in which you pose additional questions about possible U.S. participation in a

NATO-led effort to help UNPROFOR withdraw from Bosnia and/or Croatia.

Before addressing your questions individually, I would like to stress that the Administration shares your concern over an UNPROFOR pull-out: like you, we fear withdrawal may contribute to a widening of the war in both Bosnia and Croatia. For this reason, we have undertaken an active diplomatic campaign to convince President Tudjman to allow an international peacekeeping force to remain in his country. Assistant Secretary Holbrooke held meetings in Zagreb March 6 to that end.

Because all the Allies agree that an international force should remain in the region, NATO's planning for assistance to UNPROFOR withdrawal has been conducted on a contingency basis only. NATO has taken care to ensure that laying solid groundwork for possible withdrawal does not imply accession to UNPROFOR's departure. President Clinton has avoided making an explicit statement that the U.S. would help facilitate UNPROFOR withdrawal from Croatia so as not to precipitate a pull-out. Practically speaking, if a situation were to develop in Croatia where no alternative to NATO-led withdrawal appeared feasible, as in Bosnia our Alliance commitments would militate in favor of U.S. participation. But let me emphasize that we do not want this to come to pass, and we are pressing Tudjman to moderate his stance so UNPROFOR does not have to leave and NATO does not have to deploy.

You correctly suggest that UNPROFOR withdrawal from Croatia would significantly complicate the situation for UNPROFOR in Bosnia. Evacuation routes through Croatia that soldiers in UNPROFOR/Bosnia would have to use might be harder to secure if UNPROFOR/Croatia were no longer in place. Also, if the Krajina Serbs tried to prevent UNPROFOR withdrawal from Croatia (as they have sometimes threatened), conflict could spill over into the volatile Bihac area, where Bosnian Serbs might feel compelled to support Krajina Serbs, thus endangering UNPROFOR forces in Bosnia.

Because UNPROFOR's departure from one state may bring it under threat in the other, and in response to President Tudjman's stated wish to end UNPROFOR's mandate on March 31, NATO military authorities have been tasked with updating their contingency Bosnia withdrawal plan to include steps to facilitate withdrawal from both countries. NATO's revised plan is scheduled to be ready in mid-March. We do not yet have NATO's final cost estimates, but a team of budget experts from the Department of Defense, the Office of Management and Budget, the State Department, and the National Security Council travelled to Brussels and to AFSOUTH headquarters in Naples the week of March 6 to study existing figures for Bosnia withdrawal and determine whether figures were available for Croatia. Once NATO has released its revised plan, and we have made preliminary decisions on what our response should be, we will discuss funding options with Congress.

As for troop numbers, NATO has not yet asked member states to indicate possible contributions, nor has it projected troop needs. It is worth noting that a significant number of NATO troops facilitating UNPROFOR withdrawal would be reflagged UNPROFOR contingents from Allies already in the region. As with costs, troop needs for a Bosnia-only operation would be somewhat higher than for a Croatia-only operation, and somewhat lower than for an operation to help UNPROFOR withdraw from both states. Again, once NATO has released its revised

plan in mid-March, we will be in a better position to consult with you on possible U.S. troop contributions.

For planning purposes, NATO is calculating personnel and equipment needs under the most adverse circumstances. NATO projects that in facilitating UNPROFOR's departure, it might provide close air support to UNPROFOR troops, as it is already committed to do, and undertake other activities in defense of the international peacekeepers. NATO has no intention of engaging in offensive combat in Bosnia and/or Croatia, or of remaining in the region following an UNPROFOR pull-out.

The pressures you describe on NATO—and thus the U.S.—to become involved in the conflict should UNPROFOR withdraw are real and sobering. Without UNPROFOR, civilian populations will indeed have little protection. International relief organizations will find it difficult to make humanitarian deliveries. Minor conflicts that could be quelled even by the presence of international observers would escalate. Thus, as we note above, it is clearly preferable for UNPROFOR, or a similar international presence, to remain in the region. We are working actively toward that end in Croatia; in Bosnia, the Contact Group is in touch with the various parties to try to prevent a resurgence of fighting, which might provoke UNPROFOR withdrawal. The Administration is also continuing to argue against unilateral lift, the other likely trigger for UNPROFOR withdrawal from Bosnia.

As the situation clarifies itself, we will need to make decisions. We want UNPROFOR to stay, but if an upsurge in fighting threatens the safety of our Allies, we do not intend to leave them stranded. In order to give our diplomatic efforts a chance to succeed, we are not yet making a public case for assistance with an UNPROFOR pull-out. But should there be no alternative, the President will explain to the American people what is at stake: our collective security, as exemplified by mutual commitments to Allies. We trust we can count on your support, and that of the Congress, should we have to undertake an operation to assist our Allies depart from the former Yugoslavia.

We hope this information will be helpful to you and the members of the Committee. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

WENDY R. SHERMAN,
Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs.

TRAGEDY IN PAKISTAN

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in today's Washington Post. Yesterday, in Pakistan, the brutal ambush of a United States consulate van left two American diplomats dead and a third wounded. These deaths are a constant reminder of the continuation of terrorism in our world. In the last 3 months, more than 437 people have been murdered by religious zealots in Pakistan alone.

This cowardly act of terrorism is an unfortunate reminder that we must work to end these acts of violence. As we enter a new age of peace in many parts of the world, it is important to bring those who continue to terrorize others to justice.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my prayers to the families who lost loved ones in this unspeakable incident. I intend to work closely with my colleagues to investigate this act of terror and bring those responsible to justice.

[From the Washington Post, March 9, 1995]

KARACHI AMBUSH WAS WELL PLANNED

(By Kamran Khan and Molly Moore)

KARACHI, PAKISTAN, MARCH 8.—The ambush of a U.S. Consulate van by masked gunmen who killed two Americans and injured a third at a busy intersection in downtown Karachi, Pakistan, this morning was a "well-planned campaign to create panic and terror" among Americans and other Westerners, according to a Pakistani official.

Today's attack marked the first time terrorists have targeted Westerners after a year of rampant religious, ethnic and political violence that has left more than 1,000 people dead in Pakistan's financial and commercial capital.

In Washington, a senior administration official said one of the two Americans killed was an intelligence agent working under diplomatic cover, but the U.S. government does not believe this was related to the attack.

Instead, the official said, investigators believe the attack was intended as a payback for the U.S. capture in Pakistan last month of Ramzi Ahmed Yousef, the suspected mastermind of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing in New York, or was related to the ethnic violence in Pakistan. The official said there is "no evidence whatsoever" that the assailants knew about the victim's intelligence work.

As Pakistani authorities vowed to launch a full-scale investigation of today's shooting, Karachi police officials revealed that police in a squad car equipped with a rooftop machine gun were at the intersection where the ambush occurred but refused to pursue the attackers' getaway car because they were afraid of being killed.

Both U.S. and Pakistani officials said the attack appeared to be carefully planned and coordinated, although authorities said no group or organization has claimed responsibility. FBI agents were sent to Pakistan today, and Karachi police said the FBI will lead the investigation.

U.S. Consulate officials said Gary C. Durell, 45, a communications technician from Alliance, Ohio, was killed instantly when two gunmen opened fire on the van. Jackie Van Landingham, 33, a consulate secretary from Camden, S.C., died of gunshot wounds after being taken to a hospital. Mark McCloy, a 31-year-old mailroom worker from Framingham, Mass., was scheduled to undergo surgery today for his wounds, Pakistani officials said. The three consulate employees were stationed in Karachi with their spouses and children, according to U.S. officials.

Although officials at the consulate said today that they were taking extra precautions to safeguard personnel, a spokesman said, "they live and work in this community. We've told people to keep their heads down, but we can't build a wall around them." U.S. officials said there are no plans to close the consulate or evacuate family members.

U.S. and Pakistani authorities condemned the assault, which occurred as the van, with an identifying license plate, was driving the three employees to work at the consulate from the diplomatic residential neighborhood at about 7:45 a.m.

"This wanton act of terrorism deserves the severest condemnation," the Pakistani government said. "It is clear that this tragic incident is part of a premeditated plan to create fear and harassment in sensitive areas of Karachi."

In Washington, President Clinton denounced the attack as a "cowardly act." Secretary of State Warren Christopher, arriving in Cairo at the beginning of a visit to the Middle East, said the United States and Pakistan would use "every means at our disposal to bring those responsible for this crime to justice."

The incident came at an awkward time for Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, who is scheduled to visit Washington next month in an effort to improve the uneasy relations between the two countries. Pakistanis have criticized her government for its failure to control the violence in Karachi.

The White House said today the shooting would not affect first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's scheduled tour of Pakistan, India, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Bangladesh at the end of this month. She will not be visiting Karachi.

The Pakistani government censored reports of the incident carried today by the BBC and CNN television networks and played down the story on the government-controlled national television network.

Details of the attack were pieced together by Karachi police, using reports from witnesses and an account provided to U.S. officials by the Pakistani van driver, who was not injured and immediately drove his wounded passengers to one of Karachi's major hospitals.

According to police, three armed gunmen in a stolen yellow taxi followed the white consulate van for several blocks before opening fire on it with automatic weapons from a distance.

The yellow taxi then swerved in front of the van and cut it off while a red car blocked the van from the opposite side. At least two masked gunmen then stepped out of the vehicles and began firing on the van, shattering its side windows and spraying the windshield with bullets, according to U.S. officials.

As the gunmen fired on the van, traffic constable Tanvir Ahmed, who was at the intersection, spotted the police car with the machine gun approaching from an adjacent lane. Ahmed said he dashed toward the police vehicle and pointed to the yellow taxi, then speeding away.

Ahmed said the officer in charge of the police vehicle responded, "Stupid, shall we get killed by chasing these people?" Police officials, who confirmed Ahmed's account, said the police vehicle did not radio for help, but drove six minutes to its home station to report the incident.

Such a response has not been uncommon among Karachi police. More than 90 law enforcement officials have been killed in Karachi's violence in the past year, including four who were the targets of shooting sprees last weekend.

U.S. diplomats in Pakistan have become sensitive to terrorism as a result of a 1979 attack on the U.S. Embassy in the capital, Islamabad, in which hundreds of Pakistani men stormed the compound and set several buildings on fire, killing four people. The assault stemmed from unfounded rumors blaming the United States for an attack on the Grand Mosque in Mecca, Saudi Arabia, the holiest site in Islam.

Karachi police said several threatening telephone calls have been made to the U.S. Consulate in Karachi in recent weeks.

Karachi police and Pakistani intelligence sources said today they are investigating an Iranian-backed militant Shiite Muslim organization called Sipahae Muhammad (Army of the Prophet Muhammad). Sipahae Muhammad and other Shiite extremists have accused the United States of fanning Karachi's sectarian violence.

TRIBUTE TO THE LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS**HON. ANNA G. ESHOO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the League of Women Voters and all its members who are celebrating this outstanding organization's 75th anniversary. The League of Women Voters is a respected advocate for education, political awareness and the active participation of women in the political process across our country, and provides an essential and valuable service to all Americans.

The League of Women Voters was founded in 1920 as a result of the movement to assure women the right to vote. Since then, it has helped generations of voters understand the structure and function of Government by providing nonpartisan information about candidates and public policy issues. The League of Women Voters has also served the public interest by promoting equality, encouraging voter registration and informed voting, and offering leadership training to women. Thousands of League members throughout the United States devote untold volunteer hours to educate and inform their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in saluting the extraordinary contributions made by the League of Women Voters. In particular I want to highlight the invaluable

work of the many active Leagues in California's 14th Congressional District, including the Bay Area League of Women Voters, the League of Women Voters of Central San Mateo County, the League of Women Voters of South San Mateo County, the League of Women Voters of Palo Alto, the League of Women Voters of Mountain View-Los Altos, the League of Women Voters of Cupertino-Sunnyvale, and the League of Women Voters of San Jose-Santa Clara. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the League of Women Voters' 75th anniversary and thanking them for their continued efforts to promote an informed electorate, the best assurance that our precious democracy will flourish and endure.