One area that this is most evident is in bilingual voting. The Voting Rights Act requires localities with populations over a certain proportion of the population to provide all materials in the language(s) of the affected populations, even if the language does not have a written form. This opens the door to fraud and misrepresentation of issues by interpreters. Inaccurate bilingual voting materials are a costly burden on State and local governments, and is neither effective nor a low cost method of ensuring anyone's right to vote.

Nothing in my legislation prevents a State, locality, political party, or individual from providing multilingual voting assistance. Localities will be free to adopt the approach that serves their constituencies best. Given that bilingual ballots have been both inaccurate and expensive, other approaches might be more helpful.

Multilingual Government services such as these are simply too costly in a nation in which more than 320 languages are spoken. It only makes sense to designate one common language for all official Government business. That is why I am introducing this important legislation.

It is time the Government came to the same conclusion as the rest of the American people: English should be our official language. English has enabled this Nation to be something unique in history, a true Nation of immigrants. English is the language of future opportunity for all our Nation's citizens. Official English is really just common sense.

NAZI SS MEMBERS IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1997

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring a very serious and troubling affair to the attention of my colleagues. Several news reports, over the last couple of days, have uncovered an incredible story: The German Government is giving pensions to over 3,000 former members of the Nazi Waffen SS Corps, living in the United States. Not extraordinary in and of itself, because these men receive their pensions as a result of their military service during World War II, yet the question that begs answering is: How many of these individuals might be war criminals? The outrage in this matter, is that the German Government may never have bothered to check.

At this same time, there are many Holocaust survivors—Catholics, Jews, and others living in the United States and elsewhere in the world—who have received very little in the way of compensation, and even scores of surviving victims who do not receive anything from the German Government. After the horrors and suffering they were forced to endure during the war, how can we allow this additional measure of indignation?

Apparently, many of these former SS members were able to enter the United States, and eventually gain citizenship, by falsifying their identities and lying about their wartime activities. Many of them, however, have been living in the United States for years now, some boldly with the same names, the same identities, the same blood on their hands.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for that, and it is simply unacceptable. Yesterday, I sent letters to German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, President Clinton, and Attorney General Janet Reno, asking that they obtain the names of these Nazi pensioners, and release them to the proper American Government agencies, in order to fully investigate the possibility of war criminals in our midst. There must be a full accounting. Yes, many of them are old, frail men, who have lived peacefully in their respective neighborhoods for decades. Did they show the same respect for the millions in Europe who also were old, frail, and living their lives peacefully? I think we all know the answer to that question.

Thanks to the hard work of the Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations, as well as some other prominent organizations, we are beginning to uncover a trail of Nazi war criminals among us. In fact, the OSI is finding and prosecuting Nazis at the rate of one per month. It is imperative therefore, that we have all the necessary information at our disposal, so that we can continue to bring these murderers to justice. They have eluded the authorities, and the moral outrage of their deeds, for over 50 years now, but we will no longer allow that to continue. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in this endeavor, so that we may finally honor the memories of the Nazis' victims. Everyday, more and more Holocaust survivors leave this Earth, while their former tormentors continue to live on, having never been held accountable for the horrible deeds of the past. It's simply time to act now. Therefore, I call on the Government of Germany to work with us in addressing and resolving this issue once and for all—for the survivors, for the victims, and for the future. They need to do the right thing.

CURTIS W. MEADOWS, JR., RECEIVES JONSSON ETHICS AWARD

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1997

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the first recipient of the J. Erik Jonsson Ethics Award, Mr. Curtis W. Meadows, Jr.

On October 22, 1996, Southern Methodist University's Cary M. Maguire Center for Ethics and Public Responsibility presented Mr. Meadows this award for his commitment to philanthropy and to serving the needs of the Dallas community. Mr. Meadows was president and director of Dallas' Meadows Foundation, one of the largest community foundations in the United States, for 18 years between 1978 and 1996. The Foundation, created by Mr. Meadows' uncle Algur H. Meadows nearly 50 years ago, has made over $300 million in charitable contributions to benefit health, education, arts and culture, civic and public affairs, and human services programs throughout Texas.

Mr. Meadows has served on the boards of the National Council of Foundations, the Conference of Southwest Foundations, the Dallas Bar Foundations and on the advisory boards of more than 40 nonprofit organizations including the Dallas Citizens Council, Habitat for Humanity, and the Suicide and Crisis Center. He has served on the building committees for the Dallas Museum of Art and the Museum of African-American Life and Culture, and has participated in the Mayors Task Force on Homelessness.

To be the first recipient of an award named for Mr. J. Erik Jonsson is a great honor indeed. Mr. Jonsson was a mayor of Dallas from 1964 to 1971, and under his leadership, a number of public buildings including the Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport, city hall, and the Dallas Public Library were constructed and improvements to the city's public schools were made. Both Mr. Jonsson and Mr. Meadows have demonstrated the public virtue that this Ethics Award represents. Congratulations, Mr. Meadows, and thank you for all that you have done for Texas.

HONORING SAM NUNN

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1997

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would designate the Atlanta Federal Center as the Sam Nunn Federal Center, in honor of the former Senator from Georgia.

I believe we all recognize the tremendous accomplishments of Sam Nunn during his service in the U.S. Senate. Senator Nunn is one of the true statesmen of that body and is a source of pride to Georgia. Since my election to Congress in 1986, I have had many opportunities to work with Senator Nunn on several issues and often benefited from his experience and support during the time that we served together.

Since his election to the Senate in 1972, Senator Nunn has served the State of Georgia with honor and dedication. Senator Nunn worked to become the Senate's foremost expert on national security and international affairs. Senator Nunn served 8 years as the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and retired as the ranking Democrat on both the Armed Service Committee and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

I have dedicated much time and effort in support of the Atlanta Federal Center. When Georgia Gov. Zell Miller approached me and asked my support for naming the Federal Center after Senator Nunn, I thought the dedication a fitting tribute to Senator Nunn. For these reasons, I will work to see that the Federal Center soon bears the name of our former Senator, Senator Sam Nunn.

GIVE FANS A CHANCE ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1997

Mr. BLUMENAUER. On Sunday, January 26, the Packers won the Superbowl. When they returned home to Green Bay, their fans stood in freezing temperatures for hours to catch a glimpse of their heroes.

The Packers aren't an ordinary football team. Their fans aren't ordinary fans. And their community isn't an ordinary community—because 1,915 residents of Green Bay and other ''Packer Backers'' own their football team. The Packers are a vital part of the glue that holds the Green Bay community together.

Together, these fans saved the team from bankruptcy. They have plowed profits from 175 consecutive sellouts directly back into the Packers. They cheered their team to 11 consecutive championships—and this year's Superbowl.

The Green Bay Packers are unique, because NFL rules prohibit any more public ownership of teams.

Other communities should be able to invest in their own livability—to define what the community wants of, and for, itself. Other communities should be able to own the local sports team.

That's why we should give fans a chance to own their teams by: Eliminating league rules against public ownership of teams; requiring teams to listen to their fans and the community before moving—a requirement which is found in existing league rules, but seems to receive little real attention; and tying the leagues' broadcast antitrust exemption to the requirements in this bill. This congressionally granted benefit allows teams to collaborate on the purchase of national broadcast time. The NFL earned $1.2 billion on broadcast rights last year.

This bill doesn't do anything new or radical: It will allow more ownership structures like the Packers, the Boston Celtics, and the Florida Panthers. It will ensure that the leagues follow their own rules when it comes to making decisions about team relocations, and it will ensure that the sports leagues do not squander the benefits they have gained under the sports broadcasting anti-trust exemption.

Community ownership strongly encourages fan loyalty, financial stability, and strong TV audiences at a time when fan loyalty is being tested by franchise moves. It is in the long-term, best interest of any professional league. More importantly, it is in the long-term interest of the communities who support them.

I urge my colleagues to give fans a chance by supporting this legislation.

SUMMARY: GIVE FANS A CHANCE ACT

Sec. 1: This Act is called the ''Give Fans a Chance Act''. Its purpose is to give communities the tools to invest in their own livability by allowing them to purchase their home sports team.

Sec. 2: Allow Public Ownership of Teams

Purpose: To allow more communities the opportunities Green Bay, WI, has to own their professional sports team. In addition, to help the leagues by stemming the tide of loyal fans who are no longer glued to their TV sets or stadium seats to watch their favorite teams. Football fan loyalty is being tested by franchise moves and a proliferation of sports on specialty cable channels. If those fans had a chance to own their own teams, they would invest more time and money into their future.

Description: No professional sports league (football, hockey, or basketball) may have a rule, policy, or agreement that forbids any public ownership of teams, either by the general public or by any governmental entity.

Penalty: If the League ignores this provision, it will lose its sports broadcast antitrust exemption. The antitrust exemption allows teams to collaborate to sell broadcast rights, thus increasing their value dramatically.

Expected Impact: The NFL is the only league that has specific rules forbidding public ownership of sports teams (NFL Ownership Policies para. 2). The NFL earned $1.2 billion as a result of the sport broadcast anti-trust exemption in the 1995–1996 season.

Sec 3: Relocation of Teams

Purpose: To require teams to consider the needs and interests of their communities in making relocation decisions.

Description: Requires a professional sports league, in considering whether to approve or disapprove the relocation of a member team, to take into consideration several criteria; Fan loyalty; the degree to which the team has engaged in good faith negotiations concerning terms and conditions under which the teams would continue to play its games in the home territory; the degree to which ownership of management of the team has contributed to a need to relocate; the extent to which the team benefits from public financing, either federal, state or local; the adequacy of the stadium in which the team played its home games in the previous season and the willingness of the community to make changes; the current financial standing of the team; whether there is another team in either the home community or the community to which the team will seek to locate; whether the community is opposed to the relocation; and whether there is a bona fide investor offering fair market value to purchase the team and keep it in the home community.

Expected Impact: All of the sports leagues will be expected to use these criteria in evaluating the movement of member teams. These criteria closely track current NFL policies under Section 4.3 of the Constitution and By-Laws (adopted in 1984). Case law since the adoption of these policies suggest that these criteria help bolster the NFL's ability to evaluate franchise moves without running afoul of antitrust law.

Sec. 4. Opportunities for Communities to Purchase Team

Purpose: To give communities a real opportunity to purchase their team.

Description: This section requires that a team proposing to relocate give the affected home territory 180 days notice of the proposed move. During the 180 days notice period, a local government, stadium, arena authority, person, or any combination may present a proposal to retain the team in the home territory. The local community may also develop a proposal to induce the team to stay without actually purchasing the team. As noted under section 3, both the team and the league are required to carefully consider any proposals, and, if an ownership bid is successful, the league may not oppose membership in the league based on the new ownership structure. The team owner must provide a written response to the offer, stating in detail any reasons why the offer was refused.

Penalty: If the team and/or the league refuse to abide by these provisions, they will lose the antitrust exemption under the Sports Broadcasting Act.

Expected Impact: All Sports Leagues will be required to give communities an opportunity to purchase a home team in the case of proposed relocations.

INTRODUCTION OF THE WOMEN'S HEALTH AND CANCER RIGHTS ACT OF 1997

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1997

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act of 1997, comprehensive legislation that guarantees coverage for inpatient hospital care following a mastectomy, lumpectomy, or lymph node dissection—based on a doctor's judgment, requires coverage for breast reconstructive procedure, including symmetrical reconstruction, ensures a second opinion for any cancer diagnosis, and offers significant physical protections from inducement or retribution.

I want to first thank my colleagues in both the House and Senate that have worked so diligently on this legislation. Senators D'AMATO, SNOWE, and FEINSTEIN, as well as Representatives SUSAN MOLINARI and FRANK LOBIONDO, are all part of this effort to restore the ability of doctors to practice sound medicine and to restore compassion and dignity to the treatment of breast cancer patients.

So why introduce this bill? I'll tell you why. Tragically, some women who must undergo mastectomies, lumpectomies or lymph node dissections for the treatment of breast cancer are rushed through their recovery from these procedures on an outpatient basis at the insistence of their health plan or insurance company in order to cut cost. Other insurance companies cut cost by denying coverage for reconstructive surgery because they have deemed such procedures cosmetic. Ironically, they do not deny reconstructive surgery for an ear lost to cancer. We must understand that self-image is at stake at a time when optimism and inner strength can be the difference between life and death.

Furthermore, this bill requires coverage of second opinions when any cancer tests come back either negative or positive, giving all patients the benefit of a second opinion. This important provision will not only help ensure that false negatives are detected, but also give men and women greater peace of mind.

Now, to be clear, all insurance companies are not so insensitive as to not provide these benefits and, therefore, all will not be affected by this legislation. but we have a responsibility to protect the doctor-patient relationship, ensuring that the medical needs of patients are fully addressed.

Everyone has heard that one in nine women will be diagnosed with breast cancer at some point in their lifetime. Well, one of those women is my sister. So I know a little something about the horror that accompanies this disease and the personal anxiety of living with the disease.

My sister and her experiences have made me realize that we should have no greater priority than empowering those with breast cancer the right and ability to play an active role in the management of their treatment. It is our obligation as leaders to ensure them that their medical treatment is in the hands of physicians, not insurance companies. It is a profound injustice when health care forgets about the patient, yet with regard to mastectomy recovery and breast reconstruction following a mastectomy, that is just what has been done.

Let's put the reality of this disease in perspective. When a woman is told that she has breast cancer, the feeling that immediately follows the initial denial is lack of control. Our bill is a patient's bill aimed at providing patients, in consultation with their physicians, a greater degree of autonomy when deciding appropriate medical care and, therefore, taking back control of their lives.

More than 2½ million women in America today are living with breast cancer. These women are our sisters, mothers, daughters, wives, and friends. This dreadful disease now strikes over 180,000 women per year and that figure does not even include the additional 20