

role in the House's ethics process. Our fundamental goals are to further enhance the openness of the House to make this institution more responsive to the public, and to bolster citizen confidence in Congress.

LEE HAMILTON and I developed this proposal during our service as House co-chairmen of the 1993 Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Our resolution is based on the testimony of many Members and outside experts about the strengths and weaknesses of the current ethics process.

Let me first make a comment about LEE HAMILTON's recent announcement that this will be his last term in Congress. LEE's retirement will be a big loss to this institution and the American people. He has been a model legislator for us all, and I wish him all the best in whatever activity he chooses to pursue when he leaves the House. In the meantime, I am delighted to join with LEE once again in our mutual interest to improve the work and reputation of the legislative branch.

Specifically, House Resolution 61 would make several important changes in the House ethics process. First, it would authorize the Speaker and minority leader to appoint jointly 20 independent fact finders at the beginning of each Congress. These private citizens could then be called upon to conduct ethics investigations for the Standards of Official Conduct Committee. The definition of private citizens includes, among others, former Members, staff aides, and officers of Congress, but not lobbyists.

Second House Resolution 61 grants discretionary authority to the Ethics Committee to decide, on a case-by-case basis, when to request that private citizens be used to conduct investigations involving allegations of ethical misconduct. Our resolution provides that an even number of fact finders—four or six—shall be appointed jointly from the standby pool by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Standards Committee. Daily pay, travel, and per diem costs are provided the fact finders when they are engaged in ethics investigative work. Staff aides of the Standards Committee are authorized to assist the fact finders in carrying out their responsibilities.

Third, the job of the fact finders is to conduct a preliminary review of the ethical complaint. They are to make the detailed inquiries, accumulate relevant background materials, gather pertinent evidence, and so on—all activities that usually consume enormous amounts of time. A benefit that inheres in the Hamilton-Dreier approach to ethics reform is that it will alleviate time burdens on members who will not have to do this pick and shovel investigative work. Another benefit is to increase public confidence that allegations of ethical misconduct are being fully and independently explored.

Fourth, after the preliminary review of the ethics complaint has been completed, the private citizens would report their finds and recommendations to the full Ethics Committee. If the fact finders determine that their findings justify further formal action by the Ethics Committee, they may, by majority vote, transmit a statement of alleged violations to the ethics panel.

Finally, in the event that a statement of alleged violations is sent to the Ethics Committee, that panel will then act as an adjudicatory subcommittee as provided in the Committee's rules. The full Ethics Committee will then con-

duct its own review of the information transmitted to it by the fact finders, including, if required, the convening of public hearings.

In our judgment, House Resolution 61 provides an innovative and flexible approach to revamping the House's ethics process. On those high profile and complex cases, the Ethics Committee can turn to a pool of private citizens to conduct the investigations. For ethics complaints that appear minor, the committee can continue to appoint its own subcommittee to conduct the preliminary inquiry.

Everyone who serves in Congress understands that public trust in the legislative branch is not especially high. To be sure, many factors have contributed to this development, such as heightened cynicism in the body politic, but public misgivings about how Congress handles ethical charges against its own Members also contribute to the lack of citizen confidence. This institution must devote more time and attention to congressional ethics, which is why I strongly endorse the recent establishment of a bipartisan House ethics task force to revise and improve our ethics process. This initiative by our Republican and Democratic leaders deserves everyone's support and encouragement.

Members and citizens alike have a large stake in an improved ethics process. The strength of representative government rests fundamentally on public confidence in the integrity of our proceedings. In our view, there is an inherent conflict-of-interest when only members are involved in evaluating ethics complaints against their peers. House Resolution 61 will address this issue by allowing private citizens to assist in ethics investigations on a case-by-case basis. Adoption of our resolution will further demonstrate that the House and its Members care deeply about improving and strengthening their ethical processes and responsibilities.

FOR THE RELIEF OF FRANK
NOTREM

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the assistance of all my colleagues in aiding a constituent in my district, Mr. Frank Notrem.

Mr. Notrem is now 82 years old. Before World War II he was in the National Guard; when the war broke out he went to Europe to fight. In all, he served in the Army for 40 years.

In civilian life he has dedicated his life to his community, serving as a member of the Chelsea Fire Department for 32 years.

Seventeen years ago, Mr. Notrem was injured on the job, breaking both his legs. He was forced to retire due to those injuries.

At that time, Mr. Notrem's wife, concerned about the hospital bills that would soon come due, hid 10 of Mr. Notrem's veteran's checks, totaling \$8,242.20. She hid them so well that she forgot where they were. It was only recently that they were discovered after Mrs. Notrem passed away and her children were cleaning up the house.

Though the money is owed, the checks are no longer valid. Nonetheless, I believe this Na-

tion owes Mr. Notrem a debt of gratitude for his service. Therefore, I have introduced legislation requiring the Treasury Department to pay Mr. Notrem the \$8,242.20 he is owed.

Please join me in meeting our obligations to Mr. Notrem.

SAN DIEGO HOSPICE: 20 YEARS OF
EXEMPLARY SERVICE

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise today to pay tribute to San Diego Hospice. In 1977, local citizens, clergy members, and medical professionals, motivated by a shared concern for the plight of terminally ill patients, joined together to create the San Diego Hospice.

As one of the first hospice programs in the country, San Diego Hospice set the standard by which we provide care for the terminally ill and their families. Now caring for more than 1,600 people a year, San Diego Hospice is not only an integral part of our regional health care system, it is an innovator, constantly working to better its outreach and care.

San Diego Hospice has effectively employed San Diego's large medical community to foster education, and it was the first hospice to bring palliative medicine into the curriculum of a medical school—the University of California, San Diego, School of Medicine.

San Diego Hospice continues to develop cutting edge programs that serve as an example to other hospices. These include the Acute Care Center, the Center for Palliative Studies, and exceptional programs in pediatrics and bereavement support.

Mr. Speaker, each and every day the San Diego Hospice brightens the lives of terminally ill patients and their loved ones. San Diego has been blessed by the care provided by the San Diego Hospice, and I am sure that it will continue to serve as an excellent model of people helping people and working together for the betterment of their shared community.

SALUTING BEVERLY BRITTON
FRASER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the many years of invaluable community service of Beverly Britton Fraser, Esq. Ms. Britton Fraser, an attorney, has committed her life to winning justice for the poor. Despite numerous opportunities offered by corporate law firms and government agencies, Ms. Britton Fraser, a University of Buffalo School of Law graduate, has zealously worked as a trial attorney for the Legal Aid Society.

This native Brooklynite was also a "Partner in Education." As such, she visited inner-city schools and talked with students of all ages about her profession, substance abuse avoidance, and attaining personal goals through education. As a person who has always been

influenced by an intense desire to give back to her community, Ms. Britton Fraser has wholeheartedly pursued her goals.

In 1992, in the course of her career as a lawyer, Ms. Britton Fraser met and married Errol Fraser, a certified public accountant. The couple currently resides in Brooklyn where she is a court attorney for Judge Bernard Fuchs of the New York City Civil Court. She continues to pursue that the belief that "justice is being served for all," but particularly for those who are poor and downtrodden in our community.

For these reasons, it gives me great pleasure to Salute Ms. Beverly Britton Fraser, a community hero. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Ms. Britton Fraser.

LET THE CHILDREN PRAY

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, prayer in schools has moved to the front burner in American politics, and for good reason. Today, in many communities across the country, children are forbidden to pray in schools. Not just forbidden to participate in organized prayer, which most constitutional scholars believe would violate the U.S. Constitution, but forbidden to pray voluntarily, which is well within every child's constitutional rights.

For this reason, I have introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives that would amend the Constitution to make it perfectly clear that voluntary school prayer is a fundamental right that all school children enjoy. The amendment, which is just 33 words, simply states:

Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit the inclusion of voluntary prayer in any public school program or activity. Neither the United States nor any State shall prescribe the content of any such prayer.

It is a sad commentary on the state of American jurisprudence that such an amendment is necessary. It should be obvious to all that the Government has no business, and no right, to prohibit voluntary prayer by anyone. Nevertheless, liberal activists have succeeded in propagating the idea that any school prayer violates the separation of church and state.

Nothing could be further from the truth. If anything, my amendment would restore a proper understanding of the church-state separation issue. School children would be permitted to pray voluntarily, but no Government entity could determine the content of such prayer—which is as it should be.

There are those in America who would like to see not only prayer, but all other religious expression banished from public life altogether. They will not succeed. Our Nation was founded on Judeo-Christian principles and values that have just as much right to expression in the public arena as the culture relativism so fashionable today.

It is amazing that in a time when civility seems to be breaking down all around us that school prayer could be regarded as a threat. On the contrary, it is the removal of moral influences from public life that has contributed to our Nation's social ills. By introducing a constitutional amendment to ensure the rights of school children to voluntary prayer in school, I

hope I have made a small contribution toward a restoration of the legitimate place of religion in society.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR CERTAIN PERSIAN GULF EVACUEES

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to provide for the permanent resident status for certain Persian Gulf War Evacuees.

During the Persian Gulf War, the United States decided to evacuate some 200 families, approximately 2,000 individuals, the majority of whom are stateless Palestinians, who had been living in Kuwait. The United States Government evacuated these families to the United States after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait but before the United States military intervention in that conflict, because the families all had American children and some had harbored American citizens during Iraq's occupation.

The families initially were given temporary protected status, and before President Bush left office he approved deferred enforced departure [DED] for the families. This status was continued each year thereafter by President Clinton. However, on December 31, 1996, the White House did not continue the DED status. Once in the United States, these families began making a life, including having additional children. The majority of the families have received permanent residency status. However, approximately 47 families have not received permanent residency status and have now suddenly found themselves faced with deportation. Kuwait will not accept them back into the country. Most of the parents hold Jordanian passports, but are not necessarily Jordanian citizens. Even if Jordan could accept them, Jordan is already burdened with tens of thousands of Palestinians who left Kuwait during the War. In addition, in Jordan the families will have no economic assistance, no jobs in an economy that is already burdened with unemployed people, and no health care for their children. This will all work to create severe hardship on the children who are American citizens and essentially will sentence them to a life of impoverishment.

These families are principally composed of professionals and technical people who are dependent upon no one for their support in the United States except by their own labor. They have maintained an excellent record of citizens training. They are a definite asset to this country.

Mr. Speaker, going through with the deportation would be an act of great injustice for a small group of people who did not ask to be evacuated here in the first place. But now that they are here, fairness would require that they be permitted to adjust their status so that they may continue to raise their American citizen children in this society.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation to allow this small group to adjust their status to permanent residents [immigrants]. Many of the families placed themselves at grave risk by

harboring American citizens during Iraq's occupation of Kuwait—keeping them safe until they could leave or until American intervention could drive the Iraqi's out.

Deporting these few [47] families with American-born children is not the way for a grateful Nation to show its thanks. Enacting this bill, granting them permanent immigrant status, is

CALIFORNIA CIVIL RIGHTS INITIATIVE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of five citizens given last night in a tribute to Ward Connerly, the chairman of the recent campaign for the California Civil Rights Initiative. These five people shared with us their own personal experiences dealing with racial preferences. I would like to recognize them for their courage in speaking out on such a divisive issue.

REMARKS BY JANICE CAMARENA

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Janice Camarena, and I am glad to be here to honor Ward Connerly.

The first time I called Ward's office, I wanted to find out how I could get involved in proposition 209, and I was very nervous. Here I was, talking to a man who was not only a University of California regent, but also the chairman of an initiative that would have a great effect on the future of my children. Later, after I met Ward for the first time, I just had to hug him—he probably thought I was crazy, but that was okay with me * * *

Over the last year and a half, Ward has gone from being someone I was nervous about talking with, to being a great speaker whom I respect, to being my mentor, my friend and a hero.

I met Ward at a very difficult time in my life. I was in the middle of a lawsuit I had filed against the State of California, challenging the racially segregated programs in our community college system. I had been kicked out of an English 101 class after meeting every requirement except one—my skin was the wrong color.

On the first day of class, the teacher told me and one other white female student that there was a problem, that there were a couple of students who did not belong, that the class was for African-American students, and that we would have to leave. I later learned that this class was part of something called the "Black Bridge Program" designed for black students only.

What happened at school affected not only me, but my two daughters as well. My first daughter was born when I was sixteen and her father is white. The following year, I married a Mexican man; he died two weeks after my second daughter was born. From the beginning, I taught my daughters that most people are basically good, that most people will judge them by who they are as individuals, and not by their color.

But when I walked into that federally-funded English class and was ordered to walk out of it, I realized that I had misled my children. I realized that my daughters would not be treated equally—not by their government, their public education system, their teachers or their counselors. And I wondered what kind of future this country held for my multi-racial children.