

they are more understandable to investors. Why not force stock quotes to be made in plain dollars and cents, so that investors don't have to convert from fractions every time they read the stock tables in the newspaper?

Four years ago, when I chaired the Finance Subcommittee, we held a series of hearings on the future of the stock markets. During those hearings, we heard many market participants raise concerns about certain trading practices, such as payment for order flow or preferencing, which they argued had the potential to compromise the fiduciary duty of brokers and other financial professionals to achieve best execution of their customer's orders. Many proposals were put forward to address abuses in these areas, ranging from banning such practices entirely, enhancing disclosures to customers, or stepping up regulatory oversight. While many of these proposals had merit, they merely address the symptoms while ignoring the underlying problem—the fact that the artificial requirement for stocks to trade in eighths establishes a fixed minimum spread between the prices quoted by buyers and sellers of stocks. This requirement prevents market forces from working to narrow the spread to 10 cents, 5 cents, or even 1 penny. As a result, market makers have resorted to practices such as paying for order flow.

I think that our markets would function better if we moved to a more transparent form of quote-based competition. Let stocks trade in dollars and cents, and then the market can more accurately determine what the prices and the spreads should be. Investors will get more opportunities for price improvement in the most actively traded and liquid stocks, and the spreads in such stocks should narrow. Investors will also be able to more readily comprehend how much the value of a stock is increasing or decreasing, as they will not have to constantly convert fractions to dollars.

At the time we held our hearings the stock exchanges resisted such an innovation. I believed then, as I believe now, that many of the objections raised to this proposal are ill-founded, while those which warrant consideration can be readily accommodated through the regulatory process.

Some might ask, why are we bothering about a few pennies? The answer is the golden crumbs that Wall Street extracts for each trade adds up to billions of dollars in costs to consumers each year. Estimates of the resulting savings for investors range widely—from \$4 to \$9 billion a year, depending on what stocks are covered and where the minimum price increments are set. But even if investors only saved 1 penny per share, that would still mean over \$1 billion in savings annually.

The bill we are introducing today is very simple. It directs the Securities and Exchange Commission to use its existing rulemaking authority to adopt a rule, within 1 year after the date of enactment, that would transition the stock and options markets away from trading in factions to trading in dollars and cents. We give the SEC the flexibility to determine what the appropriate minimum price increment or increments should be, and how to implement it in a fashion that does not impose undue burdens on trading and information systems.

The time for delay has ended. American investors want Wall Street to show us the money by moving away from trading in fractions to a more understandable stock pricing

system. They also want more opportunities to get better prices and lower their transaction costs when they buy or sell stocks.

I congratulate Chairman OXLEY and Chairman BLILEY for their leadership in undertaking this initiative, and SEC Commissioner Steve Wallman for his outspoken advocacy on the merits of adopting this reform. I look forward to working with them, as well as with SEC Chairman Arthur Levitt, the leaders of our Nation's stock exchanges, individual and institutional investors, and the securities industry as we move to early hearings and a markup of this bill, which I believe may be the most important proconsumer legislation the Congress considers this year.

KEEP THE GLORY FOR OLD GLORY

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1997

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with all a poem written by a constituent of mine, Harry E. Dearen, who is a member of the American Legion, Chaplain Post 594 and the American Legion Citizens Flag Alliance in Houston, TX. I believe his poem captures the sentiments we all feel about our flag.

KEEP THE GLORY FOR OLD GLORY

No matter who we are, or what we think
About our nation in which we live.

We are free and have a common link
And a duty to our colors and should give
Our very heart and soul to an alliance
To our fellow man and old glory.

The flag that we fought for in defiance
Of offenses against liberty. The history

Of our country lived by men at arms
And through our victories of the past
To protect our flag from ones that harm
It in any way, or try to burn, or trash
Our flag is stepping right on me.

I will not put up with that being done.
We must see that it is stopped you see.

It mocks the freedom that we have won.

—H. Dearen.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1997

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate that on Thursday, March 6, I accompanied the President of the United States to my home State of Michigan where he discussed education and the challenge of moving people from welfare to work.

As a result, I missed rollcall votes 32 through 35. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall votes 32 and 35, and "yea" on rollcall votes 33 and 34.

CONDEMNING THE BOMBING OUTSIDE THE MERCER ISLAND JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER

HON. JENNIFER DUNN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1997

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, last week a bombing occurred outside the Jewish Community Center on Mercer Island, a city located in the congressional district I represent. It was a rare and threatening display of criminal behavior on Mercer Island and a crime that will not go unpunished.

There is an extremely dangerous individual at large who is responsible for this bombing, a coward of the highest magnitude, and who remains a threat to the Jewish community. Whether a dangerously immature prank or a deliberately anti-Semitic effort to terrorize this peaceful community, I condemn this act in the strongest possible sense. Local community leaders and I are relieved that no one was hurt and the center went undamaged. Bringing those responsible to justice is my highest priority, and I publicly declare my intention to fully support law enforcement officials toward that end.

It is particularly ironic, having recently witnessed on Israeli soil the finalizing of the Hebron agreement, that despite the historic and committed peace underway in one of the most traditionally volatile regions of the world, the community of Mercer Island is living with violence. I am proud of my neighbors on Mercer Island who refuse to allow this violence to terrorize them into retreat. They have reacted with calm, and their composure is noble and to be greatly admired.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, indeed all of us, should note that what could have been a disastrous situation characterized by loss of precious life and honored property is instead a reminder of the work that lies before us. The good, peaceful, and law-abiding citizens of our communities and our country are ready to take this country back from terrorists and vandals. They will apprehend the lawless, prosecute them, and protect their communities. That's what the people of Mercer Island and the Jewish community are doing. I stand ready to help.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LEGAL SERVICES ELIGIBILITY ACT

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1997

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to ensure that no woman who is a victim of domestic violence will be denied legal services because of the economic status of her abuser.

The Domestic Violence Legal Services Eligibility Act states that in cases of domestic violence only, the Legal Services Corporation, in determining eligibility for services, will consider only the income of the client seeking services. Legal services clinics report that women fleeing the home of a spouse or a partner comprise the majority of their domestic violence cases. Yet the Legal Services Corporation guidelines currently state that eligibility for

services is determined by household income. In the case of a great number of legal services they provide, this is fair and appropriate in ensuring that people who live at or below the poverty level have access to legal services.

But for women fleeing abuse, the situation becomes complicated. Often these women do not have independent income, so the household income counted against her is that of the alleged abuser. This legislation would make certain that these women do not have to be denied legal services because of their spouse or partner's income.

As the new welfare law goes into effect, domestic violence victims will be among those hardest hit. More than 2 million women are abused by their husband or partner each year. It has been reported that more than half of the women currently receiving government assistance cite domestic violence as a factor.

We are responsible to do everything within our power to help victims of domestic violence escape abuse and start on the path to self-sufficiency. This is just one step on that path and I hope you will join me.

MICHAEL MANLEY: PATRIOT OF
JAMAICA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1997

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I join Michael Manley's many friends and admirers who mourn his loss in paying tribute to his remarkable life. Michael was my friend for more than 20 years and I greatly admire his visionary and inspirational leadership. He was a delightful personality with wide ranging interests who was always aware of, and involved in, the issues of the day. He was a committed patriot of Jamaica, a man of the Caribbean, and a person who represented all who struggled for justice, equality, and opportunity.

Michael was a teacher and a leader on the issues which have defined the challenge facing developing nations as they move from political independence toward sustainable development and economic viability. Michael had the capacity to envision a better world for all, the ability to articulate his vision, and the leadership to inspire us individually and collectively to aspire to goals beyond our reach.

Michael Manley's leadership was a global significance and impact. His struggle against apartheid in South Africa was internationally recognized by the award of the United Nations Gold Medal in 1978—the highest award of the Special Committee Against Apartheid. In addition, his work on economic issues, particularly the New International Economic Order, and the external debt problem of developing nations, marked him as one of the preeminent international political and economic thinkers of the contemporary era. His prolific writings on economics and politics include *Poverty of Nations*, 1991; *Up and Down Escalator*, 1987; *Jamaica Struggle in the Periphery*, 1982; *A Search for Solutions*, 1977; *A Voice of the Workplace*, 1973; and *Politics of Change*, 1973. He was a visiting professor at, and received honorary doctorates from, numerous institutions of higher learning in the Caribbean, Great Britain, and the United States.

Although retired from political life since 1993, he continued to be active in public af-

fairs. Michael Manley played a pivotal role in the restoration of democracy to Haiti and the transition to majority rule in South Africa, to which he led the Commonwealth Observer Mission that won praise from the new Government of South Africa.

I had the opportunity to work particularly closely with Michael in recent years, in the restoration of Haitian democracy, and I can personally attest to his influence in mobilizing the Organization of American States and the United Nations to become engaged in negotiating the return of President Aristide to complete the term to which he was elected as President of Haiti. Michael Manley showed me his commitment to justice and his love for the Caribbean as he applied his formidable intellectual and persuasive powers to the cause of democracy in Haiti. He had similarly committed a good portion of his public life to the struggle for self-determination in Africa and especially was a leader in the effort to end apartheid and bring about majority rule in South Africa.

Michael's global view did not make everyone comfortable. In the 1970's, the United States Government opposed his friendship with Cuba and his support of the Cuban troops sent to Angola to stop the advance of the South African apartheid regime. Michael suffered the wrath of the United States for his independence and was labeled a Communist sympathizer.

Michael was more than a Jamaican, more than a man of the Caribbean; he was a man with a global reach and vision who saw the challenge of reducing the great and tragic gap between the rich and the poor through the creation of a new international economic order.

Michael had the capacity to learn and change, to adopt new tactics to accomplish his goals in recognition of new and different circumstances. His economic message changed from the 1970's when I first met him and defended him against charges that he was a Communist. In the 1990's he emphasized private sector-led growth and development. Throughout he was a prime minister beloved of his people because he opened opportunities for participation to the disadvantaged and removed historical disabilities of gender, class, and privilege.

His loss will be felt in Jamaica, the Caribbean, the hemisphere, and throughout the world. Michael Manley's intellect, energy, and passion were universal in their commitment to freedom, equality, and justice. His extraordinary impact will be forever remembered.

THE CHANGING ROLE OF ENERGY
COMPANIES

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1997

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the changing role of energy companies in the United States as we look forward to the 21st century. It is ever apparent that we, as a country, are in the process of change. Technology is shaping the future of not only the way we think, but also the way we act and react to information that we receive and put out.

There is no doubt that energy companies, like other industries that touch the lives of

people across the globe, must change and adapt to meet the growing needs of people in a world that is affected by new technology daily. In fact, some may say that we are in the process of a new revolution; an information revolution.

Mr. Speaker, on this subject, I would like to introduce into the record an insightful speech by Philip J. Carroll, the president and CEO of Shell Oil Co., on *Adapting to a Revolution: The Challenges Facing Energy Companies in the 21st Century*.

ADAPTING TO A REVOLUTION: THE CHALLENGES
FACING ENERGY COMPANIES IN THE 21ST CENTURY

(By Philip J. Carroll)

INTRODUCTION

I have been invited here today to talk to you about one man's view of energy companies as we near the close of the 20th century and begin looking forward to the 21st. It's somewhat awkward standing before an energy audience at the end of the 20th century. I feel a bit like a Trannosaurus Rex in a Gary Larson cartoon speaking before the Society of Late Cretaceous Dinosaurs on "How to Enjoy the Cooler Weather"—he had the idea right, but didn't fully understand the implications of what was going on in his environment.

While there are no meteors crashing down from the sky, we all know that we are nonetheless in the midst of a change in our environment—a true revolution. This particular revolution is the "information revolution" and I want to talk to you about how it will change our markets, our organizations, and most importantly, how it will impact you individually.

A revolution is a brief period of time where the whole nature of a system makes a radical transformation from the way things "are" to the way things "will be." A revolution usually begins when existing institutions fail to meet the present needs. When coupled with a vision of the way things "ought to be" from forces outside the establishment, a revolution results in great turmoil as the opposing sides struggle to define the future.

I believe that a dominant theme of this revolution will be to place less value on physical assets and much more value on human. This will mean that our organizational structures, and the people within them, will have to adapt rapidly to changing and increasingly competitive markets.

BACKGROUND

Allow me to go back in history a bit to try to set the stage. Humankind spent thousands of years making the first revolutionary transition from hunting to farming. This time scale was so long, that its study is relegated mostly to the field of archeology. Life during the agrarian age was simple, but quite hard. People toiled physically day in and day out, just to provide for the basic human needs of food and clothing. Change continued during this age as organizations moved from large feudal systems to single family farms. With each change came new responsibilities, but also new freedoms and opportunities. In spite of the drawbacks and tough conditions, the human welfare was nonetheless improved as civilization continued to grow.

The next revolution, the industrial revolution, was a phenomenon principally of the last century. It began at the dawn of the 19th century with the introduction of simple machines in the British textile mills, and the perfection of the steam engine in the British coal industry—both of which substantially reduced production costs. Although commerce itself had been around for thousands of years, these new industrial capabilities