honor to Andrew. It is an appropriate tribute for his remarkable efforts during those harrowing and darkest of days in Budapest during 1944. Andrew repeatedly risked his own life to save the lives of others. He was motivated not simply by the instinct to survive and to preserve himself, but by the drive and the passion and the commitment to help others, and that is what makes Andrew unique.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate and meaningful that Andrew Stevens has been honored by President Goncz of Hungary and by the people of Hungary in presenting to him this high honor. It is also a tribute to the Government and people of the newly democratic Hungary that they have chosen to honor Andrew Stevens.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are fortunate to have as an honored citizen of our Nation a man of integrity, compassion, and commitment such as Andrew Stevens. America is richer for his life and for the contributions he has made to his adopted country.

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that the awarding of this honor to Andrew will strengthen the ties of mutual friendship between the United States and Hungary. I invite my colleagues in the Congress to join me in paying tribute to Andrew Stevens.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector:

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my opposition to the so-called Working Families Flexibility Act, H.R. 1. While skillfully titled, this legislation will not, in fact, help today's working families cope with the struggles they face. Instead, this legislation will make life harder for those who toil each week to provide for their families. Perhaps it is unintentional, but unfortunately this bill represents yet another proposal put forth by the majority which will increase the strain on working families and jeopardize our Nation's basic workplace protections. The Democratic substitute that I support, on the other hand, offers employees the work schedule flexibility they desire while ensuring that the choice for compensatory time off rather than overtime pay is truly voluntary.

H.R. I attempts to offer workers a choice between overtime pay and compensatory time off when they work more than 40 hours per week, a goal which many of us would agree is reasonable. However, the bill does not assure that the employer-employee agreements on this subject will be truly voluntary. Under the bill, employers who wish to offer compensatory time rather than overtime retain authority to impose this choice on their employees. Today's workers, who face a climate of reduced job security and corporate downsizing, will find it difficult to reject their employers stated preference for time off rather than overtime pay. For example, employers could screen job applicants or assign overtime to employees according to their willingness to accept comptime.

Another flaw with H.R. 1 is that it gives employers too much authority over when an employee could take the comptime he or she has earned. Employers would have the power to deny an employee's request for comptime on the grounds that it unduly disrupts their business operations, or they could deny the request for the day requested and instead offer another day which suits the employer's schedule. With employees thus having insufficient say over when their earned comptime can be used, the goal of providing flexibility for workers to attend to family matters has not been achieved.

By reducing opportunities for overtime pay, H.R. 1 is particularly damaging to the many workers in today's economy who depend on overtime to maintain a decent standard of living for themselves and their families. Fully two-thirds of the workers who earned overtime in 1994 had a total family income of less than $40,000. For these many workers at the low end of the wage scale, the extra dollars earned from overtime can mean the difference between family self-sufficiency and government dependence. At a time when we are rightly demanding that people move from welfare to work, we must not remove a basic safeguard—overtime pay for hours worked in excess of 40 per week—that has allowed low-wage workers to stand on their own.

Unlike the majority's bill, the Democratic substitute ensures that the choice for comptime will be exclusively the employee's so that those who depend on overtime pay to make ends meet will not be forced to abandon this important source of income. In addition to requiring that it be the employee who requests comptime, the Democratic substitute also requires employers to offer comptime to all employees who are similarly situated. The majority's bill, on the other hand, would allow employers to pick and choose which employees will be offered comptime. The Democratic substitute also exempts from the comptime provisions certain segments of the work force that are particularly dependent on overtime wages, including part-time, temporary, and seasonal workers, and those in the garment, construction, and agriculture trades.

Mr. Chairman, the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act have served this Nation well. They protect workers from demands for excessive work, reward—in a financially meaningful way—those who put in extra time for their employer, and—by requiring premium pay for overtime—provide an incentive for businesses to create additional jobs. Thus, we must proceed carefully when enacting legislation which makes changes to our overtime laws, even for the laudable goal of giving employees greater flexibility with respect to their work schedules. Unfortunately, H.R. 1 does not demonstrate the requisite legislative caution. It weakens the Fair Labor Standards Act's overtime provisions while giving employers additional authority over the work schedules of their employees. This is not the way to help today's working families. Instead, we should pursue the course laid out in the Democratic substitute—offer flexibility to employees while protecting absolutely their ability to choose overtime rather than comptime.

IN HONOR OF THE PARISHIONERS OF THE CHURCH OF ST. LEO THE GREAT ON THEIR 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1997

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the dedication and achievement of the parishioners of the Church of St. Leo the Great of Cleveland, OH, on their 25th anniversary.

Approximately 120 members have assisted the pastor and associates with a multitude of volunteer work. They have performed the important functions of acolytes, readers, and eucharistic ministers. They have contributed a portion of their earnings to the Vincent De Paul Society, which looks after the poor of the parish. They have visited the sick and aged at hospitals and nursing homes. They have sung in the choir and they have helped families in their times of mourning.

St. Leo's volunteers give of themselves, and in doing that, they make Cleveland a better place.

BOB DORNAN'S DAY

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1997

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, if Bob Dornan had appeared in the well during the recent St. Patrick's period, he would have recited the following, which he described as coming from an Irish voice.

We appreciated Bob Dornan's wonderful flights of history and rhetoric and we do this in his stead and in his honor.

The article follows:

I arise today
Through a mighty strength, the invocation of the Trinity,
Through belief in the threeness,
Through confession of the oneness
Of the Creator of Creation.

I arise today
Through the strength of Christ's birth with his baptism,
Through the strength of his crucifixion with his burial,
Through the strength of his resurrection with his ascension,
Through the strength of his descent for the judgment of Doom.

I arise today
Through the strength of the love of Cherubim,
In obedience of angels,
In the service of archangels,
In hope of resurrection to meet with reward,
In prayers of patriarchs,
In predictions of prophets,
In preaching of apostles,
In faith of confessors,
In innocence of holy virgins,
In deeds of righteous men.

I arise today
Through the strength of heaven,
Light of sun,
Radiance of moon,
Splendor of fire,
Speed of lightning,
Swiftness of wind,
Depth of sea,

Stability of earth,
Firmness of rock.

I arise today
Through God's strength to pilot me,
God's might to uphold me,
God's wisdom to guide me,
God's eye to look before me,
God's ear to hear me,
God's word to speak for me,
God's hand to guard me,
God's way to lie before me,
God's shield to protect me,
God's host to save me,
From snares of devils,
From temptations of vices,
From everyone who shall wish me ill,
Afar and anear,
Alone and in multitude.

I summon today all these powers between me and those evils,
Against every cruel merciless power that may oppose my body and soul,
Against incantations of false prophets,
Against black laws of pagandom,
Against false laws of heretics,
Against craft of idolatry,
Against spells of witches and smiths and wizards,
Against every knowledge that corrupts man's body and soul.

Christ to shield me today,
Against poison, against burning,
Against drowning, against wounding,
So that there may come to me abundance of reward,
Christ with me, Christ before me, Christ behind me,
Christ in me, Christ beneath me, Christ above me,
Christ on my right, Christ on my left,
Christ when I lie down, Christ when I sit down, Christ when I rise,
Christ in the heart of every man who thinks of me,
Christ in the mouth of everyone who speaks of me,
Christ in every eye that sees me,
Christ in every ear that hears me.

I arise today
Through a mighty strength, the invocation of the Trinity,
Through belief in the threeness,
Through confession of the oneness,
Of the Creator of Creation.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1997

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to voice my opposition to H.R. 1122. H.R. 1122 as it is written now presents us with a moral issue, a religious issue and, as Members of Congress who have sworn to uphold the U.S. Constitution, a constitutional issue.

Partial-birth abortions are performed because a physician, with the benefit of his expertise and experience, determines that, given a woman's particular circumstances, this procedure is the safest available to her; that this is the procedure most likely to preserve her health and her future fertility. Only a doctor can make this determination. We, in Congress, should not interfere with the close relationship that exists between a doctor and patient; but more importantly her spiritual leader and her God.

It is a tragic fact that sometimes a mother's health is threatened by the abnormalities of the fetus that she is carrying. When this occurs the mother is faced with a terrible decision whether to carry a fetus suffering from fatal anomalies to term and in so doing jeopardize her own health and future fertility or whether to abort the fetus and preserve her chances of bringing a later healthy life into the world.

When a woman is faced with this type of painful circumstance, it is one that she should face free from Government interference. This is too intimate, too personal, and too fragile a decision to be a choice made by the Government. We should protect the sanctity of the woman's right to privacy and of the home by letting this choice remain in her hands. Families and their physicians, not politicians, should make these difficult decisions. It is a decision that should be between a woman, her spiritual leader, and her God.

I am reminded of the story of King Solomon. In that story Solomon is faced with deciding between two women who claim that a certain male child is their own. The power and authority to determine to whom that child belongs rests only with King Solomon, but in his wisdom this man gave those mothers the power to choose the child's fate. In his wisdom, King Solomon realized that the relationship between a mother and child is one with which the State should not interfere.

I believe that anti-abortion activists are truly committed to preserving the sanctity of life. However, those Members in their wisdom, should accept a compromise that would protect the health and life of the mother. With such an exception this legislation would have been made law last year and many of these procedures could have been averted.

In addition, we can not ignore the fact that H.R. 1122 is unconstitutional. We, in Congress, should not attempt to undercut the law of the land as set forth by the U.S. Supreme Court in Roe versus Wade. In Roe the Supreme Court held that women had a privacy interest in electing to have an abortion. This right is qualified, however, and so must be balanced against the State's interest in protecting prenatal life. The Roe Court determined that post-viability the State has a compelling interest in protecting prenatal life and may ban abortion, except when necessary to preserve the woman's life or health. In line with this decision, 41 States have already passed bans on late term abortions, except where the life or health of the mother is involved.

In Planned Parenthood versus Casey, the Court held that the States may not limit a woman's right to an abortion prior to viability when it places an ''undue burden'' on that right. An undue burden is one that has ''the purpose or effect of placing a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion of a nonviable fetus.'' Let's not try to overturn the law of the land.

H.R. 1122 in its current form interferes with a woman's access to the abortion procedure that her doctor has determined to be safest for her, and so unduly burdens her right to choose. It is therefore inconsistent with the principles outlined in Roe and Casey, which have been reaffirmed by every subsequent Supreme Court decision on this issue, and so is unconstitutional.

I ask my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1122 and in so doing signal their commitment to preserving the health and future fertility of American women and to upholding the U.S. Constitution.

TRAGEDIES ARE EYE-OPENING

HON. SCOTTY BAESLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1997

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Speaker, tragedies are eye-opening. They reveal a great deal about the human spirit. They teach us about the value of things we often take for granted in our fast-paced workaday world. Natural disasters have a way of changing our smug assumptions about being self-made people who can live to ourselves and by ourselves.

Nevertheless, after nights of rain and ruin, floodwaters and frustration, storm damage and damaged nerves, mud and swamped homes and businesses, we are ready to learn a little more about the human spirit and the need for community.

The recent weather threw Kentucky a curve ball. Streets became canals and roadways became rivers. Cars and trucks competed with boats and rafts for the right of way. Floodwaters transformed neighborhood parks into tributaries as nature ran amok.

Yet during those dreary days, something remarkable occurred. The human spirit also underwent a transformation. Not too long ago the practice of bashing the Federal Government was the number one spectator sport. Not anymore in Kentucky.

Homeowners and residents were, to say the least, grateful for the role played by officials with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Not only was the agency Johnny-on-the-spot in responding to the emergency, it also brought comfort to worried residents who saw their homes and hopes swallowed by floodwaters.

From the Governor and other State officials on down the line to local leaders, our public servants became just that: the servants of the people in need. They were at the top of their forms too.

Emergency crews worked around the clock to ensure that Kentuckians would have the resources not only to combat and cope with the flooding, but also to provide the means of recovering from its toll. The spirit of cooperation came alive in the floodwaters and storm damage. County officials worked across county lines to make sure that residents had bottled water, dry clothing, and temporary ports in the storm. The business community pitched in. They hauled fresh water supplies by rail to weather-weary residents. They donated large sums of money to help victims recover.

The disaster transformed ordinary citizens into local heroes. They pulled people from rooftop refuges and snatched weary drivers from cars stalled in high water. The rescuers battled swift currents in rowboats, crossed streams transformed overnight into raging rivers and battled mudslides to help residents from their inundated homes.

Centuries ago someone asked the question, ''who is my neighbor?'' Although the word comes from an old English word meaning ''near dweller,'' the proximity of people does not define neighborliness.

It is the proximity of the human heart during the crisis moment that defines it. In a crisis