

provide for the collection of data with respect to the number of nonimmigrants who remain in the United States after the expiration of the period of stay authorized by the Attorney General:

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the issue before us today is not a question of illegal immigration, there is no threat of an impending wave of illegal Greek or Portuguese immigration to the United States.

The question before us is one of fairness. It is a question of doing what is right by two countries who are our allies, our friends and our business partners. It is fair and right to extend the same rights to Greece and Portugal that we do to 25 other nations—the right to enter the U.S. freely for travel and business.

Prior to the passage of the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform Act, Greece and Portugal would have been admitted to the Visa Waiver Program because their visa refusal rates are below three percent.

Concern about illegal immigration is misplaced and fails to recognize that the Greek and Portuguese economies are strong and unemployment rates are among the lowest in Europe—there is little incentive for people to leave their enchanting countries for ours.

Moreover, immigration to the United States from those countries is no greater than U.S. immigration to Greece and Portugal.

Finally, both of these communities have made enormous contributions to our country. In my district, the Portuguese American community has transformed part of New Jersey's great cities—Newark, Elizabeth, and Perth Amboy. And the Greek community's influence has been equally remarkable.

We need to level the playing field and let the Portuguese and Greek people know that the United States welcomes them as tourists and business travelers, as we do their other European counterparts.

CONFIDENCE IN THE FAMILY ACT

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 27, 1998

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, there now exists a serious defect in our Federal criminal and civil law and procedures that has unfortunately been brought into focus by Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's investigation of the President. Under Federal law and the law of most States, children can be compelled to testify against their parents, and parents against their children. Although most prosecutors refrain from subjecting a family to this terrible situation, it can and does occur. I have long believed that parents and their children should be shielded from this trauma, and that doing so would not do significant damage to the administration of justice.

Therefore, today I am introducing a bill, the Confidence in the Family Act, to ensure that parents and children cannot be compelled to testify against one another, and that confidential communications between parents and children will be protected. These privileges would be similar to the privileges provided to spouses under current Federal law, and would be developed by the Federal courts in light of the common law, reason, and experience.

Under current law a mother can be given the choice of providing testimony that reveals

her daughter's most personal confidences, or go to jail herself. A child can be put on the witness stand and forced to reveal personal discussions with his Dad. It does not matter if this testimony relates to the most private confidences that parents and children often share in the course of seeking comfort, support, or advice.

The damage that such an experience can cause parents, children, and familial relationships is readily apparent, and worthy of our concern.

It is not at all clear that forcing parents and children to testify against each other provides great access to truth and justice. When a potential witness is put into such a predicament, they face what legal scholars refer to as the cruel "trilemma." The witness has three choices: they may testify truthfully, they may testify and lie, or they may refuse to testify and risk contempt charges and imprisonment. Among these options, testifying falsely may often be the most appealing. The other choices certainly have serious societal repercussions.

Most jurisdictions recognize privileges for individuals in certain relationships (e.g., husband-wife, lawyer-client, psychiatrist-patient) to refrain from testifying. Surely, the confidences shared between a mother and daughter deserve at least as much respect as those between psychiatrists and patients. I believe that the law should recognize the special nature of the relationship between a parent and child, and that is the basis for this legislation.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in support of this important decision.

PERSIAN GULF VETERANS HEALTH CARE EXTENSION ACT OF 1998 H.R. 3571

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 27, 1998

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to extend the period that Gulf War veterans with undiagnosed illnesses will be able to receive Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health care. This measure will extend the authority for VA to provide treatment from December 31, 1998 until December 31, 2001. This extension makes the timeline for health care eligibility consistent with the presumptive period the Secretary of Veterans Affairs defined for compensation for disabilities due to undiagnosed illnesses.

More than a year ago, I encouraged VA to extend the presumptive period for compensation because no one could explain why so many veterans had health care problems following their military service in the Persian Gulf. Former VA Secretary Jesse Brown justified the extension of the presumptive period by stating that no one knows why so many veterans are still sick—seven years after serving in the Southwest Asian theater. Of the almost 700,000 individuals who served in the Persian Gulf, about 65,000 veterans have signed onto the VA's Persian Gulf Registry and about 19,000 have registered for DOD's Comprehensive Clinical Evaluation Program. VA's latest Gulf War Veteran's Statistics indicate that, of those veterans on VA's registry, about 11% have undiagnosed illnesses. In re-

sponse to the continuing health care problems reported by these veterans, Congress enacted legislation last year to require VA to develop innovative treatment programs for these veterans and to document the effectiveness of these programs in treating veterans. I believe the large number of veterans still suffering demonstrates the need for continuing to provide VA health care services for undiagnosed illnesses.

The Persian Gulf Veterans Health Care Extension Act of 1998 follows my introduction of H.R. 3279, the Persian Gulf Veterans Act of 1998. H.R. 3279 establishes a permanent process for awarding compensation for conditions presumed to be service-connected by virtue of Gulf War service. It also addresses the need for research in many areas, including defining effective health care treatments for those who have vague or undiagnosed symptoms and investigating emerging technologies to assess exposure to various hazards and agents. The legislation would also require VA and DOD to develop information resources, and mandate VA and DOD to document their outreach programs for veterans and active duty military members.

Our nation must continue to respond to Persian Gulf veterans' need for a complete range of benefits. Veterans still want to know why they are sick, but also need health care that can alleviate their pain and compensation to ensure that the effects of their illnesses do not impoverish them and their families. Continuing VA's authority to deliver health care benefits for conditions resulting from undiagnosed illnesses is critical to ensuring that Persian Gulf veterans get the services they still need. It is essential to continue to provide health care treatment to veterans as we continue to seek answers about the cause of their conditions.

FAIRNESS FOR SMALL BUSINESS AND EMPLOYEES ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3246) to assist small businesses and labor organizations in defending themselves against government bureaucracy; to ensure that employees entitled to reinstatement get their jobs back quickly; to protect the right of employers to have a hearing to present their case in certain representation cases; and to prevent the use of the National Labor Relations Act for the purpose of disrupting or inflicting economic harm on employers.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation, which attempts to silence workers and diminish their ability to stand against discrimination in the workplace.

This bill prevents employees the opportunity to bargain or to protect their rights in the workplace. The bill subjects workers to an unreasonable and unjust test of motivation in order to gain employment, and will intimidate employees into giving up their right to join a union.

We currently have established laws to protect employers from workers performing illegal