prestigious universities and are flourishing professionals.

Through the years, Mr. Rubin has also been an active participant in community affairs. He has served in many leadership positions for various organizations such as the United Democratic Organization, the NYS Senate Staff, and the Hadassah and Deborah Hospitals. He has also been an extremely active member of the Genesis Lodge. These time and effort consuming activities were all in addition to his involvement in the Pythian Organization as Grand Chancellor and member of the Grand Lodge Committees.

Grand Chancellor Rubin's determined and altruistic personality makes him a natural leader in community affairs. His various involvements have not gone unnoticed; he has been rewarded with various distinguished awards and honors, including the Man of the Year Award, the Distinguished Service Award, Humanitarian Award, Life Membership Memorial Award, and the most coveted of all honors. The Degree of the Golden Spur.

We are proud and honored to welcome home the Grand Chancellor of the Pythian Knights, William Rubin. His leadership abilities and qualities, as well as his concern for the community make him a true role model and friend.

DEMOCRACY TRANSITION PACKAGE

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the third bill in my Democracy Transition Package, a resolution that would return the District's limited right to vote on the House floor in the Committee of the Whole to the rules package for the 106th Congress. I ask Congress to return the delegate vote that I won in the 103rd Congress out of respect for the more than half million taxpaying residents whom I represent. This vote was withdrawn from all five delegates in the 104th Congress, but, as I will indicate, I do not believe the withdrawal was an act focused on the District and its unique circumstances as the home of the only taxpaying residents without full congressional representation. The repeal was wrapped in a package of rules, and the District was never considered individually. On behalf of my constituents, to whom the vote is deeply meaningful, I ask my colleagues to support this important measure.

Without disparaging the rights of the other delegates to seek the return of their votes, I base my request on the unique responsibilities and equities particular to the District of Columbia. I supported the rationale of the decision that gave all the delegates the vote in the Committee of the Whole, namely that, historically, delegates have been accorded the same treatment. At the same time, there are important differences between the District and the territories, most notably, that the District is subject to federal income taxes.

The unique circumstances and equities that argue for a vote for the District can be embodied in four principles.

Principle No. 1—I represent the only Americans who pay federal income taxes but have no vote on the House floor; my constituents pay $1.7 billion annually in federal income taxes, making them third per capita among the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The District is the only territory under the jurisdiction of the United States whose citizens are subject to every obligation of citizenship, notably federal taxation, but remain barred from sending a voting representative to the House and Senate. Unlike the delegate from the District, the delegates from American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands do not represent citizens who pay federal income taxes. Yet, fortunately, they enjoy full self-government and the District does not, and they are afforded the same representation in Congress as the District.

Principle No. 2—I represent the only Americans whose budget governing the expenditure of their own locally raised tax dollars must be enacted by the Congress. The passage of the President's Revitalization package ensures that nearly all of the District's local budget will now be D.C. taxpayer-raised revenues. As the first measure in my Democracy Transition package and with the support of the President, I introduced a bill that would eliminate the D.C. Appropriations subcommittees in the Congress to reflect this important change.

Principle No. 3—I represent the only Americans who do not enjoy full democratic self-government. The four territories, like the states and localities, are self governing under accepted principles of democracy without interference from the Congress. Under the Home Rule Act of 1973, the Congress reserves and exercises the right to revoke and change the laws and budget of the District consisting of locally raised revenues. As the second measure in my Democracy Transition package, I introduced a bill that would allow the District to enact its own laws free of Congressional approval.

Principle No. 4—I represent more than a half million residents, a population more than some Congressional districts.

The District Court of the District of Columbia and the Court of Appeals for this circuit have ruled that there is no constitutional impediment to extending voting rights to delegates in the House to the Committee of the Whole. Article I, Section 5, Clause 2 which states that, ''Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings'' is the constitutional basis for this ruling. Had the case gone against the House, an extraordinary precedent for intrusion by the courts into the Rules and proceedings of this body that no one in the House desires would have resulted.

The House granted a limited right to delegates to vote in the Committee of the Whole on the basis of a legal memorandum that I prepared that was factually grounded in the District's taxpaying status. The other territories were granted the vote at the same time to avoid differential treatment, although, of course, taxpaying status legitimately sets the District apart from the residents of the territories, who do not pay federal income taxes to the federal treasury. Subsequently, the courts approved delegate voting as granted by the Rules of the House, removing any legal or constitutional question.

My vote in the Committee of the Whole still left taxpaying District citizens without a vote in the formal House and without any vote in the Senate. To avoid any constitutional question, a re-vote requirement provided that a delegate's vote would never decide an issue before the Committee of the Whole if the delegate's vote provided the deciding margin.

the work of the Committee of the Whole is no more final than that of standing committees, such as Transportation and Infrastructure and Judiciary, where Delegates have long had the vote. Therefore, nothing done in the Committee of the Whole is final until the full House acts. My constituents do no assert that they yet meet the constitutional requirements for full voting membership in the House, inasmuch as the District is not a state. What my constituents do meet each and every day is each and every obligation of citizenship, including paying every federal tax paid by other American citizens, serving in the armed forces, and being subject to all obligations required by the nation's laws. District residents have fought and died in every war since the American Revolution and sent more citizens to fight the nation's most recent war, Operation Desert Storm, than did 47 states.

Most Americans today would almost surely agree that citizens who are third per capita in federal income taxes should have the right to vote in the Committee of the Whole if that is constitutionally permissible. Denying me my vote in the Committee of the Whole punishes hard working taxpaying Americans. The House gains by adherence to its often expressed democratic principles while losing nothing if my vote is returned. It would mean a great deal to the people I represent at this critical time in the life of the nation's capital. Disempowering me cannot help in my work to help dispel the District's current problems.

A vote in the Committee of the Whole would give District residents a vote on most matters—several steps up from being a representative confined to debating while other Members vote on her local laws and her local taxpayer raised budget and revenues. In a body that justifiably gives great deference to taxpaying Americans, allowing a vote to a jurisdiction that ranks higher in federal income taxes than almost all others is a matter of simple justice.

The unique taxpaying status of my constituents, the unique privilege this body assumes of appropriating locally raised taxpayer revenue, the unique requirement to bring each and every action taken to the local city council to a body in which residents have no voting representation, and the significant population of the District makes the District's case unique. The vote in the Committee of the Whole should be granted to the District, considering the principle that produced the nation itself: no taxation without representation. Under these circumstances, the House should do all that is constitutionally permissible. I ask my colleagues to restore my limited voting rights in the House and afford the respect that the residents of the nation's capital are due.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL HEFNER

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend Paul Hefner, who has just completed a remarkably successful tenure as President of the Greater San Fernando Chamber of Commerce. In 1997, Paul began his one-year term as Chairman of the San Fernando Chamber of Commerce. Under Paul's able leadership, the Chamber has grown and engaged in a series of successful outreach efforts, which led to changing the name to the ''Greater'' San Fernando Chamber. Paul's affable personality and business experience proved to be of tremendous value in this effort.

For 25 years, Paul worked with First Interstate Bank of California. He began as a branch operations officer, and rose through the ranks to hold a number of senior positions, including Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff, Los Angeles Metro Division. He played a major role in creating the first multi-state First Interstate image and several automation projects, including Cirrus, the national automated teller machine network.

In 1989, Paul left First Interstate and formed his own business, Words in Motion, which he established in his hometown of San Fernando. Words in Motion is a unique business, one that reflects the strong spirituality of its founder. Paul's company specializes in the resolution of Christian church disputes, offering assistance to those seeking to resolve disputes in a biblically faithful manner.

I don't know whether Paul put this training to work as President of the San Fernando Chamber. What I do know is that by common consensus 1997–98 was one of the most productive years in Chamber history. In August, a few weeks after Paul assumed the chairmanship, The Chamber entered into a consulting services agreement with the City of San Fernando to conduct four key economic development programs for the business community. And under Paul's leadership the Chamber has changed from a primarily volunteer-based organization to one with a full-time, professional staff.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Paul Hefner, a great Chamber Chairman, an exceptional businessman and an extremely nice guy. I salute him for his extraordinary efforts on behalf of the business community of San Fernando and the Northeast San Fernando Valley.

HONORING DANIEL CARTER BEARD

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Daniel Carter Beard, the founder of the Boy Scouts of America, for his contributions to the young people of our country. I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the outstanding achievements of Daniel Carter Beard, who made his home in my Congressional District in Suffern, which is located in Rockland County, New York. This year Rockland County, as part of its celebrations of its bicentennial, is honoring this distinguished former resident of our county.

On June 14th, the Hudson Valley Boy Scout Council/Rockland District of the Boy Scouts of America will be honoring Daniel Carter Beard with the dedication of a new bronze plaque. This dedication coincides with the Rockland County Bicentennial Celebration.

Born in Cincinnati, Ohio in 1850, Daniel Carter Beard enjoyed camping and exploring the wilderness as a child. This early interest sowed the seeds of a later passion for the outdoors and a career as an illustrator. Beard studied engineering at Covington, Kentucky and art at the Art Students League in New York City. By 1900, Beard had received national recognition for his illustrations in many wildlife and outdoor magazines.

In 1905, Beard became the editor of Recreation, a sportsmen magazine, which under his direction became a voice in wildlife conservation. Daniel Carter Beard also founded the Sons of Daniel Boone; a group dedicated to conservation, to the outdoor life, and the pioneer spirit. By 1909, he founded the Boy Pioneers of America. This group, like the Sons of Daniel Boone, was a way to improve the lives of urban youths, according to Beard.

Following the success of a youth movement in England, Beard worked to start the Boy Scouts of America which were chartered in 1910. As founder of the BSA, Beard designed the hat, shirt, and neckerchief to be worn as a symbol of the American frontier.

Beard appreciated the importance of preserving the dwindling frontier and felt it was important to stop the deterioration of the wilderness. He recognized that the frontier way of life was rapidly disappearing forever, and recognized the importance of preserving this rich heritage for future generations. He taught our young people how to camp, hunt, fish, and to appreciate their environment. The Boy Scouts of America continue to instruct these ideals and to preserve the teachings of Daniel Carter Beard.

Subsequently, Beard's personality made him a folk hero to many young men who attended his camp in Pennsylvania and read his articles in Boys Life. He became known as ''Uncle Dan,'' with his public appearances wearing a buck skin suit, and his monthly columns describing his experiences in the wilderness.

Daniel Carter Beard died at the ripe age of 90, after living a life full of many experiences and accomplishments. His legacy lives on through his books, illustrations, and stories. Board was laid to rest at the Brick Church Cemetery, not far from his home, Brooklands, in Suffern. He has continued to touch the lives of America's youth with his contributions to scouting and wildlife conservation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Daniel Carter Beard. The Boy Scouts of America has been an important part of my of my life since my youth, and I recognize that it is an important outlet for young men to learn to appreciate their natural surroundings and to value all that nature has given us, and to hold character as they learn the importance of integrity, hard work, and brotherhood.

AMERICANS DON'T NEED SPEECH NANNIES

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the RECORD Douglas Johnson's insightful and valuable analysis of campaign regulation proposals and their impact on freedom of speech. I hope my colleagues will examine it prior to supporting so-called campaign ''reform'' measures.

[From National Right to Life News, Sept. 30, 1997]

DO AMERICAN VOTERS NEED SPEECH NANNIES?

(By Douglas Johnson)

Many incumbent members of Congress are eager to provide America's voters with a new government service—a federal law to protect them from messages about politicians that may ''manipulate'' simple-minded voters, especially those communications that are ''negative'' in tone, or that will result in ''unhealthy'' debate.

Yes, if Senator John McCain, Senator Russ Feingold, Common Cause, and their allies get their way, federal legislators, political appointees, and FEC career speech regulators will become the political speech nannies for the rest of us. They will do their utmost to shield their fellow citizens from an excess of information and claims about politicians—conflicting messages that may confuse and befuddle them, or even trick them into voting for the ''wrong'' candidates.

If you do not regard yourself as being in need of such a service from your government, then maybe it's time for you to take a closer look at the McCain-Feingold bill. The latest revision, currently on the Senate floor, contains speech-nanny provisions that are even stronger than those found in earlier versions, and astonishing in their brazenness.

In recent days, the media have reported that the new bill would restrict broadcast ads that mention candidates within 60 days of an election. However, the bill actually contains multiple speech restrictions that sweep far more broadly than the 60-day provision.

The other, less publicized provisions encompass both print and broadcast communications—and apply year around. The bill would generally prohibit unions and corporations—including issue-advocacy groups such as National Right to Life, the ACLU, or the Sierra Club—from paying for communications to the public at any time of the year that federal regulators consider to be ''for the purpose of influencing a federal election,'' if the sponsoring organization is deemed to have any of ten broad categories of links (direct or indirect, actual or presumed) to a candidate, including the mere sharing of professional vendors. ''Candidate'' includes all incumbent members of Congress, unless they have announced their retirement, starting the day after any election.

AND ''EXCEPTION'' THAT PROVES THE RULE

Sen. McCain has made much of what he calls an ''exception'' which he claims would protect the right to disseminate certain printed information about the voting records of Members of Congress and the positions of candidates, including so-called ''voter-guides.''

Actually, however, the so-called ''exception'' amounts to an elaborate set of ''speech specifications,'' spelling out what type of information on politicians' votes and positions