

being established in many districts in which urban institutions provide a "rural track", training residents to serve in rural communities. The definition of facilities allowed "special consideration" under the cap restrictions should be expanded to include programs that are targeting rural communities, even if the hospital itself is located in a non-rural area. Many small community hospitals offer only one residency program, and these are primarily family practice programs. Those hospitals with only a single residency program should be exempt from the cap in order to allow the facilities the flexibility to adapt to the needs of their community.

Another shortfall of the GME reimbursement changes effects new primary care residency programs which were in the process of expanding their programs to meet the needs of their rural communities when the Balanced Budget Act became law. The published interim final rule arbitrarily utilizes August 5, 1997 as the date by which all new residency programs had to fill their allocation of residency slots. There are programs that were recently accredited which did not have time to meet their full allotment of residency slots. For this reason, the legislation I am introducing today would change the cut-off date to September 30, 1999. These developing programs should be allowed to come to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, similar legislation has been introduced in the other body of my colleagues and friend, Senator SUSAN COLLINS. I ask that Members of the House examine how their rural residency programs will be affected by the GME changes mandated by the Balanced Budget Act, and that they support this legislation which seeks only to give rural communities an opportunity to meet the health care needs of their citizens.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN E. LOBBIA

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1998

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, a good friend is retiring in Michigan and I wanted to share a letter that the Michigan delegation sent to John Lobbia, CEO of Detroit Edison Company.

MR. JOHN E. LOBBIA
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The Detroit Edison Company, 2000 2nd Avenue, Detroit, Michigan

DEAR MR. LOBBIA. On behalf of the entire Michigan Congressional Delegation, it is a great honor for us to wish you a long, healthy, and happy retirement. Congratulations on the completion of an outstanding career.

Under your guidance, Detroit Edison has emerged as a national leader, known for its quality, competitiveness, and innovation. More than two million Michigan homes and businesses count on Detroit Edison for their energy needs. Your success at meeting those demands has helped to power Michigan through its economic renaissance and emerge as one of the nation's most successful states.

But we recognize that many of the milestones of your career occurred outside Detroit Edison. Your unwavering support for a number of civic and community organizations has left an indelible mark on our state. Clearly, your caring and support of our community runs deep—the mark of a true leader.

Again, congratulations on your many years of service to Detroit Edison and to Michigan. With respect and admiration we remain,

Very truly yours,
FRED UPTON,
Member of Congress.
JOHN DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

HONORING LAKESIDE FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1998

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Lakeside Family and Children's Services on their Seventy-fifth Anniversary. Lakeside Family and Children's Services has been a shining example of what a community together can accomplish and what effect the selfless service of individuals can have on children.

On October 1, 1998 Lakeside Family and Children's Services will celebrate this special anniversary. The Gala Dinner will be held at the New York Hilton Hotel and Towers, and will celebrate the "Jewels of Lakeside," the children and the families that it serves.

Three individuals deserve special recognition for the care and love they have shown as foster parents. Rufina Rodriguez, Felix and Ingrid Simeon have each provided warm loving homes to children and are being honored by Lakeside for the tremendous service that they have performed. Nothing can be more difficult than to open your life to a child and act as a parent for a short time. Giving your entire heart to the child, who in many cases has gone without the love of a parent for far too long, is one of the most trying experiences an individual can face. Rufina, Felix and Ingrid must be commended for their accomplishment, and for the love that they have given to such deserving children.

Seventy-five years is a very long time for an organization to maintain a high quality service, yet Lakeside Family & Children's Services has accomplished just that. Lakeside was a beacon of light to countless children during the darkest hours of the Depression, a home to children while the world was torn by war, and a launching pad for children today as they reach the 21st century.

When Lakeside first began in 1923 it was an orphanage, providing a home to children who had lost their parents and had no family to turn to. Orphanages played a very important role in that era as many children were left by parents who had to search for work and eke out an existence during one of the darkest times in our nation's history.

Today Lakeside Family and Children's Services provides so much more. Lakeside matches children to foster parents so that a child can have the feeling of a real home. For many fortunate children Lakeside is able to find adoptive parents who take a child in as their own. Lakeside also provides adolescents with group homes and greater chances for independent living. As Lakeside has grown, so have the options available to the children it serves.

Lakeside has also become an active service to children with disabilities. Today, Lakeside

offers residential alternatives for mentally retarded and developmentally disabled children. This specific service shows how the role Lakeside has undertaken has grown over 75 years. Lakeside Family and Children's Services has adapted to the community as our needs change. Today it is as critical to the youths in our community as it was 75 years ago.

Lakeside Family and Children's Services must be commended for the superb job that it has done for our society. Life has changed in many ways over the last 75 years, but one thing has remained constant, the need for caring individuals. Our children are the most vulnerable to the dangers of our society, and are in critical need of the services provided by Lakeside and organizations like it throughout our nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join in honoring Lakeside Family and Children's Services and foster parent honorees Rufina Rodriguez, Felix and Ingrid Simeon. We should encourage more individuals to be like them and to help extraordinary organizations like Lakeside.

REMARKS CONCERNING RULE 30 OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE AND RESTORATION OF THE STENOGRAPHIC PREFERENCE

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1998

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation that will restore the stenographic preference for depositions taken in federal court proceedings. This bill is similar to S. 1352, which Senator GRASSLEY sponsored on October 31, 1997.

For 23 years, Rule 30 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure permitted the use of non-stenographic means to record depositions, but only pursuant to court order or the written stipulation of the parties. In December of 1993, however, the Chief Justice submitted a recommendation pursuant to the Rules Enabling Act that eliminated the old Rule 30 requirement of a court order or stipulation. The revision also afforded each party the right to arrange for recording of a deposition by non-stenographic means.

When representatives of the Judicial Conference testified on the subject in 1993, they could not provide the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property with a single justification for their recommendation. As a result, the Subcommittee unanimously approved legislation, H.R. 2814, to prevent implementation of the change. The full House of Representatives followed suit by passing the bill under suspension of the rules on November 3, 1993.

It is my understanding that the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts and Administrative Practice also held hearings on Rule 30 during the 103d Congress. I believe the members who participated in those hearings received testimony which generated concerns about the reliability and durability of video or audio tape alternatives to stenographic depositions. Then and since, court reporters have complained of increased difficulty in identifying speakers, deciphering unintelligible passages, and reconstructing accurate testimony from

"blank" passages when relying on mechanical recordings. In contrast, information was also submitted at this time which suggested that the stenographic method will become even more cost-effective in the future as a result of improvements in recording technology.

These findings from the 103d Congress were confirmed last term when the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property again conducted its own hearing on H.R. 1445, the precursor to the bill I am introducing today; and later, when the Committee on the Judiciary reported H.R. 1445 to the full House.

Mr. Speaker, I have never entirely understood why Rule 30 was changed in the first place. Like many others, I have found that experience is the best teacher; and it has been my experience that no one in my district was displeased with the application of the law prior to 1993. I visit my district frequently and maintain good relations with members of the bench and bar, and not one attorney or judge ever complained about the operation of Rule 30 to me before 1993.

I am pleased to continue my ongoing support for reinstating the pre-1993 law on Rule 30 by sponsoring this bill.

STARR SUBPOENAS THE PRESIDENT'S MEN WHO STAND IN THE LINE OF FIRE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1998

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today we have learned that the Independent Counsel Ken Starr has issued a new subpoena for the testimony of Special Agent Larry Cockell, a plainclothes Secret Service officer who is in charge of the President's personal security detail. This new turn in Mr. Starr's endless investigation raises an important question: why didn't he subpoena this plainclothes agent earlier this year before he went to court over whether the Secret Service should give confidential information to the grand jury.

Perhaps Mr. Starr was concerned that the court might take a different view of his arguments against the Secret Service's privilege if it knew the full scope of his intentions with respect to questioning the Secret Service. It is disturbing that two courts have had to examine the issue of a secret service privilege without being informed that Mr. Starr also intended to question plainclothes Secret Service agents in addition to the uniformed Secret Service agents.

Plainclothes Secret Service agents are unique in that they enjoy intimate access to the President and are responsible for his physical safety in public crowds and other places where the risk of harm is the greatest. In the event of an assassination attempt, they are truly in the line of fire.

Seeking to question those agents raises a different set of issues which the courts have not yet been confronted with. Mr. Starr's latest subpoenas frustrate the orderly judicial resolution of the important issues raised by his unprecedented requests for the testimony of uniformed Secret Service agents.

The Secret Service argument in support of a privilege against testifying seems more reasonable than Starr's argument that the attor-

ney-client privilege did not survive the death of the client. In both cases, there was little available precedent and the arguments were based on policy considerations. If Starr's attorney-client privilege argument was not frivolous and deserved Supreme Court review, it must be said that the Secret Service's sincere arguments in support of their protective function is just as legitimate.

It seems Mr. Starr is determined to deny the Secret Service the same opportunity for Supreme Court review that he has sought for himself. He has already forced the Secret Service to seek a stay of his subpoena in court while it pursues its request for judicial review.

It has been reported that Starr may ask Secret Service personnel to testify about conversations between President Clinton and his attorney Robert Bennett concerning the Paula Jones case. This would create a potentially tragic Catch-22 situation in which the Secret Service has an obligation to guard the President, but Mr. Starr argues that their presence eliminates the President's attorney-client privilege. It is unreasonable, unfair and unprecedented for Mr. Starr to force the President to compromise his Secret Service protection in order to receive confidential advice from his private attorney.

To its credit, the Secret Service strongly believes that their duty to protect the President is far more important than Mr. Starr's inquiry into what any of them may or may not have witnessed in the course of carrying out their responsibilities.

It is unseemly and inappropriate for Mr. Starr to continue to force the Secret Service to forego the judicial review that it believes is absolutely appropriate in order to carry out its mission of protecting the President. Mr. Starr got to go to the Supreme Court on his privilege issue and he lost. Why doesn't the Secret Service, which is trying to protect the life of this and future Presidents, get to go to the Supreme Court? What Mr. Starr is trying to do with this latest subpoena is to get the testimony he wants before the arguments about privilege can reach the Supreme Court. This new subpoena is a tactical maneuver to avoid the full judicial review of these issues of enormous national importance. They are legal maneuvers that violate a fundamental sense of fairness and are really unnecessary to the execution of his statutory responsibilities.

It is obvious to everyone that any further review will be handled in an expeditious manner, just as the courts have already done. A fair-minded prosecutor would welcome a complete Supreme Court review of the privilege asserted by the Secret Service and efforts to thwart such review only serves to increase the doubts that many have about the legitimacy of this investigation.

A TRIBUTE TO MIDDLE SCHOOL 45

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1998

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, on July 7, 1998 while the House was in recess, I had the privilege of receiving, in my district office, a group of thirteen students from Middle School 45 who won first place in the K-8th grade cat-

egory in the National Chess Tournament held in Phoenix, Arizona from April 30 to May 2. I am submitting for the RECORD some remarks I made during their visit.

It gives me great pleasure to be with such a wonderful group of gifted and talented South Bronx students from Middle School 45. Oscar Bedoya, Ariel Uriarte, Bianey Morillo, Rafael Ortiz, Eliexer De Jesus, Joel Nolasco, Juan De Jesús, Jorge Pérez, Trung Nguyen, Sarun Sin, Trung Bui, Granit Gjonbalaj and Reasy Suon, under the leadership of coach Félix López, you won first place in the K-8th grade category among 62 teams who participated in the National Chess Tournament held in Phoenix, Arizona from April 30 to May 2.

You have demonstrated an outstanding skill, for which you have become role models in our community. We are proud of your accomplishments and I hope that you will continue succeeding in chess and also in academics. I also encourage you to take full advantage of the possible opportunity that some universities offer to chess champions to earn scholarships for their higher education. You are terrific examples for future chess players.

I would like to applaud teachers César Solís and Georgina Pierre for being with us today but, more important, for their tireless work in helping these students reach their potential.

I also would like to commend the National Scholastic Chess Foundation for sponsoring the chess program at Middle School 45, which includes weekly chess classes for 500 students. Their teaching and support were invaluable for what you have achieved.

I have the privilege of representing the 16th district of New York where Middle School 45 is located, and I am delighted by your chess team's success.

All of us here congratulate Middle School 45, the administration and faculty, and you, the students whose ambition and hard work will make this great institution a tremendous source of pride and success for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Middle School 45, to the administration and faculty, and to the students whose ambition and hard work will make this great institution a tremendous source of pride and success for years to come.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2676, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RESTRUCTURING AND REFORM ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1998

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act Conference Report (H.R. 2676).

Continuously, I hear from my constituents who ask this Congress to address ways to simplify filing, and improve IRS customer assistance and service. I have long advocated that the IRS should be overhauled to better serve taxpayers and run more like a business. I believe that the Conference Report we are voting on today effectively addresses these concerns.

This landmark legislation establishes an independent review board which will oversee