

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO LAURA
KILLINGSWORTH—GIFTED PER-
FORMER AND CIVIC LEADER

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the leading citizens of Long Beach who is celebrating her 75th Birthday on January 24, 1999. A gifted performer and civic leader, Laura Killingsworth has achieved a remarkable record of performance in scores of leading roles and making a significant contribution to the growth and administration of many cultural arts organizations in Long Beach and Southern California.

Laura Killingsworth has delighted Southland audiences as guest soloist with the Long Beach Symphony and as leading lady in most of the great musicals of our time. She has been a favorite because of her stunning voice, presence, and ability to move audiences whether in comedy or pathos. Laura has starred in the following: Auntie Mame; Applause; Bittersweet; Camelot; Company; Guys & Dolls; Hello Dolly; I Do, I Do, The King and I; Kismet; Kiss Me Kate; A Little Night Music; The Mikado, Naughty Marietta; Rose Marie; Side By Side By Sondheim; 42nd Street; and the Song of Norway. Her most recent role was as Sara Roosevelt in the musical "Eleanor, a Love Story", where she appeared to critical acclaim.

Laura's list of civic involvement leadership is as long as her performance repertoire. There is hardly an arts organization in Long Beach which has not benefitted from her leadership ability, sound ideas, and diplomatic skills. Laura has served as President of the Long Beach Symphony Association, the Long Beach Symphony Guild, the Long Beach Civic Light Opera Association and its Board of Trustees, the Long Beach Public Corporation for the Arts, and the Symphony Juniors of the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra. She was a Founding Member of the Mayor's Community Arts Committee, the Long Beach Arts Committee, the Long Beach Regional Arts Council, Board Member of the Long Beach Community Players and California State University, Long Beach's Fine Arts Affiliates, and the Opera Ring of the Long Beach Opera. In addition to cultural arts organizations, Laura has contributed to the community at large as a Charter Member of the Long Beach Cancer League, Member of the Junior League of Long Beach, and Member of the Mayor's Task Force for the Arts.

Her outstanding record of accomplishment has been recognized by the Assistance League's Rick Racker "Woman of the Year" award. She was the first recipient of the "Distinguished Arts Award" from the Public Corporation for the Arts.

Laura Killingsworth is the mother of two sons, Greg and Kim, and the wife of Edward Killingsworth, internationally acclaimed archi-

tect. Long Beach enjoys a more vital cultural climate because of her significant talents and efforts, and it is because of her lifetime of achievement that we honor her today.

PROTECT OUR FLAG

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a constitutional amendment for the protection of our nation's flag. The flag is a revered symbol of America's great tradition of liberty and democratic government, and it ought to be protected from acts of desecration that diminish us all.

As you know, there have been several attempts to outlaw by statute the desecration of the flag. Both Congress and state legislatures have passed such measures in recent years, only to be overruled later by decisions of the Supreme Court. It is clear that nothing short of an amendment to the Constitution will ensure that Old Glory has the complete and unqualified protection of the law.

The most common objection to this kind of amendment is that it unduly infringes on the freedom of speech. However, this objection disregards the fact that our freedoms are not practiced beyond the bounds of common sense and reason. As is often the case, there are reasonable exceptions to the freedom of speech, such as libel, obscenity, trademarks, and the like. Desecration of the flag is this kind of act, something that goes well beyond the legitimate exercising of a right. It is a wholly disgraceful and unacceptable form of behavior, an affront to the proud heritage and tradition of America.

Make no mistake, this constitutional amendment should be at the very top of the agenda of this Congress. We owe it to every citizen of this country, and particularly to those brave men and women who have stood in harm's way so that the flag and what it stands for might endure. I urge this body to take a strong stand for what is right and ensure the protection of our flag.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ALIEN SMUGGLER PUNISHMENT ACT

HON. JAMES E. ROGAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, on the streets, they are known as "Coyotes." To law enforcement officials they are known simply as smugglers. Every night along our 1000-mile borders with Mexico, hundreds of undocumented aliens are loaded into vans, trucks, car trunks, and other concealed hiding spots. They all hope that the few hundred dollars they paid

will get them across the border. Often, it is not. For many, the story ends in robbery, violence, rape or worse.

Today, I am introducing the Alien Smuggler Punishment Act, which increases the minimum penalties for criminals convicted of smuggling aliens into the United States. This legislation is designed to send the message that preying on innocent victims and then escaping across the border will no longer be tolerated.

Under current law, an alien smuggler can be sentenced to as little as 18 months in prison, even if the criminal was armed. Under this bill, a judge will have stricter guidelines when sentencing armed smugglers. This legislation will ensure that convicted alien smugglers, particularly those who carry guns, face penalties as stiff as those of convicted drug dealers and other violent criminals.

Mr. Speaker, efforts to stop the damage to this nation caused by illegal immigration are routinely thwarted by alien smugglers. These criminals ignore our nation's laws and take advantage of those incapable of protecting themselves. It is my hope that the Alien Smuggler Punishment Act will dramatically reduce the practice of alien smuggling.

THE QUALITY CHILD CARE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ACT, H.R. 28

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Quality Child Care for Federal Employees Act, H.R. 28, which will improve the quality of federal child care facilities throughout our nation.

I was first introduced to the horrors of inadequate day care by former constituents, Mark and Julie Fiedelholz of Pembroke Pines, Florida. Mr. Fiedelholz asked for my help after the tragic death of his 3 month old son, Jeremy. Left at a day care center for merely two hours, little Jeremy died as a result of deplorable conditions, unqualified personnel and the blatant lack of respect for the laws intended to protect our children. Although this horrifying situation did not take place in a federal center, clean, safe and quality conditions for our children need to be ensured in every child care center throughout our nation.

Because many of these child care facilities are housed in federal buildings, state and local authorities have little or no jurisdiction regarding health, fire and safety codes. This Act would require all federal centers responsible for maintaining these basic regulations. With over one thousand federally owned or operated child care centers in the United States capable of accommodating 200,000 children, this legislation is essential.

After conferring with representatives from various federal agencies, I learned that many federal centers, such as the facilities operated by GSA, follow their own standards which in

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

most instances are higher than most states. I want to stress that it is not the intention of this bill to lower federal agency standards, should they be greater than the state or local regulations. Instead, we are looking to raise the standards of those federal centers across the country whose standards fall below state and local codes and hold them accountable for failure to do so. This bill does not allow state or local law enforcement officials to enter federal facilities to perform checks of any kind unless GSA agrees to it. This option is left up to the discretion of GSA and is not mandated by this bill.

This legislation includes language which will help GSA in its quest to provide a more comprehensive day care plan, by allowing GSA to expand its child care services to more children and let its centers join into a consortium of private businesses and health care providers. This provision will enable agencies to partner with external organizations, conduct pilot programs and search for new methods of providing child care assistance to federal employees.

Our children are so important and the care they receive during their first 5 years of development are essential to raising intelligent and productive members of society. This legislation is a great first step in ensuring the positive development and growth of our children and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the months ahead on additional child care measures.

H.R. 28

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Quality Child Care for Federal Employees Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ACCREDITED CHILD CARE FACILITY.—The term "accredited child care facility" means—

(A) a facility that is accredited, by a child care accreditation entity, as defined in paragraph (2);

(B) a facility that is used as a Head Start center under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.) and is in compliance with any applicable performance standards established by regulation under such Act for Head Start programs; or

(C) an armed forces child development facility that is in compliance with any applicable performance standards established by regulation, rule, or military order.

(2) CHILD CARE ACCREDITATION ENTITY.—The term "child care accreditation entity" means a non-profit private organization or public agency that—

(A) is recognized by a State agency or by a national organization which serves as a peer review panel for the standards and procedures of public and private childcare or school accrediting bodies; and

(B) accredits a facility to provide child care on the basis of—

(i) an accreditation or credentialing instrument based on peer-validated research;

(ii) compliance with applicable State or local licensing requirements, as appropriate, for the facility;

(iii) outside monitoring of the facility; and

(iv) criteria that provide assurances of—

(I) developmentally appropriate health and safety standards at the facility;

(II) use of developmentally appropriate educational activities, as an integral part of the child care program carried out at the facility; and

(III) use of ongoing staff development or training activities for the staff of the facility, including related skills-based testing.

(3) STATE.—The term "State" has the meaning given the term in section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9858n).

SEC. 3. PROVIDING QUALITY CHILD CARE IN FEDERAL FACILITIES.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) ENTITY SPONSORING A CHILD CARE FACILITY.—The term "entity sponsoring a child care facility" means a Federal agency that operates, or an entity that enters into a contract or licensing agreement with a Federal agency to operate, a child care center primarily for the use of Federal employees.

(3) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term "Executive agency" has the meaning given the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, except that the term—

(A) does not include the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard; and

(B) includes the General Services Administration, with respect to the administration of a facility described in paragraph (4)(B).

(4) EXECUTIVE FACILITY.—The term "executive facility"—

(A) means a facility that is owned or leased by an Executive agency; and

(B) includes a facility that is owned or leased by the General Services Administration on behalf of a judicial office.

(5) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term "Federal agency" means an Executive agency or a judicial office.

(6) JUDICIAL FACILITY.—The term "judicial facility" means a facility that is owned or leased by a judicial office (other than a facility that is also a facility described in paragraph (4)(B)).

(7) JUDICIAL OFFICE.—The term "judicial office" means an entity of the judicial branch of the Federal Government.

(b) EXECUTIVE BRANCH STANDARDS AND COMPLIANCE.—

(1) STATE AND LOCAL LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any entity sponsoring a child care facility in an executive facility shall—

(i) comply with childcare standards that minimally encompass State or local licensing requirements related to the provision of child care in that geographic area; or

(ii) obtain the appropriate State or local licenses for the facility.

(B) COMPLIANCE.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act—

(i) the entity shall comply, or make substantial progress (as determined by the Administrator) toward complying with subparagraph (A); and

(ii) any contract or licensing agreement used by an Executive agency for the operation of such a child care center shall include a condition that the child care be provided by an entity that complies with the appropriate State or local licensing requirements related to the provision of child care.

(2) HEALTH, SAFETY, AND FACILITY STANDARDS.—The Administrator shall by regulation establish standards relating to health, safety, facilities, facility design, and other aspects of child care that the Administrator determines to be appropriate for child care in executive facilities, and require child care facilities, and entities sponsoring child care facilities, in executive facilities to comply with the standards. Such standards shall include requirements that child care facilities be inspected for, and be free of, lead hazards.

(3) ACCREDITATION STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall issue regulations requiring, to the maximum

extent possible, any entity sponsoring an eligible child care center (as defined by the Administrator) in an executive facility to comply with child care accreditation standards as identified in section 2(2)(A).

(B) COMPLIANCE.—The regulations shall require that, not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act—

(i) the entity shall comply, or make substantial progress (as determined by the Administrator) toward complying, with the standards; and

(ii) any contract or licensing agreement used by an Executive agency for the provision of child care services shall include a condition that the child care be provided by an entity that complies with the standards.

(A) EVALUATION AND COMPLIANCE.—

(4) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall evaluate the compliance, with the requirements of paragraph (1) and the regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (2) and (3), of child care facilities, and entities sponsoring child care services, in executive facilities. The Administrator may conduct the evaluation of such a child care center or entity directly, or through an agreement with another Federal agency or private entity, other than the Federal agency for which the child care facility is providing services. If the Administrator determines, on the basis of such an evaluation, that the child care facility or entity is not in compliance with the requirements, the Administrator shall notify the Executive agency.

(B) EFFECT OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—On receipt of the notification of noncompliance issued by the Administrator, the head of the Executive agency shall—

(i) if the entity operating the child care center is the agency—

(I) no later than 2 business days after the date of receipt of the notification correct any deficiencies that are determined by the Administrator to be life threatening or to present a risk of serious bodily harm;

(II) develop and provide to the Administrator a plan to correct any other deficiencies in the operation of the center and bring the center and entity into compliance with the requirements not later than 4 months after the date of receipt of the notification;

(III) provide the parents of the children receiving child care services at the center and employees of the center with a notification detailing the deficiencies described in subclauses (I) and (II) and actions that will be taken to correct the deficiencies and post a copy of the notification in a conspicuous place in the facility for a period of 5 working days or until the deficiencies are corrected, whichever is later;

(IV) bring the facility and entity into compliance with the requirements and certify to the Administrator that the facility and entity are in compliance, based on an on-site evaluation of the facility conducted by an independent entity with expertise in child care health and safety; and

(V) in the event that deficiencies determined by the Administrator to be life threatening or to present a risk of serious bodily harm cannot be corrected within 2 business days after the date of receipt of the notification, close the facility or the affected portion of the facility, until such deficiencies are corrected and notify the Administrator of such closure; and

(ii) if the entity operating the child care facility is a contractor or licensee of the Executive Agency—

(I) require the contractor or licensee no later than 2 business days after the date of receipt of the notification, to correct any deficiencies that are determined by the Administrator to be life threatening or to present a risk of serious bodily harm;

(II) require the contractor or licensee to develop and provide to the head of the agency a plan to correct any other deficiencies in the operation of the center and bring the center and entity into compliance with the requirements not later than 4 months after the date of receipt of the notification;

(III) require the contractor or licensee to provide the parents of the children receiving child care services at the facility and employees of the facility with a notification detailing the deficiencies described in subclauses (I) and (II) and actions that will be taken to correct the deficiencies, and to post a copy of the notification in a conspicuous place in the facility for 5 working days or until the deficiency is corrected, whichever is later;

(IV) require the contractor or licensee to bring the facility and entity into compliance with the requirements and certify to the head of the agency that the facility and entity are in compliance, based on an on-site evaluation of the facility conducted by an independent entity with expertise in child care health and safety; and

(V) in the event that deficiencies determined by the Administrator to be life threatening or to present a risk of serious bodily harm cannot be corrected within 2 business days after the date of receipt of the notification, close the facility or the affected portion of the facility until such deficiencies are corrected and notify the Administrator of such closure, which closure may be grounds for the immediate termination or suspension of the contract or license of the contractor or licensee.

(C) COST REIMBURSEMENT.—The Executive agency shall reimburse the Administrator for the costs of carrying out subparagraph (A) for child care facilities located in an executive facility other than an executive facility of the General Services Administration. If an entity is sponsoring a child care facility for 2 or more Executive agencies, the Administrator shall allocate the costs of providing such reimbursement with respect to the entity among the agencies in a fair and equitable manner, based on the extent to which each agency is eligible to place children in the facility.

(5) DISCLOSURE OF PRIOR VIOLATIONS TO PARENTS AND FACILITY EMPLOYEES.—The Administrator shall issue regulations that require that each Executive agency that operates a child care facility, and each entity that enters into a contract or licensing agreement with an Executive agency to operate a child care facility, upon receipt by the facility or the agency or entity (as applicable) of a request by any individual who is a parent of any child enrolled at the facility, a parent of a child for whom there has been submitted an application to enroll at the facility, or an employee of the facility, shall provide to the individual—

(A) copies of all notifications of deficiencies that have been provided in the past with respect to the facility under paragraph (4)(B)(i)(III) or (ii)(III), as applicable; and

(B) a description of the actions that were taken to correct the deficiencies.

(C) APPLICATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if 8 or more child care facilities are sponsored in facilities owned or leased by an Executive agency, the Administrator shall delegate to the head of the agency the evaluation and compliance responsibilities assigned to the Administrator under subsection (b)(4)(A).

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, STUDIES, AND REVIEWS.—The Administrator may provide technical assistance, and conduct and provide the results of studies and reviews, for Executive agencies, and entities sponsoring child care centers in executive facilities, on a reimbursable basis, in order to assist the entities in complying with this section.

(e) COUNCIL.—The Administrator shall establish an interagency council, comprised of all Executive agencies described in subsection (d), to facilitate cooperation and sharing of best practices, and to develop and coordinate policy, regarding the provision of child care, including areas for nursing mothers and other lactation support facilities and services, in the Federal Government.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$900,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year.

SEC. 4. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS RELATING TO CHILD CARE PROVIDED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF FEDERAL CHILD CARE CENTERS FOR ON-SITE CONTRACTORS; PERCENTAGE GOAL.—Section 616(a) of the Act of December 22, 1987 (40 U.S.C. 490b), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) such officer or agency determines that such space will be used to provide child care and related services to children of Federal employees or on-site Federal contractors, or dependent children who live with Federal employees or on-site Federal contractors; and

“(3) such officer or agency determines that such individual or entity will give priority for available child care and related services in such space to Federal employees and on-site Federal contractors.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e)(1) The Administrator of General Services must confirm that at least 50 percent of aggregate enrollment in Federal child care centers governmentwide are children of Federal employees or on-site Federal contractors, or dependent children who live with Federal employees or on-site Federal contractors. Each provider of child care services at an individual Federal child care center shall maintain this percentage as a goal for enrollment at the center. If enrollment at a center drops below the goal, the provider shall develop and implement a business plan with the sponsoring Federal agency to achieve the goal within a reasonable timeframe. This plan must be approved by the Administrator of General Services based on its compliance with standards established by the Administrator, and its effect on achieving the aggregate Federal enrollment percentage goal.

“(2) The Administrator of General Services Administration may enter into public-private partnerships or contracts with non-governmental entities to increase the capacity, quality, affordability, or range of child care and related services and may, on a demonstration basis, waive subsection (a)(3) and paragraph (1) of this subsection.”.

(b) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Section 616(b)(3) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 490(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) If an agency has a child care facility in its space, or is a sponsoring agency for a child care facility in other Federal or leased space, the agency or the General Services Administration may pay accreditation fees, including renewal fees, for that center to be accredited. Any agency, department, or instrumentality of the United States that provides or proposes to provide child care services for children referred to in subsection (a)(2), may reimburse any Federal employee or any person employed to provide such services for the costs of training programs, conferences, and meetings and related travel, transportation, and subsistence expenses incurred in connection with those activities. Any per diem allowance made pursuant to this section shall not exceed the rate speci-

fied in regulations prescribed pursuant to section 5707 of title 5, United States Code.”.

(c) PROVISION OF CHILD CARE BY PRIVATE ENTITIES.—Section 616(d) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 490b(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d)(1) If a Federal agency has a child care facility in its space, or is a sponsoring agency for a child care facility in other Federal or leased space, the agency, the child care center board of directors, or the General Services Administration may enter into an agreement with one or more private entities under which such private entities would assist in defraying the general operating expenses of the child care provider including, but not limited to, salaries and tuition assistance programs at the facility.

“(2)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a Federal agency does not have a child care program, or if the Administrator of General Services has identified a need for child care for Federal employees at an agency providing child care services that do not meet the criteria of subsection (a), the agency or the Administrator may enter into an agreement with an existing non-Federal, licensed, and accredited child care facility, or a planned child care facility that will become licensed and accredited, for the provision of child care services for children of Federal employees.

“(B) Prior to entering into an agreement, the head of the Federal agency must determine that child care services to be provided through the agreement are more cost effectively provided through this arrangement than through establishment of an Executive child care facility.

“(C) The agency may provide any of the services described in subsection (b)(3) if, in exchange for such services, the facility reserves child care spaces for children referred to in subsection (a)(2), as agreed to by the parties. The cost of any such services provided by an agency to a child care facility on behalf of another agency shall be reimbursed by the receiving agency.

“(3) This subsection does not apply to residential child care programs.”.

(d) PILOT PROJECTS.—Section 616 of such Act (40 U.S.C. 490b) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f)(1) Upon approval of the agency head, an agency may conduct a pilot project not otherwise authorized by law for up to 2 years to test innovative approaches to providing alternative forms of quality child care assistance for Federal employees. An agency head may extend a pilot project for an additional 2-year period. Before any pilot project may be implemented, a determination must be made by the agency head that initiating the pilot project would be more cost effective than establishing a new child care facility. Costs of any pilot project shall be borne solely by the agency conducting the pilot project.

“(2) The Administrator of General Services shall serve as an information clearinghouse for pilot projects initiated by other agencies to disseminate information concerning the pilot projects to the other agencies.

“(3) Within 6 months after completion of the initial 2-year pilot project period, an agency conducting a pilot project under this subsection shall provide for an evaluation of the impact of the project on the delivery of child care services to Federal employees, and shall submit the results of the evaluation to the Administrator of General Services. The Administrator shall share the results with other Federal agencies.”.

(e) BACKGROUND CHECK.—Section 616 of such Act (40 U.S.C. 490b) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) All existing and newly hired workers in any child care center located in federally owned or leased facilities shall undergo a

criminal history background check as defined in 42 U.S.C. 13401."

SEC. 5. REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE LACTATION SUPPORT IN NEW EXECUTIVE CHILD CARE FACILITIES.

The head of each Federal agency shall require that each child care facility first operated after the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act by the Federal agency, or under a contract or licensing agreement with the Federal agency, shall provide reasonable accommodations for the needs of breast fed infants and their mothers, including by providing a lactation area or a room for nursing mothers as part of the operating plan for the center.

**RESOLUTION ON THE
INDEPENDENCE OF KOSOVA**

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House Concurrent Resolution urging the Clinton Administration to publicly declare that the Albanians of Kosova have a legal right to self-determination and independence from Serbia. It is identical to the resolution I introduced in the last Congress. I urge all Members to support this important resolution.

The Clinton Administration has failed to deal forthrightly with the serious situation in Kosova. It is clear that diplomacy has failed in stopping Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic's dirty campaign of repression against the Kosovar Albanians. The time has come for the United States to support, in no uncertain terms, independence for Kosova.

The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that: 1) the U.S. should publicly declare that the Albanians of Kosova have a legal right to self-determination and that independence is the only political solution acceptable to the Kosovars; 2) the U.S. should, in conformity with its principles and beliefs, support and sponsor the right of self-determination for the Kosovar Albanians and this should be a high priority for restoring peace and security to the region; 3) the U.S. should provide its share of any financial or other resources necessary to facilitate the independence of Kosova; 4) the U.S. in conjunction with members of the United Nations and other multilateral organizations, should convene a working group that deals with the specifics of secession in order to prevent future civil conflict from rising to the level of a breach of international peace and security and the facilitates constructive dialogue in order to prevent violence; and 5) the U.S. and others should use any and all means necessary to remove impediments to the Kosovar Albanian's right to self-determination.

The resolution asserts that the Kosovar Albanians satisfy the objective requirements for self determination according to well-established tenets of international law. The Kosovar Albanians comprise more than 90 percent of Kosova's population; share the common language of Albanian; are descendants of the Illyrian—the first group to occupy the Balkans well before the Common Era; share a common ethnicity; share a common history in the Kosova region; and share a common cultural identity as ethnic Albanians with an unbroken

historic bond to the region. The resolution also notes that the Kosovar Albanians seek independence from Serbia in order to establish a democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the disintegration of the former Yugoslavia, Kosova was a separate political and legal entity with separate and distinct political, economic, social, judicial, legal, medical and educational institutions. Before it was forcibly absorbed into Serbia in the late 1980s, Kosova enjoyed the same legal and political status as the other six republics of the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Since Serbian President Milosevic came to power in 1987 Kosova has been brutally stripped of all vestiges of self-rule. We are now at a critical juncture in Kosova's history. Failure on the part of the U.S. and the world community to take decisive action could lead to further repression, genocide and regional instability. Diplomacy has failed. Fighting continues to rage. Innocent civilians are being slaughtered. Independence may be the only viable option the Kosovar Albanians have to realize self-determination. It's time for the Clinton Administration to stop coddling Milosevic and take a stand for freedom and self-determination.

**CENSURE THE PRESIDENT AND
GET BACK TO BUSINESS**

SPEECH OF

HON. ELLEN O. TAUSCHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 19, 1998

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, from the day in early September that the Starr referral was delivered to the House, I have said that the decision to impeach the President called upon me to consider the Constitution, my constituents and my conscience. I have read and reread the Constitution and Federalist papers. I have heard from over 10,000 of my consistent by phone, mail and E-mail. I have searched my conscience. That is why I rise to urge my colleagues to strongly oppose the impeachment of the President.

Let me reiterate that the President's behavior has been reckless, wrong and harmful to his family, friends and the American people. His efforts to misled the American people were inappropriate for the leader of our great Nation. But, my review of the Constitution leads me to believe that while what the President did may be indictable, it is not impeachable.

The President did not undermine our constitutional form of government, nor did he commit treason or bribery. These are fundamental issues that must be considered when the Congress considers articles of impeachment. Also, I'm very troubled by the tampering with the separation of powers proposed by the House's action against the President. Those who support impeachment speak of the rule of law, but they fail to talk about the framers' clear and explicit delineation of the powers of each branch of our Government. It is the Judicial branch of government that enforces the rule of law and punishes those who violate it. If the President committed perjury, the grand jury can indict him when his is out of office.

My constituents and I are searching for a way to strongly but appropriately register our

disgust with the President actions. Censure the President and move on, they say, by a 2-to 1 margin. I agree. But, we have been denied a vote on censure in spite of the fact that this is what an overwhelming number of Americans have told us that they want.

When I came to Congress 2 years ago I said that while I couldn't agree with anyone 100 percent of the time, it was my responsibility as a Representative of the people to LISTEN 100 percent of the time. My colleagues, we were sent here to be our constituents eyes and ears.

Americans want people in their elected Government who know more, not people who think they know better. Colleagues, please stop and listen. The American people say we must strongly censure the President and get back to their business. I urge you to vote no on impeaching the President.

**CONGRATULATING COACH PHILLIP
FULMER AND THE TENNESSEE
VOLUNTEERS ON WINNING THE
NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP**

HON. VAN HILLEARY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor Phillip Fulmer, the head football coach of the undefeated, unified national champion University of Tennessee Volunteers. Coach Fulmer is a native of Winchester, Tennessee, which I am honored to represent in the United States Congress.

In just his first seven years as a head coach, Phillip Fulmer has made his mark as one of the best coaches in the nation. He has won a national championship faster than many of the game's most legendary coaches. His 67-11 career record gives him the best winning percentage (.859) in Division I-A college football among active coaches. He has led the Volunteers to back-to-back Southeastern Conference Championships over the past two seasons, and on January 4 led the Vols to the national championship for the first time since 1951.

Coach Fulmer's success has not gone unnoticed by the media or his peers. Earlier this month, Fulmer was awarded the Eddie Robinson National Coach of the Year Award, and he was also named the national Coach of the Year by the Maxwell Football Club. He was also recently named the Southeastern Conference (SEC) Coach of the Year by the Associated Press and by his fellow SEC coaches.

However, Phillip Fulmer is more than a coach to the young men who play on his team. He genuinely cares about his players, and he leads them on and off the field by setting a good example for how they should live their lives. He personally embodies the values his players should incorporate into their lives long after their football days are over.

Mr. Speaker, as a University of Tennessee graduate (Class of 1981) and a dedicated Big Orange fan who proudly displays a real piece of the old artificial turf where so many great Vols played, I feel qualified to convey to you the immeasurable joy which Coach Fulmer, his staff and his players have brought to Tennesseans and Tennessee football fans around the world. Coach Phillip Fulmer has shown a

great deal of class, dedication and excellence. For that, I say thank you, congratulations, and we will always cherish the memory of this national championship and this dream season.

HONORING MARY TRUSCOTT

HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents who has dedicated her life to something of which we speak so often in this Chamber, the pursuit of excellence in education. For the past 40 years, Mary Truscott has faithfully served as secretary and administrative assistant at Father Lopez High School in Daytona Beach, FL. Throughout this time, Mary had a profound positive influence on countless lives and helped to shape our future leaders. She has been the glue that binds the school together and is a shining constant in an all too rapidly changing world.

Mary Truscott's 40 years of selfless service to the Father Lopez school community and to the Diocese of Orlando is truly a remarkable accomplishment. To many students and teachers, she has been a real American hero. As she celebrates her anniversary this coming weekend, I am proud to recognize her accomplishments and to express my personal gratitude as well as that of the entire Daytona Beach community.

IT'S TIME FOR A TAX CUT

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the new year and the 106th Congress, there are many things that the American people can be optimistic about. Our economy is growing at a brisk pace. Unemployment is low. Inflation is almost non-existent. And interest rates are down.

While more Americans are working and earning more money because of our strong economy, excessive taxation is making it harder for families to get ahead. When looking at the burden taxes impose on the lives of the American people, I am reminded of an observation offered by Mark Twain. This great American author asked, "What's the difference between a taxidermist and a tax collector?" He answered, "the taxidermist takes only your skin."

The average family in America is currently paying more money in taxes than it spends on housing, food, and clothing combined. In fact, when State and local taxes are added to Federal taxes, the average family sees 40 percent of its income confiscated by the Government. This is outrageous. Working Americans should be allowed to take care of their basic needs before being asked to finance the Government.

With the budget balanced and the Federal Government projected to run a surplus of \$1.6 trillion over the next 10 years, the 106th Congress has a historic opportunity to cut taxes so

working Americans can keep more of their hard-earned money.

Today, I have introduced five bills which ease the burden of Federal taxation. These bills will strengthen families and promote economic growth by cutting income taxes and removing the penalties imposed on saving and investing.

The first bill in my tax relief package is entitled the Taxpayer Relief Act. This bill cuts marginal income tax rates by 10 percent across the board. This broad-based tax cut benefits every working American and rewards hard work and success.

The next bill in my package is the Taxpayer Fairness Act. This bill allows taxpayers to deduct the amount of payroll taxes they pay each year from their Federal income taxes. It's simply wrong to tax people on income they never receive. This bill ends this ridiculous policy and will benefit millions of middle income taxpayers, many who pay more in payroll taxes than they pay in income taxes.

The third bill in my package is the Job Creation Act. This bill will stimulate investment in new businesses and good paying jobs by eliminating the capital gains tax.

The fourth bill in my package is the Senior Citizen Tax Relief Act. This bill contains three provisions. It repeals the 1993 tax increase on Social Security benefits. It eliminates the earnings limitation for Social Security benefits, thereby encouraging more seniors to continue working and contributing to our Nation's economy. And it eliminates the taxes on estates and gifts. While death and taxes may be the only two certainties of life, any individual shouldn't have to encounter both at the same time.

The last bill in my package is the Marriage Penalty Relief Act. Under current law, approximately 21 million married couples pay about \$1,400 more a year in taxes than they would if they were single. My bill provides some relief from this stiff penalty by increasing the standard deduction provided to married couples so that it equals twice the amount of the deduction provided to single taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are paying too much in taxes and they want their Members of Congress to do something about it. The five bills I have just discussed provide significant tax relief to the American people. These tax cuts benefit every working American. They strengthen working families. They promote economic growth. And they restore fairness and simplicity to the tax code.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this fight for lower taxes and yield back the balance of my time.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE ALLOCATION FAIRNESS ACT OF 1999,
H.R. 24

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 24 the Veterans Health Care Allocation Fairness Act of 1999.

In 1996, the Veterans Administration was mandated by Congress to develop and implement a more equitable method for allocating health care resources. In response, the VA

devised the veterans equity resource allocation (VERA) model.

While VERA was a noble effort, it is based on a flawed model. As a research method, VERA is unfairly biased against older veterans in major metropolitan areas. These veterans are those in need of inpatient, comprehensive health care, and they will suffer if VERA is allowed to go forward as planned.

This legislation is designed to correct these inherent flaws within VERA. Specifically, it does this in three ways:

First, the bill would raise the income level in the means test by 20% for any veteran who lives in a standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) as defined by the Bureau of the Census. This would make the VA more accessible to veterans who live in high-cost areas, thus increasing the number of veterans who use VA in those regions.

Second, the bill would move veterans with catastrophic health care expenses from category "C" (those who must meet the means test for non-service connected care) to category "A" (those eligible for free non-service connected care). These veterans are defined as those individuals whose medical expenses for the previous year exceeded 7.5% of their adjusted gross income.

Third, the bill would level the playing field between the northeast and southwest by removing the high-cost, "inefficient" speciality care programs from those funds which can be considered in reallocation calculations under VERA. The programs removed would include: Readjustment counseling and treatment, counseling and psychiatric care for the mentally ill, drug and alcohol related programs, programs for the homeless, PTSD programs, spinal cord injury programs, AIDS programs and geriatric and extended care programs.

In a memorandum prepared for me by the Congressional Research Service on this legislation, it estimates that this bill would result in an additional 5-6% of veterans in the northeast becoming eligible for free health care. That translates to approximately 75,000 additional veterans for New York alone. CRS also estimates that if 20% of these veterans seek to use VA services, a conservative assumption, it would result in an increased caseload for both VISN #2 and #3 of 15-20%. This would force a recomputation of VERA distributions, and result in more VA health care funds remaining in northern urban areas.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which will help ensure that all veterans receive equal opportunity to the health care which they have earned, regardless of where they have chosen to live.

H.R. 24

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CRITERIA FOR REQUIRED COPAYMENT FOR MEDICAL CARE PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) EXCEPTION BASED ON PRIOR CATASTROPHIC HEALTH CARE EXPENSES.—Subsection (a) of section 1722 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "or" at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting "; or"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) the veteran's expenses for medical care (as defined in section 213 of the Internal

Revenue Code of 1986) for the previous year are in excess of 7½ percent of the veteran's adjusted gross income for the previous year (as determined for purposes of the personal income tax under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)."

(b) ADJUSTMENT IN INCOME THRESHOLDS FOR VETERANS RESIDING IN SMSAS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) The amounts in effect for purposes of this subsection for any calendar year shall be increased by 20 percent for any veteran who resides in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), as defined by the Bureau of the Census."

(c) AMENDMENTS WITHIN EXISTING RESOURCES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out the amendments made by this section for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 within the amount of funds otherwise available (or programmed to be available) for medical care for the Department of Veterans Affairs for those fiscal years.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2000.

SEC. 2. SERVICES FOR MENTALLY ILL VETERANS.

(a) MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE ON CARE OF SEVERELY CHRONICALLY MENTALLY ILL VETERANS.—Section 7321 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "and members of the general public with expertise in the care of the chronically mentally ill" in the second sentence after "chronically mentally ill"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) The Secretary shall determine the terms of service and (for members appointed from the general public) the pay and allowances of the members of the committee, except that a term of service may not exceed five years. The Secretary may reappoint any member for additional terms of service."

(b) CENTERS FOR MENTAL ILLNESS RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND CLINICAL ACTIVITIES.—Paragraph (3) of section 7320(b) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The Secretary shall designate at least one center under this section in each service network region of the Veterans Health Association."

SEC. 3. ALLOCATION OF MEDICAL CARE RESOURCES FOR THE DEPARTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 8116 the following new section:

"§8117. Allocation of medical care resources

"In applying the plan for the allocation of health care resources (including personnel and funds) known as the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation system, developed by the Secretary pursuant to the requirements of section 429 of Public Law 104-204 (110 Stat. 2929) and submitted to Congress in March 1997, the Secretary shall exclude from consideration in the determination of the allocation of such resources the following (resources for which shall be allocated in such manner as the Secretary determines to be appropriate):

"(1) Programs to provide readjustment counseling and treatment.

"(2) Programs to provide counseling and treatment (including psychiatric care) for the mentally ill.

"(3) Programs relating to drug and alcohol abuse and dependence.

"(4) Programs for the homeless.

"(5) Programs relating to post-traumatic stress disorder.

"(6) Programs relating to spinal cord dysfunction.

"(7) Programs relating to AIDS.

"(8) Programs relating to geriatric and extended care."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 8116 the following new item:

"8117. Allocation of medical care resources."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 8117 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to the allocation of resources for each fiscal year after fiscal year 1999.

COMMENDING THE CITY OF ARROYO, PUERTO RICO ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the special relationship between the city of Arroyo, Puerto Rico, and the United States. December 25, 1998, will mark the centennial Christmas celebrated with the United States.

In the summer of 1898, American troops landed in the city of Arroyo, Puerto Rico, to help free the Puerto Ricans from Spanish colonialism. General John Rutter Brooke and his troops spent Christmas in Arroyo that year, and that event marked the beginning of a close and lasting relationship between the people of the city of Arroyo and the United States. To memorialize General Brooke, there is a city street named in his honor.

The city of Arroyo resembles many typical U.S. small towns, with its "Main Street USA". This central street, running north-south through the town, is named Calle Morse, after Samuel Morse, the inventor of the Morse code. He came to Arroyo to visit his daughter, who resided at the Enriqueta estate, and was present when the first telegraph line was installed in Puerto Rico in 1858. The city of Arroyo has the esteem of being the first location in Puerto Rico to send a telegraph, welcoming Puerto Rico to the age of telecommunications.

The historical homes which line Main Street in Arroyo are fashioned after southern American styles of architecture, and the citizens of Arroyo are very proud of this feature of Main Street. The old U.S. customhouse in town has been well-preserved and today is an important center of the city's culture, serving as a museum which traces the historical connections with the United States.

The town of Arroyo has taken an active role in defending the United States. From the First World War, to the Second World War, to the war in Korea, and to Vietnam, to Desert Storm, young men from Arroyo have answered the call to duty, and brave soldiers such as Virgilio Sanchez in Korea and Raul Serrano in Vietnam, have heroically given their lives in these wars.

This year marks the 100th Christmas anniversary since that first Christmas that the U.S. officially spent in Arroyo. The town did their best to make General Brooke and his troops feel welcome, having to spend Christmas away from their immediate families. To commemorate this special Christmas celebration, students of welding at a local vocational technical school have crafted iron ornaments that

will be placed throughout Main Street in recognition of the city's unique relationship with the United States. These beautiful handmade ornaments will be lighted on Christmas Eve, 1998, in remembrance of this joyous occasion.

I commend the people of the city of Arroyo, Puerto Rico, for their special relationship with the United States and congratulate them on their 100th Christmas anniversary.

UNDERLYING THE IMPEACHMENT CRISIS—HISTORY: THE WAY WE SEE IT

HON. JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Republicans say the underlying issue is not about sex, it's about perjury and obstruction of justice. Democrats say the underlying issue is about sex—a private consensual sexual relationship—and the President lied about it, possibly committing perjury in the process. But since lying about sex is not an act that involved using his official position against the state, as Nixon did, Democrats say Clinton's sins do not reach the Constitutional standard for impeachment.

That is the essence of the arguments we heard presented by members of the House Judiciary Committee and members on the floor of the Congress who voted, along partisan party lines, to impeach President Clinton. That is what the current Republicans and Democrats are saying. What will history say?

Underlying the Clinton impeachment is neither sex, nor lying, nor perjury, but American history itself. Essentially the same economic and political forces that drove the presidential impeachment process against Andrew Johnson in 1868 are driving the impeachment process 130 years later. There has been a "role reversal"—the Republicans of 1998 were the Democrats of 1868 and I will show how their roles reversed—but the underlying issue is essentially the same; reconstruction. Our nation's first effort at economic reconstruction after the Civil War was at issue in 1868, our nation's second effort at economic reconstruction after the Civil War, beginning with Brown in 1954, is at issue in 1998.

The end of the Civil War and the adoption of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution on December 18, 1865 ended legal slavery. Slavery, the Democratic Party, its geography and its ideology were all defeated. But Lincoln's assassination five days after Appomattox denied him and the Republican Party the opportunity to pursue a "Big Federal Government" policy of economic reconstruction and political enfranchisement for all Americans, leaving no American behind.

When legal slavery ended, there were nine million people in the old Confederacy, which was led by the party of Thomas Jefferson. Then, the Democratic Party defined itself in exclusive terms—as slave holders with private property rights, which were protected legally by "states' rights" governments. Four million of the southerners were uneducated and untrained former slaves who needed to be educated, trained and brought into the economic mainstream and politically enfranchised with the right and ability to vote. That didn't include

poor and working class whites who had similar needs and had been exploited, manipulated, misused and politically diverted through a focus on social issues (then, perpetuating the fear of interracial marriage and sex) by the slave owners to preserve and protect the southern economic system of elite special interests.

Just eight years earlier, in 1857, in the Dred Scott decision, the Court had ruled that blacks had no rights that a white man must respect and that Congress could not outlaw slavery anywhere in the U.S. The Confederacy—its economy, religion, family, social customs, mores and politics—was based and built on the institution of slavery. The Civil War ended slavery, but there were still two outstanding problems: (1) How to bring four million former slaves into the economic mainstream? And (2) How to politically enfranchise them? That was the goal of the First Reconstruction and its goal has never been realized and those twin problems have never been completely fixed! One-hundred-and-thirty-two historically black colleges and universities were founded in this context.

It was a massive Federal government commitment to educate the newly freed slaves—who were nearly half the population of the eleven former confederate states—not a commitment by those states to educate them. This Federal commitment to educate the newly freed slaves was determined to be central to a new black middle-class that could then lift themselves or take advantage of opportunities in the general economy. Northern Republican Federal troops were occupying the South after the Civil War because they could not depend on the Democratic South to enforce federal laws. With regard to education, it was the only way the Federal Government could prevent racial discrimination and insure that educated blacks had an equal opportunity of getting hired after they were educated and trained.

Lincoln fought to preserve the Union and to end slavery. He defeated the southern slave forces militarily at a national cost of 620,000 lives and was prepared to reconstruct the nation with a Republican program of inclusion and political enfranchisement. “Former” Democratic Confederates opposed and resisted the “Big Centralized Republican Federal Government” and wanted “the government off of their states’ backs” so they could go back to a legal system (“States’ Rights”) that protected their economic interests (the ability to own slaves).

The identification of Lincoln and the Republican Party with ending slavery and commencing reconstruction led southern Democrats to refer to Lincoln as the Black President and the Republican Party as the Black Republican Party. Blacks, after Lincoln’s assassination, remained loyal to the Republican Party until 1936, Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s second term. The New Deal appealed to black economic interests. Roosevelt defined a new more inclusive Democratic Party by offering an economic agenda that appealed to every American. The political history of African Americans shows that their loyalty follows reconstructive efforts.

Senator Andrew Johnson was a Tennessee Democrat who had refused to join his fellow southern Democratic Confederates and stayed with the northern Unionists. Lincoln’s concern about preserving and reunifying the nation following the war led our first Republican Presi-

dent to reward Johnson’s loyalty by nominating him for Vice President in the 1864 campaign.

After Lincoln’s assassination, President Johnson focused on putting the Union back together, but lacked the Republican commitment to build a “more perfect Union” for all Americans. Unlike Lincoln and the Republicans, he was willing to preserve the Union by leaving some Americans behind, sacrificing the rights and interests of the former slaves. As a result, angry northern Radical Republicans investigated a vulnerable Johnson—who was not unlike Bill Clinton in terms of his personal foibles—to try to come up with an excuse to impeach him. It was a partisan Republican attack on a Democratic President in order to preserve undertaking the Republicans’ First Reconstruction program.

The struggle between these radical progressive northern Republicans and these radical conservative southern Democrats (Dixiecrats) continued following the Civil War, and finally came to a head in the 1876 presidential election and Tilden-Hayes Compromise of 1877—which ended reconstruction. Rutherford B. Hayes, a Republican, was finally elected President by one vote in the House in exchange for pulling out Federal troops protecting the newly freed slaves in the South, and agreeing to appoint conservative Dixiecrats to the Supreme Court. The Dixiecrats, with the help of new “black laws” of discrimination, psychological intimidation, physical violence and murder, were now on their way back to power in the South.

By 1896, the Supreme Court appointments resulted in Plessy, which ushered in Jim Crow, and by 1901 the first Congressional Black Caucus was completely eliminated from Congress, not to return for three decades.

It is the same elitist southern forces and their continuing anti-Federal government ideology—except today they are called Republicans—who want, this time, not to preserve but undo the nation’s effort at reconstruction, a Second Reconstruction begun in 1954 with Brown—the desegregation of all aspects of American life, from public facilities to private corporate behavior—and continued with the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1965 Voting Rights Act, affirmative action and majority-minority political districts. The southern Democratic Party, with the legacy of the Confederacy, generally found itself on the wrong side of history again in the 1960s. Governors George Wallace of Alabama, Lester Maddox of Georgia and Orville Faubus of Arkansas were all Democrats from Dixie. Renowned segregationists like Senator Richard Russell of Georgia and Congressman Howard Smith from Virginia were Democrats. Today’s Senators STROM THURMOND of South Carolina and RICHARD SHELBY of Alabama were originally Dixiecrats, but are now Republicans.

Today’s conservative southern-based Republicans’ target is Second Reconstruction, especially the “liberalism” of Democratic President Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society, but also ultimately including many of the “Big Government” economic programs of Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal. The real underlying dynamic of this impeachment proceeding is not the removal of Bill Clinton, but the removal of the social and economic programs of the New Deal and the Second Reconstruction of the Great Society, a weakening of the Big Federal Government generally, and the de-

struction of liberalism as a viable political ideology in particular.

Whether these conservative anti-Federal government Republicans are successful or not will be determined by history. There will be a few pro-impeachment Democrats thrown in for good measure because, politically, they must factor in the old Democratic forces in the South, now controlled by the Republicans. The Republican impeachment strategy can only be measured by future elections. Will the American people be lead astray again by the Republicans’ new sex diversion or will a strong political leader be able to get them to focus on their real economic interests of full employment, comprehensive and universal health care, affordable housing and a quality public education? History—not President Clinton or the current crop of Democrats and Republicans—will render that judgment!

Today, the political, ideological and geographical roots of the anti-reconstruction and anti-more-perfect-union effort is in the South, though its tentacles have spread beyond the South. This Republican impeachment effort allows us to look at the roots, dynamic and current political structure of this post-Civil War and Current conservative political movement. One-hundred-and-thirty-three years after the “Great Quake,” the impeachment of President Clinton is a mere tremor in the on-going struggle to reconstruct America.

Begin with the Judiciary Committee. Ten of the eighteen Republican members of the Judiciary Committee are ultra-conservatives from former Confederate states. In the middle of the impeachment hearings, one of them, BOB BARR of Georgia, was exposed for having recently spoken before a white supremacist group.

Move on to the House Republican leadership. The outgoing Speaker is Newt Gingrich (R-GA), whose history is laced with not-so-subtle new racial code words, and the Speaker-elect is BOB LIVINGSTON (R-LA). Their styles are different, but their substance is essentially the same. Both abdicated their leadership roles in the impeachment crisis only to have another southern conservative, Rep. TOM “The Hammer” DELAY (R-TX), fill the void. He, through intimidation, forced Republicans, not to vote against censure, but to vote with their party on a procedural vote—which, in essence, is a vote to kill a vote of conscience for censure of the President’s private behavior.

In addition, call the roll of House leadership and committee chairmanships in the 105th Congress: RICHARD ARMEY (TX), Majority Leader; BILL ARCHER (TX), Ways & Means; BOB LIVINGSTON (LA), Appropriations; FLOYD SPENCE (SC), National Security; THOMAS BLILEY (VA), Commerce; PORTER GOSS (FL), Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

In the 105th Republican-controlled Senate: TRENT LOTT (MS), Senate Majority Leader; STROM THURMOND (SC), President Pro Tem (3rd in line to be President), Chairman, Armed Services; JESSE HELMS (NC), Senate Foreign Relations; JOHN WARNER (VA), Rules; RICHARD SHELBY (AL), Select Committee on Intelligence. Today in Congress there are more people arguing on behalf of States rights than there are people arguing on behalf of building a more perfect union. That is why fighting against racial injustice cannot be relegated to a department of the government. That is why several of the nation’s top journalists have chosen to focus on what TRENT LOTT (R-MS) and BOB BARR (R-GA) do with their political

spare time, including speaking before and having memberships in certain southern political organizations. The institutional nature of our historic problem requires eternal vigilance on many fronts and in every election.

The presiding officer at an impeachment trial in the Senate will be U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist, the ultimate conservative states' righter. Nominated to the Court by Nixon and elevated to Chief Justice by Reagan, this intellectually gifted conservative, while clerking for Justice Robert H. Jackson between 1952 and 1953, wrote a memorandum arguing in favor of upholding the "separate but equal" doctrine of Plessy versus Ferguson in preparation for the 1954 decision on Brown. As a conservative Phoenix lawyer, he appeared as a witness before the Phoenix City Council in opposition to a public accommodations ordinance and took part in a program of challenging African American voters at the polls.

From 1969 until 1971, he served as assistant attorney general for the Office of Legal Counsel. In that position, he supported executive authority to order wiretapping and surveillance without a court order, no-knock entry by the police, preventive detention and abolishing the exclusionary rule, that is, a rule to dismiss evidence gathered in an illegal way.

As a member of the Burger Court, Rehnquist played a crucial role in reviving the debate regarding the relationship between government and the states. The consequences of Rehnquist's state-centered federalism surfaced dramatically in the area of individual rights. Since the 1960s, the Court had held that nearly every provision in the Bill of Rights applies to the states through the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Rehnquist voiced his disagreement with such a method of determining the constitutional requirements of state action, particularly in the context of criminal proceedings, urging a return to an earlier approach whereby the states were not required to comply with the Bill of Rights but only to treat individuals with "fundamental fairness."

Likewise, Rehnquist narrowly construed the Fourteenth Amendment's mandate to the states not to deny any person the equal protection of the laws. He contended that all that the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment hoped to achieve with the Equal Protection Clause was to prevent the states from treating black and white citizens differently. The most important value for Rehnquist is his state-centered federalism, followed by private property and individual rights. In other words, his current views are consistent with the core of the states' rights legal philosophy a century-and-a-half-ago, where the individual right to own property (slaves) was to be protected by a states' rights government! (Source: *The Oxford Companion To The Supreme Court*)

To capture a new political base, Republicans abandoned the essence of Lincoln and decided to go after Dixie, using social issues as cover for their narrow economic interests. Barry Goldwater launched this modern conservative anti-Federal government movement with his 1964 presidential campaign. Ronald Reagan picked it up and sent the same signal by launching his southern campaign from Philadelphia, Mississippi in 1980, in the name of states' rights, where two Jews and a Black were murdered, in the name of states' rights, fighting for the right to vote. Now Republicans

want to complete Mr. GINGRICH's 1994 "Revolution of Devolution" by defeating and eliminating the twin evil forces of "liberalism" and "Big Government" in the 2000 election.

The Republicans know that, based on the information they have gathered, if the President is impeached in the House, he will not be convicted in the Senate. They don't want him convicted and out of office, with President Al Gore given two years to solidify his hold on the White House. They want an impeached, but not convicted, President twisting in the wind for two years leading up to the 2000 election. This is a continuation of the November 3, 1998, strategy of the Republican hard liners to motivate and build their conservative "social values" political base as a diversion from economic justice issues. The Republicans will not allow censure because that would allow Democrats to say that they took some action against the President for his immoral actions, which would take away their "social-moral" issue for 2000 campaign.

What the Republicans want out of this impeachment crisis is a "family values" issue for the 2000 presidential campaign. They want to say that Clinton's sexual misconduct is the result of the "decadent values" of the 1960's and liberalism generally. In other words, in some form, the Lewinsky matter will become a Republican "wedge issue" in the 2000 campaign. The fact that African Americans are so closely identified with both President Clinton and liberal "Big Government" programs fits perfectly with their consistent use of race to divide the electorate in presidential campaigns. They can send the subliminal race signal while publicly denying they are using race as an issue in the campaign.

The Republican goal in 2000 is to use this strategy to retain control of the House and Senate and to gain control of the White House. They can then appoint hardcore right wing conservatives to the Supreme Court after 2001. Remember, Kenneth Starr's ambition before being sullied by the Lewinsky affair was to be appointed to the Supreme Court.

Republicans, with Dixie as its geo-political and theological center, in control of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the Federal government, could turn the clock back to a twenty-first century version of the States' Rights days of the 1850s and the 1896 "separate but equal" days of Plessy versus Ferguson—not a return to slavery, but a return to the days when equal opportunity for all is twisted and converted to equal opportunity for a limited few.

By putting impeachment in the legislative rather than the judicial branch of government, the framers of the Constitution deliberately made it a political-legal affair. Republicans have done in 1998, what Democrats did in 1868. They have use the political-legal nature of the impeachment process to turn it into a political-political affair to further their anti-Big Government aims.

Clinton launched a dialogue to talk about race, but the real race dialogue is what will happen to economic reconstruction in 2001 if the reactionary Republican strategy works. Clinton has worked hard to separate the race dialogue from the economic dialogue—joining with the Republicans in 1997, and ignoring his strongest liberal supporters today, to cut a budget deal to "balance the budget" with conservative Republicans. That deal assures that there will not be enough money to fix our his-

toric problem or build a bridge to the future for Americans left behind. He has reduced his own defense to a personal defense instead of a defense of history.

Republicans are trying to impeach reconstruction. The President's reckless behavior played into the political hands of Dixie's history-driven religiously-based self-righteous politics of advancing it's own lost cause.

To whom much is given, much is required. The President was not elected to be our pastor, priest, rabbi or imam. He was elected to protect our constitutional rights. All Presidents are public servants, not perfect servants. His error of private behavior and poor public judgment played perfectly into Dixie's regional politics to undermine a century-and-a quarter of economic progress for all. President Clinton risked all of that history of social and economic progress by lying about an issue of personal satisfaction. He has not committed treason as defined by the Constitution as an impeachable offense. His "teason" is against the cause of building a more perfect union.

After economic and socially conservative Presidents Nixon, Ford, Carter (and economic conservative, but more liberal socially), Reagan and Bush, a moderate-to-conservative southern Democrat, President Clinton, has helped to prepare an economic bridge which would allow us to again begin to work on some of the unfinished and unreconstructed tasks of the Civil War. The Monica Lewinsky affair has now reduced the defense of that agenda to a defense of him.

On December 19, 1998, Republicans are trying to impeach Social Security (privatize it), affirmative action, Medicare, Medicaid, a clean environment, women's freedom to choose, Supreme Court justices who believe in equal protection under the law for all Americans, public education for all over vouchers for some, universal and comprehensive health coverage over medical savings accounts for the few, affordable housing for all, versus mansions for a select few.

Something deeper in history than sex, lying and perjury is at issue here—just as something deeper in history than the removal of a cabinet secretary was at stake in 1868. At stake in 1868 was the First Reconstruction. At stake in 1998 is the Second Reconstruction. The struggle taking place in Congress and nationally today is between those political forces who want to build a more perfect union for all Americans, leaving no American behind, and those who want to return an elitist economic program of more perfect "States' Rights" for the few. That is what underlies the impeachment crisis.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 13, 1998]
130 YEARS AGO, PARALLELS UP TO A BOILING POINT

(By Peter Carlson)

The president was a Southern Democrat who'd risen from the class scorned as "white trash." His personal life inspired widespread snickering. The Republicans who controlled Congress detested him. They investigated every aspect of his life and then voted to impeach him. With his fate in the hands of a few moderates, he hired a clique of lawyers skilled in nitpicking and pettiffogery.

The president was, of course, Andrew Johnson. The year was 1868. When news of Johnson's impeachment reached Philadelphia, Republicans celebrated by firing a 50-gun salute while Democrats threatened to send scores of armed men to defy Congress. In

1868, unlike 1998, Americans were not blasé about impeachment. Passions ran high, at least at the beginning. The issue was not sex—or even perjury. It was far more incendiary. On paper, the question was whether the president could fire the secretary of war without the consent of Congress. In reality, it was a battle over Reconstruction—over the fate of former Confederates and former slaves.

Wild rumors spread: Johnson would use the Army to stay in power. Confederates were marching toward Washington to help him. The *Houston Telegraph* reported that the War Department had been burned, the secretary wounded in battle. The *Louisville Democrat* asked readers: "Are you ready once more to take up the musket?" Many Americans were ready to fight. Iowa's governor, who supported impeachment, cabled his state's congressional delegation: "100,000 Iowans are ready to maintain the integrity of the Union." On the same day, a man from *Terre Haute* cabled Johnson: "Indiana will sustain you with 100,000 of her brave, stalwart and tried men."

For a while, it seemed that America was on the verge of a second Civil War. But soon things settled into a spectacle more familiar to today's impeachment watchers—one part drama, one part farce and many, many parts legal hairsplitting, windy speechifying and mind-numbing tedium.

THE SECRETARY OF WAR WAR

"I am in favor of the official death of Andrew Johnson," an Indiana congressman said during the House debate on impeachment. "I am not surprised that one who began his presidential career in drunkenness should end it in crime."

Other congressmen were almost as nasty. One said the president was stained with "the filth of treason." Another called him a "despicable, besotted, traitorous man."

The only American president ever impeached was a tailor by trade. He grew up dirt poor in Raleigh, N.C., and didn't learn to read until he married and his bride tutored him. He opened a tailor shop in Tennessee and drifted into politics. He had a gift for oratorical invective—populist volleys directed at the Southern planter elite. He was elected state legislator, then congressman, then governor, then senator.

In 1860, when Abraham Lincoln was elected president and Southern states began seceding from the Union, Sen. Johnson returned to Tennessee to campaign against secession. He wasn't opposed to slavery—he owned a few slaves himself—but he was loyal to the Union. When Tennessee joined the Confederacy, Johnson returned to Washington. On the way, he was nearly lynched by a rebel mob in Lynchburg, Va.

The only Southern senator who stayed with the Union, he was a hero in the North—"the greatest man of the age," said the *New York Times*. In 1864, Lincoln chose him as his vice presidential running mate. Feeling a tad sick on inauguration day in 1865, Johnson fortified himself with whiskey—too much whiskey. Visibly soused, he delivered an incoherent speech, and forever after his enemies mocked him as a drunk.

When Lincoln was assassinated, Johnson inherited the task of reuniting the nation. He was determined to bring the South back into the Union as quickly as possible. Under his rules, the rebel states merely had to end slavery and pledge loyalty and they could send representatives to Congress. In December 1865—only eight months after the war's end at Appomattox—those representatives arrived. Chosen in whites-only elections, they included the Confederate vice president, six members of the Confederate Cabinet and four Confederate generals.

Northern congressmen were incensed. Asked Sen. Ben Wade of Ohio: Did any nation in history ever welcome "traitors" into its Congress as equals? "Would a man who was not utterly insane advocate such a thing?"

Congress refused to seat the Southern delegations. Johnson was outraged. It was the beginning of the long battle that led to impeachment.

When the Republican-dominated Congress passed a bill giving full citizenship rights to blacks, Johnson vetoed it. When Congress passed a bill funding a Freedmen's Bureau to assist former slaves, Johnson vetoed it. When Congress passed a bill allowing blacks in the District of Columbia to vote, Johnson vetoed it.

In the South, the all-white "Johnson governments" passed laws denying blacks the right to vote or buy property or own firearms. Angry Republicans asked: Are we losing in peace what we won in war?

But Johnson wasn't interested in the problems of former slaves. He wanted only to reunite the country. He was for union in 1860, he said, and he was still for union in 1866. He broke with the Republicans and toured the country campaigning against them.

His strategy backfired. Republicans won big in the election of 1866. Emboldened, they started investigating Johnson, spreading rumors that he had conspired with the men who killed Lincoln. Over his veto, they enacted a Reconstruction Bill that dissolved the "Johnson governments" and put the South under military rule.

That law gave Secretary of War Edwin Stanton, who ran the military, a great deal of power over Reconstruction. Stanton was allied with the Republicans. To keep him in office, Congress passed the Tenure of Office Act, which barred the president from firing Cabinet secretaries without the consent of the Senate. Johnson asked for Stanton's resignation. Stanton refused. Johnson asked the Senate to fire him. The Senate refused. Johnson fired him anyway but Stanton refused to leave, barricading himself in his office.

Johnson's treasury secretary warned the president that he could be impeached if he persisted in removing Stanton.

"Impeach and be damned," Johnson replied.

THE SHOW

Slowly, painfully, Thaddeus Stevens, the aged, sickly leader of the House Republicans, shuffled into the hushed Senate chamber on Feb. 25, 1868, followed by a group of congressmen.

"We appear before you," Stevens said, "and in the name of the House of Representatives and all the people of the United States, do impeach Andrew Johnson, president of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors."

Clubfooted, gaunt and grim-faced, Stevens, 76, was an avid abolitionist who had spent the war urging Lincoln to crush the Confederates mercilessly, even if "their whole country is to be laid waste." The rebels hated him so much they detoured on their way to Gettysburg just to burn down his Pennsylvania ironworks. After the war, he lived in sin with his black housekeeper and didn't much care who gossiped about it. He sponsored the impeachment bill, and after it passed, 126-47, the House named him to the committee that would prosecute the president in the Senate.

The smart money was betting on conviction. Acquittal, the *New York Times* reported, "is looked upon as simply impossible, unless some new and startling development takes place."

The president hired five crafty lawyers, including his attorney general, and paid them

each \$2,000 out of his own pocket. They opted to stall. On March 13, they asked for another 40 days to prepare their case.

"Forty days!" roared Rep. Ben Butler, the former Union general who was serving with Stevens as a prosecutor. "As long as it took God to destroy the world by a flood!"

Butler wanted to start the trial immediately. The Senate compromised, scheduling the case for March 30.

When that day arrived, Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase presided over the Senate, which was stuffed with 150 extra chairs to accommodate House members. The President did not appear—nor was he expected—but the galleries were packed, mostly with well-dressed women who had connections to senators, who each got four gallery tickets, or to congressmen, who each got two.

"Congressmen appear to be very good judges of female beauty," the *Washington Star* reported. "We looked and looked in vain for a dozen plain-looking women in the galleries."

Butler delivered the prosecution's opening statement. He started slowly, droning on about this unique historical moment, but soon he was orating grandiloquently: "By murder most foul he succeeded to the presidency and is the elect of an assassin to that high office!"

After a few hours, Butler's audience began to wilt but Butler kept going. He was still chugging along on April Fool's Day, when wags in the press gallery amused themselves by sending notes, purportedly from women in the galleries, to the congressmen on the floor, and then snickering as they read the congressmen's replies.

When Butler finally finished his opening statement, he began calling witnesses who had observed the attempt to remove Stanton from office. The scene they described barely rose above farce: Gen. Lorenzo Thomas, the new appointee as secretary, went to Stanton's office and ordered him to leave. Stanton refused and ordered Thomas to leave. Thomas refused. Back and forth it went, each man ordering the other to leave, until finally Stanton poured two stiff shots of whiskey and the dueling secretaries sat down for a friendly chat.

One witness, a Delaware buddy of Thomas, recalled his efforts to buck up the general during this historic confrontation: "Said I to him, 'General, the eyes of Delaware are upon you.'"

The senators burst out laughing. Next, Butler summoned several newspaper reporters to testify about the president's speeches during the 1866 campaign. The reporters confirmed that the president had indeed said many nasty things about his Republican congressional enemies. To Butler, this was proof that Johnson was subverting the power of Congress. To most observers, it was proof of nothing more than politics as usual.

Tedium was setting in. Many hours were spent in the reading of legal documents and senatorial speechifying. "Spectators found the proceedings rather uninteresting," the *Star* reported. Rep. James Garfield was equally bored: "This trial has developed, in the most remarkable manner, the insane love of speaking among public men," the congressman wrote in a letter. "We are wading knee deep in words, words, words . . . and are but little more than half across the turbid stream."

Newspaper editorialists began complaining about the lack of public interest in the impeachment controversy. The *Baltimore Gazette* lamented that "the greatest act known to the Constitution—the trial of a President of the United States" was inspiring "less interest in the public mind than the report of a prize fight."

Johnson could have enlivened things by appearing at his trial but he never did. He also refused to make any public comment on impeachment. Privately, he contemptuously referred to the proceedings as "the show."

Behind the scenes, the president was wooing moderate Republican senators by appointing officials whom they supported and by sending signals that he would stop obstructing Reconstruction. "The president," the Chicago Tribune reported, "has been on his good behavior."

Finally, at the end of April, both sides began to sum up their cases. The ailing Thaddeus Stevens, who spent most of the trial huddled under a blanket, rose on wobbly legs to make his final statement. The case was about Reconstruction, he said, about how the president had usurped congressional power and helped to create new Confederate governments in the South. Stevens denounced Johnson as a "wretched man" and a "pettifogging political trickster," but then his strength gave out and he had to sit down and let Butler read the rest of his speech.

The next day, while another prosecutor was delivering a long summation, British novelist Anthony Trollope fell asleep in the gallery, much to the amusement of the press corps.

Then the defense began its summation, and the president's lawyers more than earned their \$2,000 fees. They quibbled about the definition of "high crimes and misdemeanors" and concluded that the president's actions did not rise to that level. They said the Tenure of Office Act was unconstitutional. They said that violating that act couldn't be an impeachable offense because the act hadn't been passed when the Constitution was adopted. Finally, in a delightful demonstration of the art of legal hairsplitting, they claimed that Johnson could not be convicted of removing Stanton from office but only of attempting to remove Stanton from office. After all, Stanton had never left his office—he was still barricaded in his suite at the War Department.

As the speakers droned on, the Washington Star tracked the daily fluctuations in the betting action. On May 2, the odds were 3 to 1 for conviction. On May 5, the odds were 2 to 1 for acquittal. The next day, the paper reported: "Today impeachment stock is as unaccountably up as it was unaccountably down yesterday. The bulls have it."

On May 6, as prosecutor John Bingham prepared to deliver the final summation of the trial, a false rumor swept the galleries that Sen. James Grimes had died. Grimes was a Johnson backer, and Republicans in the galleries began to sing gleefully: "Old Grimes is dead, that bad old man."

Justice Chase gavelled for order and then Bingham began his speech. It was a full-blown barn-burner. "We stand this day pleading for the violated majesty of the law, by the graves of half a million martyred hero-patriots who made death beautiful by the sacrifice of themselves for their country."

After much florid rhetoric, he spoke the last words of the trial: "Before man and God, he is guilty!"

Now it was time to decide the question—except the senators insisted on discussing the matter in secret sessions for a few days.

Finally, on May 16, 1868, they were ready to vote.

CLOSE CALL

The galleries and the Senate floor were packed but the room was absolutely silent as Chief Justice Chase called the roll. Conviction required a two-thirds majority, which meant 36 of the 54 senators, and everyone knew that the vote would be close.

"Mr. Senator Anthony, how say you?" Chase asked.

"Guilty," said Henry Anthony, a Rhode Island Republican.

"Mr. Senator Bayard, how say you?"

"Not guilty," said James Bayard, a Delaware Democrat.

Those votes were no surprise. Anthony and Bayard, like most of the senators, had already announced their opinions. There were 35 certain votes for conviction and three undecided. The first of the undecided was William Pitt Fessenden, a Republican from Maine.

"Mr. Senator Fessenden, how say you?" Chase asked.

"Not guilty."

Across the country, crowds packed newspaper offices to get news of each vote as it came over the telegraph. In the White House, Johnson also learned of each vote by a separate telegram.

The next undecided voter was Sen. Joseph Fowler. He was from Tennessee, Johnson's home state, but he was a Republican who'd frequently voted against the president.

"Mr. Senator Fowler, how say you?"

Fowler mumbled something that sounded like "guilty."

"Did the court hear his answer?" a senator called out.

Chase asked the question again.

"Not guilty," Fowler shouted.

Now it all came down to Edmund G. Ross, A Kansas Republican, Ross was new in office, having replaced a senator who had committed suicide in 1866. Ross disliked Johnson and voted against his Reconstruction policies. He'd been seen as a certain vote for conviction until he sided with Johnson supporters on some procedural motions. Since then, he'd been bombarded by mail demanding that he vote to convict. But he worried that conviction would damage the presidency forever. During the vote, he sat at his desk, nervously ripping papers into strips. When his name was called, he stood up and the strips fell to the floor.

"Mr. Senator Ross, how say you?"

"Not guilty."

It was over. The president was saved by a single vote. His lawyers sprinted to the White House to bring him the news. Johnson wept with joy. He called for whiskey, poured shots for his lawyers, and they celebrated with a silent toast.

Back in the Capitol, the senators elbowed their way through a rowdy crowd. "Fessenden, you villainous traitor!" somebody yelled. Fessenden said nothing and kept moving.

Too ill to walk, Thaddeus Stevens was carried from the chamber in a chair. Seething with rage, he glared down at the crowd. Someone asked him what had happened.

"The country," he screamed, "is going to the Devil!"

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 18, 1998]

THE MAN BEHIND THE VOTES

(By Joseph A. Califano, Jr.)

The president most responsible for the Democratic victories in 1998 is the stealth president whom Democrats are loath to mention: Lyndon Johnson.

In March of 1965, when racial tension was high and taking a pro-civil rights stand was sure to put the solid South (and much of the North) in political play, President Johnson addressed a joint session of Congress to propose the Voting Rights Act. Flying in the face of polls that showed his position was hurting his popularity, he said that ensuring everyone the right to vote was an act of obedience to the oath that the president and Congress take before "God to support and defend the Constitution." Looking members on

the floor straight in the eye, he closed by intoning the battle hymn of the civil rights movement, "And we shall overcome." One southern congressman seated next to White House counsel Harry McPherson exclaimed in shocked surprise, "God damn!"

That summer, with Johnson hovering over it, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act. The president was so excited that he rushed over to the Capitol to have a few celebratory drinks with Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield and Republican Minority leader Everett Dirksen. The next day LBJ pressed Martin Luther King Jr. and other black leaders to turn their energy to registering black voters.

LBJ planned every detail of the signing ceremony in the Capitol Rotunda. He wanted "a section for special people I can invite," such as Rosa Parks (the 42-year-old black seamstress who refused to give up her seat on a bus in Montgomery) and Vivian Malone (the first black woman admitted to the University of Alabama, in 1963). He told me to get "a table so people can say, 'This is the table on which LBJ signed the Voting Rights Bill.'"

He was exuberant as he drove with me and other staffers up to Capitol Hill for the signing. Riding in the presidential limo he spoke of a new day, "If, if, if, if," he said, "the Negro leaders get their people to register and vote."

I rarely saw him happier than on that day. For years after that, he fretted that too many black leaders were more interested in a rousing speech or demonstration full of sound bites and action for the TV cameras than in marshaling the voting power of their people.

Well, if he was looking down on us on Nov. 3—and I'm sure he was up there counting votes—he saw his dream come true. Without the heavy black turnout, the Democrats would not have held their own in the Senate, picked up seats in the House and moved into more state houses. In Georgia, the black share of the total vote rose 10 points to 29 percent, helping to elect a Democratic governor and the state's first black attorney general.

In Maryland, that share rose eight points to 21 percent, saving the unpopular Gov. Parris Glendening from defeat. The black vote in South Carolina kept Fritz Hollings in his Senate seat, defeated Lauch Faircloth in North Carolina and ensured Chuck Schumer's victory over Al D'Amato in New York.

Here and there across the country, the black vote provided the margin of victory for democratic governors and congressmen—and where Republicans such as the Bush brothers attracted large percentages of Hispanic and black voters, helped roll up majorities with national implications.

The Voting Rights Act is not the only thing Democrats can thank LBJ for. Johnson captured for the Democratic Party issues that were decisively important in this election. He got Congress to pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which for the first time told the people they could look to the federal government for help in local school districts. It is his Medicare that Democrats promised to protect from conservative Republican sledgehammers. LBJ was the president who ratcheted up Social Security payments to lift more than 2 million Americans above the poverty line.

Together Medicare and Social Security have changed the nature of growing old in America and freed millions of baby boomers to buy homes and send their kids to college rather than spend the money to help their aging parents. The Great Society's Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, Motor Vehicle Pollution, Solid Waste Disposal and Highway Beautification acts have given Democrats a lock on environmental issues.

LBJ was also the president who created the unified budget to include Social Security, which helped produce a balanced budget in fiscal year 1969. Without that budget system, President Clinton would not be able to claim credit for producing the first balanced budget in 30 years.

As exit polls showed, the Democratic command of the terrain of education, health care, Social Security, the economy and the environment—and the growth of the minority vote—paved the road to electoral success in 1998.

With the demise of Newt Gingrich, many Republicans think it's time to mute his libelous assault on the Great Society programs he loved to hate. Isn't it also time for Democrats to come out of the closet and recognize the legacy of the president who opened the polls to minorities and established federal beachheads in education, health care and the environment. After all, it's the Democrats' promise to protect these beachheads and forge forward that accounts for much of their success this November and offers their best chance to retain the White House and recapture the House of Representatives in 2000.

The writer was President Lyndon Johnson's special assistant for domestic affairs.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 11, 1998]
BARR SPOKE TO WHITE SUPREMACY GROUP
(By Thomas B. Edsal)

A spokesman for Rep. Robert L. Barr Jr. (R-Ga.) acknowledged yesterday that Barr was a keynote speaker earlier this year at a meeting of the Council of Conservative Citizens, an organization promoting views that interracial marriage amounts to white genocide and that Abraham Lincoln was elected by socialists and communists.

Barr spoke at the organization's semi-annual convention on June 6 in Charleston, S.C. His presence was cited by Harvard law professor Alan M. Dershowitz, who testified against the impeachment of President Clinton at a hearing of the House Judiciary Committee. Barr, the most outspoken proponent of impeachment in the House, serves on the committee.

"Congressman Barr, who was fully aware of this organization's racist and antisemitic agenda, not only gave the keynote address to the CCC's national board, but even allowed himself to be photographed literally embracing one of their national directors," Dershowitz wrote Judiciary Committee Chairman Henry J. Hyde (R-Ill.) last week.

In a letter to Hyde responding to Dershowitz, Barr declared that Dershowitz's "accusations are unfounded and deplorable."

Asked to comment on the views of the council, Brad Alexander, Barr's spokesman, said Barr is working full time on impeachment, and "he is not going to take time away from it to respond to groundless attacks by Professor Dershowitz."

In the letter to Hyde, Barr counterattacked, accusing Dershowitz of "condoning the use of racism in court, most notably in the O.J. Simpson case," in which Dershowitz served as part of the defense team.

The World Wide Web site of the Council of Conservative Citizens is dominated by material portraying the "white race" as under siege. A council columnist described only as "H. Millard" writes:

"Take 10 bottles of milk to represent all humans on earth. Nine of them will be chocolate and only one white. Now mix all those bottles together and you have gotten rid of that troublesome bottle of white milk. There too is the way to get rid of the world of whites. Convince them to mix their few genes with the genes of the many. Genocide

via the bedroom chamber is as long lasting as genocide via war."

LOTT'S ODD FRIENDS
(By Colbert I. King)

When the Senate convenes in January, its first order of business should be to review Majority Leader Trent Lott's fitness to serve as guiding light of the world's most deliberative body. You heard it right. Before the senior senator from Mississippi sits in judgment of anybody, most of all the president, Lott's colleagues ought to pass fresh judgment on him.

The need for a closer look arises from recent articles by Port reporter Thomas Edsall on Georgia Republican Rep. Robert Barr's keynote address to the Council of Conservative Citizens, a white "racialist" group that, among other things, publishes anti-black screeds capable of making bigots weak in the knees with delight. And Barr isn't alone. Lott and the council have kept company, too.

Barr's link with the council was first disclosed by Harvard Law Prof. Alan Dershowitz during the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment hearing. Barr initially screamed like a stuck pig, claiming he knew nothing about the council's alleged racist and antisemitic agenda. He only schmoozed it up with council members at their meeting, said Barr, because the group enjoyed the blessings of other big-name southern conservatives, including Trent Lott, whom the council presses to the bosom as one of its own.

Lott, now at the peak of his GOP legislative career and recognizing a banana peel when he sees one, demonstrated the public relations smoothness that helped get him where he is today by swiftly denying through a spokesman any council membership. Lott has "no firsthand knowledge of the group's views," said the spokesman. Would that those words had been uttered under oath.

No sooner had Lott freed himself from the group than the head of the council's national capital branch, Mark Cerr, embraced the senator as an active member who had spoken to the group in the past. And guess what? The Post next produced a copy of the group's newsletter, Citizens Informer, with who else but Lott on the front page delivering a suck-up speech to a council gathering in Greenwood, Miss., in 1992. Lott told those staunch proponents of preserving the white race from immigration, intermarriage and "the dark forces" that are overwhelming America that the council "stand[s] for the right principles and the right philosophy."

Lott spokesman John Czwartacki told me this week that the '92 event was just another case of a politician delivering a stump speech to a local group of unknown political pedigree—no big deal. What's more, after being confronted with evidence of the 1992 speech and the group's views, Lott renounced the council and said he won't truck with the likes of them now or henceforth forevermore.

Well, not so fast.

If, as it is now being argued in Lott's behalf, the majority leader is not comfortable with xenophobic, race-baiting bigots, when did he first grow suspicious and really start keeping his distance from the group? Because contrary to claims that he participated in the council event in '92 because he didn't know any better, they seem to have been keeping company for some time.

On my desk is a copy of a page from the 1997 Citizens Informer with a smiling Trent Lott pictured meeting in his Washington office with council national officers William D. Lord Jr., president Tom Dover and CEO Gordon Lee Baum. Lord and Baum were also in

the '92 photo. And who is Lord? The Post reports Lord was a regional organizer for the southern-based segregationist Citizen Councils. In the '60s, white Citizen Council members shared the Ku Klux Klan's views on civil rights but tended to speak and dress better and not slink around after dark in white hoods.

So much could be said about the Council of Conservative Citizens. But let's let Citizens Informer, the group's Web site and its other document speak for themselves:

"Given what has come out in the press about Mr. Clinton's alleged [sexual] preferences, and his apparent belief that oral sex is not sex one wonders if perhaps Mr. Clinton isn't America's first liberal black president. . . . His beliefs are actually a result of his inner black culture. Call him an Oreo turned inside out" (H. Millard, 1998).

"Life Magazine, the glossy photo album of folksy liberals, has been enlarging depraved miscreants like John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King into national heroes for decades" (1998).

"The most important issue facing us is the continued existence of our people, the European derived descendants of the founders of the American nation. As immigration fills our country with aliens, we risk being disposed and, ultimately displaced entirely" (1995).

"A Formal Protest of the [Arthur] Ashe Statue unveiling ceremony will be held on the site of a Confederate Fortification with Battle Flags. . . . Those with confederate battle flags will assemble behind the statue. . . . Come early and dress formal (coat and tie) No racial slurs please" (Richmond Chapter, June 30, 1996).

"Black rule in South Africa a total failure." "The increase of crime and barbarism in South Africa is nothing more than the emergence of the African ethos, so long submerged by strong pre-deKlerk National Party governments" (Citizens Informer, Winter, 1997-98).

"The Jews' motto is 'never forget, and never forgive.' One can't agree with the way they've turned spite into welfare billions for themselves, but the 'never forget' part is very sound" ("A Southern View," Citizens Informer, 1997).

"Our liberal establishment is using the media of television to promote racial intimacy and miscegenation. . . . all of the news teams on the major networks have black and white newscasters of opposite sexes" (Citizens Informer, 1998).

And as for Trent Lott's view of the council before the Citizens Informer article appeared in Edsall's story? A 1995 council promotional mailer quotes Lott: "America needs a national organization to mobilize conservative, patriotic citizens to help protect our flag, Constitution and other symbols of freedom."

Trent Lott's column regularly appears in the Informer newsletter (including its most recent issue in 1998) along with the publication's offensive racial columns and articles. However, Lott's spokesman said it would be wrong to associate his boss's noncontroversial and businesslike column, which is widely distributed, with the repugnant views and materials published by the council. Fair enough.

But has Lott kept his distance from the council—or are the ties long-running and cozy? And if the relationship is ended, when did he do it, and how clean is the break? Before hearing the case against Bill Clinton, the Senate and the country need to hear Republican majority leader Trent Lott's case for himself.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 21, 1998]
 GOP IN SOUTH SEES A CIVIL WAR IT CAN WIN
 (By Earl Ofari Hutchinson)

"RACISTS LEAD THE IMPEACHMENT BATTLE TO PUNISH CLINTON FOR HIS SOCIAL PROGRAMS AND CIVIL RIGHTS STANDS."

Rep. Bob Barr of Georgia gives us an answer to why so many House Republicans defy public opinion, ignore the advice of GOP governors, reject the advice of party moderates in the Senate and are willing to paralyze the government to nail President Clinton. Barr says that they are fighting a civil war.

Since November 1997, Barr has been the point man for Southern Republicans in calling for Bill Clinton's head. This isn't the usual conservative political rage at a politician they regard as a corrupt, immoral, big-spending, big-government Democrat.

Barr, who represents the mostly white, conservative, suburban 7th District in Georgia, is a big booster of the Council of Conservative Citizens. This is the outfit that issued "A Call to White Americans," has denounced blacks as intellectually inferior, champions the Confederate flag and maintains tight ties to Klansman David Duke.

In House speeches, Barr has slammed the Congressional Black Caucus, opposed hate crime laws and spending on social programs. His Web page is linked to the pages of the most extreme right-wing groups in the nation. His campaign against Clinton is part of the Republican Party's Southern strategy to roll back the civil rights gains and eliminate the social programs of the 1960s.

Although Barr is one of the most extreme GOP race-baiters in Congress, he has got the political muscle to push the South's vendetta. Southern Republicans control 82 out of 228 Republican House seats, by far the largest single bloc in Congress. Clinton's victory in 1992 temporarily derailed the Southern bloc's plan to gut civil rights and social programs. Southern Republicans watched as more than 85% of African Americans voted for Clinton in 1992 and 1996 and provided the swing vote for many Democrats in congressional and state races this November. African Americans regard Clinton more favorably than Jesse Jackson or Louis Farrakhan.

The Southern bloc is distressed that the Congressional Black Caucus has been Clinton's biggest defender against the GOP assault and dismayed that far more African Americans than whites oppose impeachment. These Republicans are disgusted that Clinton has appointed more blacks to high administrative offices than any other president, supported minority redistricting in the South, called for tougher action against church burnings and convened the first-ever White House conference to push for tougher penalties to combat hate crimes.

Barr and his cohorts are enraged that Clinton is the first president since Lyndon Johnson to empanel a commission to talk seriously about racial problems and supported the U.S. Sentencing Commission's recommendations to "equalize" the disproportionate drug sentences given to minority offenders. They are affronted that Clinton increased funding for job and education programs, made numerous high-profile appearances at black churches, conferences and ceremonies on school integration in the South and opposed the anti-affirmative action Proposition 209 in California. They are distressed that Clinton is the first president to travel to and support economic initiatives in Caribbean and sub-saharan African nations.

The faster the Southern Republicans rush to dump Clinton, the greater his popularity will be among African Americans. Many blacks see impeachment as a thinly disguised attempt to hammer the president for

acting and speaking out on black causes, and as a backdoor power grab for the White House in the year 2000—and they're right. But as long as Southern Republicans control such a huge block of congressional votes, they believe that impeachment is the civil war they can win.

Earl Ofari Hutchinson is the author of "The Crisis in Black and Black" (Middle Passage Press, 1998)

TRIBUTE TO SACRAMENTO
 COUNTY ASSESSOR ROGER FONG

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today in tribute to one of Sacramento County's most outstanding public servants, County Assessor Roger Fong. Today, as Mr. Fong celebrates his retirement, I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in saluting a great citizen, husband, and father.

As a native of Sacramento, Roger attended public schools in the area. After his exemplary service in the United States Navy, he graduated from California State University, Sacramento in 1956 with a degree in Business Administration.

Roger began his career in the Assessor's office in 1960. For the next 26 years, he held nearly every promotional position in that office. Then, in 1986 he was elected Assessor, a position to which he was returned in 1990 and 1994 by sizeable margins.

During Roger's tenure as Assessor, he has focussed on bringing technological advancements to his office of 156 employees and a budget of over \$12 million annually. He and his staff have maintained current ownership data and property value on more than 380,000 parcels in Sacramento County with a combined value in excess of \$53 billion.

Roger's leadership in the Assessor's office has earned him statewide recognition. In just the past 12 years, his professional tasks have grown immensely as our county's assessment roll has nearly doubled, as has the staff workload.

The professional distinctions which Roger has earned are too numerous to list in their entirety. But they include recognition as the Sacramento County Taxpayer League's "Tax Advocate of the Year"; California State University, Sacramento, "Alumni Distinguished Service Award" recipient; and the Sacramento Chinese Community Service Center's "August Moon" honoree.

Although his professional pursuits have occupied much of his time, Roger has managed to make great contributions locally with his tireless community service endeavors. He has been an active member in the United Way, on the Sacramento Symphony Board, St. Hope Academy Advisory Board, and the Chinese American Council of Sacramento, among other groups.

Roger has also maintained professional relationships with a variety of assessors' organizations. Among these are the Bay Area Assessor's Association, of which he was president in 1994. These memberships reflect Roger's qualities as an incredibly dedicated and hardworking individual who has always put the needs of his constituency above all other considerations.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Sacramento have been the fortunate beneficiaries of Roger Fong's great professionalism over the past 38 years. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing Roger and his wife Florence every future success in their retirement endeavors.

DESIGNATING THE U.S. NAVY SUPPORT SITE IN NAPLES AS THE "THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA SUPPORT SITE"

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to designate the U.S. Navy facility in Gricignano d'Aversa, Italy, known as the Naples Support Site, as the "Thomas M. Foglietta Support Site." I introduced similar legislation in the 105th Congress, and I am honored to reintroduce this legislation on the first day of the 106th Congress.

As you well know, Tom Foglietta had a distinguished career in Congress representing the Philadelphia area of Pennsylvania. Last year he was appointed our Ambassador to Italy. Ambassador Foglietta's career has been dedicated to public service. He served for 20 years on the Philadelphia City Council. From 1976 to 1977 he represented the U.S. Department of Labor in Pennsylvania. From 1980 to 1998 he represented Pennsylvania's First Congressional District.

During that time Tom Foglietta distinguished himself as a hard working and effective legislator. In the 1980s he emerged as one of the leading advocates in the Congress of democratic reforms in South Korea. As a senior member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations he was an outspoken advocate in the 1990s for advancing America's role in promoting free markets and democratic institutions in the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union.

In addition to his tireless efforts to ensure the United States maintained its stature as the moral and democratic leader of the free world, Tom Foglietta never forgot his constituents back home. He always maintained close ties to the working people of the district. He was always accessible to his constituents and fought hard on their behalf in Congress.

Throughout his congressional career Ambassador Foglietta maintained close ties to the land of ancestors—Italy. Many members of the Ambassador's large family still reside in Italy. Shortly after his election to Congress in 1980, a devastating earthquake struck southern Italy. In typical fashion, Tom Foglietta skipped freshman orientation and other freshman events in Congress to be in Italy to participate personally in the relief efforts.

While in Congress, Tom took notice of the poor living and working conditions for Navy personnel at the Naples Support Site in Gricignano d'Aversa. He worked tirelessly as a member of the Appropriations Committee to improve conditions for Navy personnel serving at the site. Not surprisingly, his efforts were extremely effective and Navy personnel have seen a dramatic improvement in the living conditions at the site.

It is only fitting that we name the facility for this fine public servant. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

MONGAUP VISITORS CENTER H.R.
20 AND UPPER DELAWARE CAC,
H.R. 54

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to introduce two bills—one to authorize the Mongaup Visitor's Center, H.R. 20 and the other to extend the Upper Delaware Citizen's Advisory Council, H.R. 54.

Mr. Speaker, as you may know, in 1978, along with our good friend and colleague, Congressman JOE MCDADE, I introduced Federal legislation establishing the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The property proposed as the location of the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River's primary visitor facility—the Mongaup Visitor Center—is owned by the State of New York's Department of Environmental Conservation. The property was acquired by the State in 1986 as part of a much larger purchase of a 10,000-acre tract intended to provide habitat for a population of wintering bald eagles. New York State legislation authorizing Federal development of the property as a visitor center by means of a long-term lease was passed in 1993. A legislative support data package was prepared in 1994 for Federal legislation authorizing development of the site, to appropriate funds for development and to increase the Upper Delaware's operational base to provide for year-round operation.

The site for the Mongaup Visitor Center contains abundant natural and cultural resources and this proposal will identify and develop strategies to protect the Mongaup area's natural resources, including: wintering bald eagles; upland forest; hemlock and laurel gorges and steep slopes; riverline and flood plain forest, and a mile or river front with natural sand beaches. The possible presence of prehistoric elements will also be evaluated.

The visitor center will benefit the community in many respects. It will serve as an educational asset, a local museum, a classroom, and meeting place. Bordered by the Delaware River, the Mongaup River, and New York State highway route 97 in the town of Deerpark in Orange County, New York—it is the only center of its kind within an hour's drive from New York City. Both the proposed visitor center Mongaup site and the Upper Delaware valley have enormous unrealized potential to provide both the local and visiting public with an exceptional experience.

I am also introducing a bill, H.R. 54, that will extend the Upper Delaware Citizens Advisory Council for another ten years. The Upper Delaware CAC provides an excellent forum for citizens of the Upper Delaware to have an opportunity to impact and interact with the National Park Service and Department of the Interior.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to help pass these two measures which will benefit the State of New York on economic, environmental and educational levels.

H.R. 20

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River Mongaup Visitor Center Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior approved a management plan for the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River, as required by section 704 of Public Law 95-625 (16 U.S.C. 1274 note), on September 29, 1987.

(2) The river management plan called for the development of a primary visitor contact facility located at the southern end of the river corridor.

(3) The river management plan determined that the visitor center would be built and operated by the National Park Service.

(4) The Act that designated the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River and the approved river management plan limits the Secretary of the Interior's authority to acquire land within the boundary of the river corridor.

(5) The State of New York authorized on June 21, 1993, a 99-year lease between the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and the National Park Service for the construction and operation of a visitor center by the Federal Government on State-owned land in the Town of Deerpark, Orange County, New York, in the vicinity of Mongaup, which is the preferred site for the visitor center.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF VISITOR CENTER FOR UPPER DELAWARE SCENIC AND RECREATIONAL RIVER.

For the purpose of constructing and operating a visitor center for the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary of the Interior may—

(1) enter into a lease with the State of New York, for a term of 99 years, for State-owned land within the boundaries of the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River located at an area known as Mongaup near the confluence of the Mongaup and Upper Delaware Rivers in the State of New York; and

(2) construct and operate such a visitor center on land leased under paragraph (2).

H.R. 54

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR UPPER DELAWARE CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL.

The last sentence of paragraph (1) of section 704(f) of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1274 note) is amended by striking "20" and inserting "30".

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a constitutional amendment to ensure that students can choose to pray in school. Regrettably, the notion of the separation of church and state has been widely misrepresented in recent years, and the government has strayed far from the vision of America as established by the Founding Fathers.

Our Founding Fathers had the foresight and wisdom to understand that a government can-

not secure the freedom of religion if at the same time it favors one religion over another through official actions. Their philosophy was one of even-handed treatment of the different faiths practiced in America, a philosophy that was at the very core of what their new nation was to be about. Somehow, this philosophy is often interpreted today to mean that religion has no place at all in public life, no matter what its form. President Reagan summarized the situation well when he remarked, "The First Amendment of the Constitution was not written to protect the people of this country from religious values; it was written to protect religious values from government tyranny." And this is what voluntary school prayer is about, making sure that prayer, regardless of its denomination, is protected.

There can be little doubt that no student should be forced to pray in a certain fashion or be forced to pray at all. At the same time, a student should not be prohibited from praying, just because he/she is attending a public school. This straightforward principle is lost on the liberal courts and high-minded bureaucrats who have systematically eroded the right to voluntary school prayer, and it is now necessary to correct the situation through a constitutional amendment. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and make a strong statement in support of the freedom of religion.

CRUISES TO NOWHERE ACT 1999

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation regarding so-called "cruises to nowhere." "Cruises to nowhere" are gambling cruises, ships where a destination, created for the sole purpose of allowing passengers to gamble on the high seas on board a floating casino. The cruises depart from a certain state, sail three miles into international waters for gambling, and then return to the same state. States receive no revenue from the cruises, but must absorb the social costs associated with the gambling traffic through their state.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation is about the fundamental principle that states should be able to determine on their own if they want gambling cruises in their state. My colleagues should be aware that on October 16, 1998, a federal district court ruled in the state of South Carolina that federal law preempts certain state laws prohibiting "cruises to nowhere," and are therefore unenforceable. (Casino Ventures v. Robert M. Stewart, et al. C/A No. 2:98-1923-18, October 1998) The federal law cited by the court is a poorly worded 1992 amendment to the Johnson Act buried a bill designating the "Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary" (P.L. 102-251). Congress did not intend for the 1992 amendment to supercede states' rights, and we should act to restore state sovereignty with regard high-stakes, unpoliced and unregulated casino gambling around the country.

Almost every state has a law making it illegal to possess gambling equipment (e.g., slot machines). Thus it should be patently illegal for a day-trip gambling boat to dock in a state

with statutes that clearly prohibit such operations, and it was illegal prior to enactment of the 1992 Johnson Act amendment.

In the meantime, casino "cruises to nowhere" have started operating out of Florida, Georgia, New York, Massachusetts, and South Carolina. Most recently, "cruises to nowhere" are planning to dock in Virginia and begin operations out of Virginia Beach. Unless Congress acts soon, almost all other states bordering the Atlantic Ocean, Pacific Ocean, or Gulf of Mexico could expect gambling ships to be docking very soon.

The legislation I am introducing today would make it clear that no preexisting state gambling law is weakened, preempted, or superseded by the 1992 Johnson Act amendment. My legislation will restore state sovereignty with regard to "cruises to nowhere." (It will give states the right to debate, vote and ultimately decide for themselves if they want this type of gambling). If states do choose to permit "cruises to nowhere," they can enact appropriate legislation, but will not be forced to by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in this fundamental issues of restoring states' rights. In particular, I urge members from coastal states to take a look at this issue and join me as a cosponsor.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cruises-to-Nowhere Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) Gambling cruises-to-nowhere are voyages in which a vessel departs a State, sails 3 miles into international waters for the primary purpose of offering gambling beyond the jurisdiction of Federal and State laws prohibiting that activity, and returns to the same State.

(2) Legal authorities have ruled that existing State laws cannot stop the operation of gambling cruises-to-nowhere, on the basis that the Congress preempted such State laws by the enactment of an obscure amendment buried in a 1992 law entitled "An Act to provide for the designation of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary" (Public Law 102-251).

(3) Gambling cruises-to-nowhere offer high-stakes, untaxed, unpoliced, and unregulated casino gambling.

(4) Accordingly, it is necessary to make absolutely clear that gambling cruises-to-nowhere enjoy no special exception from the operation of existing or future State laws and that relevant Federal law is not intended to preempt, supersede, or weaken the authority of States to apply their own laws to gambling cruises-to-nowhere.

SEC. 3. STATE AUTHORITY OVER CRUISES-TO-NOWHERE.

Section 5 of the Act of January 2, 1951, entitled "An Act to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce" (15 U.S.C. 1175; popularly known as the Johnson Act), is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by striking "enacted"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(d) NO PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt the law of any State or possession of the United States."

THE STAND-BY-YOUR-AD ACT

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the 1998 campaign season marked a new low in political advertising or not. It is difficult to measure degrees of the bottom of the barrel or the volume of mud spread across the air. I know for a fact that the 1998 campaign season was more of the mess that results when intelligent discourse gives way to attack and counterattack.

Last year, the House of Representatives took an arduous and promising step toward cleaning up our Nation's political campaigns. We passed the Shays-Meehan campaign reform bill, which had been amended to include a version of the Stand-by-Your-Ad proposal that Representative STEPHEN HORN and I introduced in 1997. Unfortunately, the leadership of the Senate lacked the political will to see campaign reform through to a conclusion. I hope that 1999 will prove a more fruitful year for campaign reform.

In that light, Representative HORN and I are once again introducing the Stand-by-Your-Ad proposal. Our legislation would require candidates to appear full-screen in television ads and thus take responsibility for them. Candidates would be required to provide comparable disclosure, boldly and clearly, in both radio and print ads. These enhanced disclosure requirements would also apply to party independent committees.

It is too easy for candidates to attack one another on television without the voter knowing who is behind the dirt. Candidates can obscure their identities with postage stamp size disclaimers. We need to make effective the requirement that candidates say who they are and take responsibility for their ads' content. This is an important step toward strengthening the accountability of candidates and campaigns. Campaign reform is not just about money; it is also about improving the quality and responsibility of debate. The bipartisan bill Mr. HORN and I recommend to the House would start us down that path, not by regulating the content of ads but by requiring candidates to assume responsibility for them.

Our Stand-by-Your-Ad legislation has its origins in the North Carolina General Assembly where it has been championed by Lt. Governor Dennis Wicker and was approved last session by the Senate but not the House.

Stand by Your Ad is compatible with and complementary to the full range of campaign reform proposals that will be considered by the 106th Congress, from Shays-Meehan to the disclosure-only bills. By approving this proposal, the Congress can strengthen disclosure so as to make sponsorship more clear and to require an assumption of personal responsibility in a way likely to discourage the most irresponsible and distorted attacks. We invite our colleagues to join us as cosponsors of this legislation.

PREVENTING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Government Shutdown Prevention Act, legislation designed to maintain government operations that would otherwise be halted due to an impasse in budget negotiations between Congress and the President. I first introduced this legislation in 1989, and since then the need for it has become even more apparent. Joining me as original cosponsors are Representatives ROHRBACHER, WYNN, COX, ISTOOK, PITTS, EHLERS, DAVIS (VA), and HAYWORTH.

Since I entered Congress, there have been 8 government shutdowns, costing American taxpayer millions of dollars and diminishing his confidence in elected officials. The estimated cost of the 21-day shutdown of the 104th Congress was \$44 million per day! During the first shutdown in the 104th Congress, 800,000 federal employees were "furloughed". Budget negotiations between Congress and the President should be about the American people, not a battleground for public relations.

This bill accomplishes a very simple function: to keep funding at levels allowing appropriators to complete their work while keeping the government operating. This bill essentially works as an automatic continuing resolution, providing for funding at the previous year's levels so the government can continue to operate, even through an impasse in budget negotiations. The legislation protects Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security by guaranteeing that they remain at their current funding levels.

As Members of Congress, we are duty-bound by the Constitution to forge a budget for the American people. At times our ideological disagreements have led to heartaches for our constituents. I propose, through this legislation, that we provide an environment whereupon we can work together and negotiate in good faith, and strive to reach a compromise that will be good for the people we serve.

We need to restore the public's faith in its leaders by showing that we have learned from our mistakes. Enactment of this legislation will send a clear message to the American people that we will no longer allow them to be pawns in budget disputes.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1999

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to increase the cap on state authority to allocate Low Income Housing Tax Credits to \$1.75 per capita and index the cap to inflation. The current cap of \$1.25 per capita has not been adjusted since the program was created in 1986. Since that time, population growth has totaled about 5 percent.

Although building costs rise each year, as does the affordable housing needs of the nation, the federal government's most important

and successful housing program is in effect being cut annually as a result of inflation. Since 1986, inflation has eroded the Housing Credit's purchasing power by nearly 50 percent, as measured by the Consumer Price Index. This cap is strangling state capacity to meet pressing low income housing needs.

Last year, I sponsored legislation with Representative LEWIS (D-GA) proposing this same increase in the Housing Credit cap and indexing it for inflation. Representatives ENSIGN (R-NV) and RANGEL (D-NY) also sponsored legislation to accomplish the same increase. Nearly 70 percent of the Ways and Means Committee and a total of 299 of our fellow House Members cosponsored one or both of these bills last year. Unfortunately, the Congress did not pass a Housing Credit increase because the Omnibus Appropriation bill eventually enacted was not large enough to accommodate it.

The Housing Credit is the primary federal-state tool for producing affordable rental housing all across the country. Since it was established, state agencies have allocated over \$3 billion in Housing Credits to help finance nearly one million homes for low income families, including 70,000 apartments in 1997. In my own state of Connecticut, the Credit is responsible for helping finance over 7,000 apartments for low income families, including 650 apartments in 1997.

Despite the success of the Housing Credit in meeting affordable rental housing needs, the apartments it helps finance can barely keep pace with the nearly 100,000 low cost apartments which were demolished, abandoned, or converted to market rate use each year. Demand for Housing Credits currently outstrips supply by more than three to one nationwide. Increasing the cap as I propose would allow states to finance approximately 27,000 more critically-needed low income apartments each year using the Housing Credit, helping to meet this growing need.

A broad, bipartisan consensus exists for raising the Housing Credit cap, just as in 1993, when Congress made the Credit permanent. The Administration, the nation's governors and mayors, and virtually all major housing groups also support this increase.

I urge my colleagues to join me in a bipartisan effort to provide this long overdue increase in the Housing Credit cap.

REGARDING HOUSE RESOLUTION
612

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 24,000 men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are currently involved in operations in the Persian Gulf Region.

It is important that we protect the interests of the United States. It is important that we have peace in the Middle East. It is important that we do what we can to prevent the development of weapons of mass destruction.

However, Mr. Speaker, we must pursue these goals with great caution. We must exer-

cise restraint in our use of force. We must use great care when putting our young men and women in harms way. We must be circumspect before putting the lives of other citizens at risk. We must be prudent in our decisions to intervene in the internal affairs of foreign nations. We may not like Saddam Hussein, but that does not give us the right to declare his death.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the advisors to the President were very deliberate and judicious before arriving at the recommendation to undertake military action against Iraq. However, I am not certain that the assumptions upon which they relied are correct. I am not certain that Saddam Hussein poses the threat to our national security interests that many believe he does. I am not certain that Iraq has the capacity to deliver the kind of mass destruction that should cause us the kind of concern that has triggered this reaction. I am not certain that peace is best achieved through war.

Nonetheless, I stand behind our men and women whose courage and patriotism cannot be questioned. I stand behind our President who, it is clear, painstakingly reached this difficult decision. I stand behind this Nation, at a time which calls upon us to cooperate with each other and be united in our resolve to promote and protect democracy.

TREATMENT OF CHILDREN'S
DEFORMITIES ACT

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Treatment of Children's Deformities Act, legislation that prohibits insurers from discriminating against children born with deformities by denying coverage of reconstructive surgery. Children should not only be provided reconstructive surgery to improve the function of a part of the body, but also should be given the opportunity to face the world with a normal appearance. Insurers would like for you to think that such surgery is merely cosmetic—parents of children dealing with the physical and psychological effects of such deformities would beg to differ.

Today, approximately seven percent of American children are born with pediatric deformities and congenital defects such as birth marks, cleft lip, cleft palate, absent external ears and other facial deformities. A recent survey of the American Society of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgeons indicated that over half of the plastic surgeons surveyed have had a pediatric patient who in the last two years has been denied, or experienced significant difficulty in obtaining, insurance coverage for their surgical procedures.

Some insurance companies claim that reconstructive procedures that do not improve function are not medically necessary and are, therefore, cosmetic. America's physicians recognize an important difference between reconstructive and cosmetic surgery to which this bill calls attention. The American Medical Association defines cosmetic surgery as being performed to reshape normal structures of the

body in order to improve the patient's appearance and self-esteem. They define reconstructive surgery as being performed on abnormal structures of the body caused by congenital defects, developmental abnormalities, trauma, infection, tumors or disease.

The Treatment of Children's Deformities Act acknowledges the importance of the AMA's definitions and requires that managed care and insurance companies do the same. The problems that Americans across the board are experiencing with various managed care companies who place cost over quality care are infuriating enough, but when it affects the physical and emotional well-being of children, Congress must be willing to put our foot down.

Please join me in defending the needs of children with deformities and congenital defects and their families by cosponsoring this important bill.

TRIBUTE TO LEOPOLDO "CONDO"
GONZALES

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a husband and father, a veteran and war hero, and a member of the San Diego community who died on November 7, 1998, at the age of 75.

Leopoldo "Condo" Gonzales was born to Sophia and Francisco Gonzales on October 7, 1923. In 1941, he met Connie Briones, and they were married on July 14, 1943.

Condo joined the Army in 1942 to serve his country in World War II. He served with the 63d Engineer Battalion in Europe until the end of the war, and received the Campaign Medal, three Bronze Stars, and two Victory Medals.

Condo and Connie began their family with the birth of their first child, Robert, in 1946. Joining Robert was his brother, Frank, in 1948 and sister, Margie, in 1952.

After the war years, Condo worked for the Cannery and Cudahy Meat Packing Company. He was a member of Masonry Union Local No. 89 and worked for several construction companies before his retirement.

Condo and his family lived in the Linda Vista area of San Diego for many years before moving to their farm in Lakeside, CA. Condo enjoyed gardening, and his farm was full of watermelons, corn, and animals. In 1956, they moved back to San Diego, to the Sierra Mesa area. In his retirement years, Condo enjoyed especially his children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

His was a wonderful life. He was a man who did his duty to his country, who raised his family well, and who contributed to his community. He is survived by Connie, his wife of 55 years, as well as his children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. My thoughts and prayers go out to his wife and family and to the larger community that was touched by his presence.

TRIBUTE TO PHILADELPHIA COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE ON ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my enthusiastic congratulations to Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine (PCOM), which this year celebrates its Centennial anniversary. For 100 years, PCOM has served as a national leader in the training of exceptional physicians. Today, the College is the largest osteopathic medical school in the United States, and graduates more primary health care physicians than any other medical school in the nation. PCOM was recently praised for its strong emphasis on primary care and early clinical exposure in the Princeton Review's 1998 Guide, "The Best Medical Schools." In addition, the College was awarded the highest possible ranking in the 1998 "Primary Care Scorecard," which ranks osteopathic medical schools according to the number of students entering primary care fields, and the presence of a family practice division within the College.

PCOM's success in educating high quality physicians is directly attributable to its interdisciplinary curriculum, and "Doctors from Day One" philosophy. While students are thoroughly trained in the science of medicine, they are also schooled in the humanistic application of their trade. Clinical experience beginning early in a student's career sets a tone, which values both a thorough assessment of a patient's medical symptoms, and an ability to discern the social, economic, and other individual factors which also play a role in determining a patient's health and wellness. This integrated approach to the practice of medicine is reinforced during the required four months students spend staffing the College's rural and urban health care facilities, which serve Philadelphia's underserved populations. Clearly, PCOM boasts a unique tradition of medical education.

PCOM has an exciting year ahead. Construction of its new Student Activity Center, a comprehensive exercise facility, will be completed this summer. The Student Activity Center underscores the College's commitment to its mission by encouraging its students and faculty to practice the good health habits that they advise their patients to practice. A book commemorating PCOM's 100 years of medical education has been published, with a special introduction by former United States Surgeon General C. Everett Koop. Two historical exhibits on display at the College throughout the year present photographs and papers, which document PCOM's proud history and the emergence of osteopathic medicine as a medical practice. PCOM will also be a 1999 Philadelphia sponsor of the nationally acclaimed Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation "Race for the Cure."

Mr. Speaker, and fellow Colleagues of the House, please join me in extending our gratitude to Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine for its 100 years of outstanding medical leadership and service to our nation. May PCOM's distinguished tradition of medical

education continue to thrive for the next 100 years and beyond.

TRIBUTE TO THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF OUR LADY OF CHALDEANS CATHEDRAL, MOTHER OF GOD CHURCH

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize a parish that has dedicated 50 years to the service of God and community. On Friday, January 8, 1999, Our Lady of Chaldeans Cathedral, Mother of God Church will celebrate its Golden Jubilee Anniversary.

Located in Southfield, Michigan, Our Lady of Chaldeans Cathedral has been a center of religious and social activity for 50 years. During those years, the congregation has joyfully celebrated Christmas and Easter, baptisms and weddings, while lending a warm shoulder to those suffering. The Church has been a faithful friend to all who have walked through the front doors.

When the parish was founded in 1948, the church was named for the Holy Mother, calling it the Mother of God Church. In 1982, Pastor Ibrahim Ibrahim was named the first Chaldean Bishop in the United States. The Mother of God Parish was then elevated to a Cathedral. The Chaldean community is family oriented and religious. The congregation grew from 100 families to approximately four thousand in 1998. The clergy and membership have given their time and talents to serve God and their community.

Our Lady of Chaldeans Cathedral, Mother of God Church has been the center of many people's lives for 50 years. Although history and time have changed the congregation, the spirit of the church has remained strong. I would like to personally congratulate the parishioners on this historic milestone. Best wishes in the next 50 years.

HONORING SALLY JAMESON

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the appointment of my good friend, Mrs. Sally Jameson as executive director of the Charles County Chamber of Commerce.

For the past six years, Sally has been affiliated with the Charles County Chamber of Commerce; five of those years she served the legislative committee.

Prior to her appointment, Sally was the director of the Waldorf Jaycee Community Center since it opened in 1992. Today, it has evolved as a focal point for Charles County and is currently undergoing expansion.

Mr. Speaker, she is working with the Charles County Public Schools on a student exchange with students in Waldorf, Germany and with the Charles County Commissioners on a twin-city establishment between Waldorf, Maryland and Waldorf, Germany.

Sally is a life-long resident of Charles County and resides in Bryantown with her husband, Gene and two children, Donnie and Michelle.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that Sally will be a tremendous asset to the Chamber of Commerce and southern Maryland. I am proud to be her representative in Congress and I ask you and the remainder of my colleagues to join with me in acknowledging the appointment of this fine American.

TRIBUTE TO REV. CANON JOSE DANIEL CARLO

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Reverend Canon Jose Daniel Carlo, beloved spiritual leader of St. Simon's Episcopal Church in San Fernando. Father Carlo recently announced that he is retiring from St. Simon's after 18 years. I know his parishioners reacted to his decision with mixed emotions. While they wish him the best, they know that he is virtually irreplaceable. His extraordinary contributions to the Church and the Northeast San Fernando Valley will be remembered with great appreciation.

Father Carlo constantly sought ways for the Church to build strong bonds with the community. For example, every Sunday, he conducted four services, two in English and two in Spanish. In this way, Father Carlo ensured that St. Simon's would be a place of worship open to every resident of San Fernando and its surrounding areas.

Father Carlo also turned the Church into a home for many programs providing much-needed services to residents of the Northeast Valley. He recognized the special responsibility of the Church to become involved during a time of government cutbacks. The Parish became the site for community and outreach programs relating to alcoholism, drugs, teen pregnancy, senior citizens, pre-school kids and clothing and food.

In addition to these ongoing programs, Father Carlo was adamant that St. Simon's provide assistance during times of urgency or crisis. In 1986, the Church assisted over 4500 persons applying for their cards during the Amnesty Program for Undocumented Aliens. For six months after the devastating Northridge Earthquake of 1994, St. Simon's made available tons of emergency food, clothing, diapers, sleeping bags and other necessities to more than 2500 families.

Within the diocese of Los Angeles, Father Carlo promoted the implementation of the first Five Year Plan for the Development of Hispanic Ministry at the national and provincial levels.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Father Daniel Carlo of St. Simon's Episcopal Church of San Fernando, whose dedication to his Parish and the community inspires us all. During his 18-year tenure at St. Simon's, Father Carlo had a positive affect on the lives of so many people. I join his congregation in wishing Father Carlo and his family all the best as he embarks on new challenges.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA DEMOCRACY 2000
ACT**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Wednesday, January 6, 1999*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the first bill in my D.C. Democracy Now Package. The bills to follow, as many as half a dozen, will be introduced at appropriate times throughout the 106th Congress.

The purpose of the first of these bills, the District of Columbia Democracy 2000 Act (D.C. Democracy 2000) is to ensure that the new city administration has sufficient control of the District government to be held accountable in preparation for the expiration of the control period. Among the other bills that will be included in the Package are: D.C. Budget Autonomy Act; D.C. Legislative Autonomy Act; D.C. City Employee Tax Fairness Act (Commuter Tax for District Government Employees); and Delegate Vote Restoration.

I am introducing D.C. Democracy 2000 first because it is the most urgent. This bill is essential to assure the stable transition to full self-government already begun by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority. The heart of D.C. Democracy 2000 is the early return of Home Rule, allowing the Authority to expire a full year ahead of schedule. At the time that the Authority Act was passed, the District's insolvency led the Congress to estimate that it would take four years of balanced budgets to achieve the necessary stability. However, the District's reforms have far outstripped the estimate of Congress. It now seems clear that by Fiscal Year 2000 the District shall have had three consecutive years of balanced budgets. If the failure to achieve balanced budgets could delay the return of Home Rule, it should follow that the prudence reflected in continuous years of surpluses should be equally recognized. Further delay is especially unwarranted in light of the continued oversight of the City Council and Congress.

The District has just revolutionized its political culture by election of a new Mayor who earned his stripes as a tenacious Chief Financial Officer who cut budgets, prevented overspending, and helped create surpluses. To match the new Mayor, a new City Council has already shown a new, strict approach to oversight that holds the executive and the city agencies accountable. Moreover, the District has used most of its surplus revenues to pay down its accumulated deficit. As a result, the District is expected to eliminate its operating deficit without using the authority to borrow, that Congress granted the city in the Revitalization Package in 1997. This is performance that not only deserves recognition, it is performance that deserves encouragement by the return of authority that was stripped away only because of a fiscal crisis. Needless to say, it would lift the spirits of District residents to begin the Year 2000 with Home Rule restored.

The bill also includes a section that would give the Mayor authority to hire and fire department heads. This section carries out the purpose of the Authority Act "to ensure the most efficient and effective delivery of services, by the District government during a period of fiscal emergency." P.L. 104-8, Title I

§2(b)(2). On January 2, Alice Rivlin, for the Authority, signed a memorandum of agreement delegating authority to the Mayor to run the District government to the fullest extent allowed by existing law. Viewed from the front lines of the District government's present progress, the Authority's considered judgment was that a transition to Home Rule through the delegation of power to the new Mayor was necessary in advance of the transfer of ultimate power at the end of the control period; a clean line of reporting authority unmistakably identifying the responsible officials was necessary for efficient and effective government operational reform; and Mayor Williams, in his role as Chief Financial Officer, had already demonstrated his capacity to administer complicated operations.

This section amends existing law to complete a transfer of power that the Authority desired but could not make because of the wording of the statute. The Authority transferred to the Mayor its jurisdiction over nine operating agencies, but believed it was unable to return that authority to hire and fire department heads. In returning this power, this section seeks to enhance and facilitate the Mayor's ability to control managers. It eliminates the possibility of an illusion of an appeal to a higher authority beyond the Mayor to acquire or retain a position.

The advantage of having a government that knows that it and it alone will be fully accountable cannot be overestimated in a democracy. Whatever justification some may have found for the denial of self-government has been stripped away by the growing fiscal health of the District government and its prudence in management of its finances and operations. Beyond securing more revenue, city officials have already shown that they know what to do with it. Their decision to use surplus revenues to pay down the city's accumulated deficit demonstrates they can and will make tough financial choices. In the face of the sacrifices that District residents have made and the unanticipated surpluses that have been produced, there is no justification for delaying a return to coherent and fully accountable self-government.

A TRIBUTE TO CASA LARIOS AND
THE LARIOS FAMILY**HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Quintin and Maria Teresa Larios. The owners and operators of some of the best Cuban restaurants in the United States, Casa Larios, Larios on the Beach and Bongos Cuban Cafe.

I believe that Quintin and Maria Teresa typify the dream of so many who spend countless hours working hard in the food service industry—to open their own restaurant.

The Larios came to the United States in 1973, after first fleeing Cuba and then living in Spain, and their culinary skills expertly reflect their Cuban heritage. The couple worked in the restaurant business in Miami for 12 years, gaining valuable experience before embarking on their own venture.

Casa Larios opened in 1988, and in the tradition of Cuban restaurants, Maria Teresa

worked out front with the customers while Quintin took over the kitchen as chief.

As its popularity has grown, the Larios expanded by opening a location in South Beach as well as Disney Downtown in Orlando. The popular vocal artist, Gloria Estefan, liked Casa Larios so much that she and her husband, Cuban-American entrepreneur Emilio Estefan, joined the Larios in the ownership of the South Beach and Orlando locations, Larios on the Beach and Bongos Cuban Cafe.

When Casa Larios outgrew its original location on West Flagler Street in Miami earlier this summer and moved a few blocks down the street, the Larios gave interested customers pieces of the memorabilia depicting the republican era in Cuba (1902–1959) from newspapers on the restaurant's walls.

We feel very fortunate to have such excellent cuisine in South Florida and I congratulate Maria Teresa and Quintin on their well-deserved, extraordinary success.

ELIMINATE THE FAA'S LIAISON
AND FAMILIARIZATION TRAINING
PROGRAM**HON. RAY LAHOOD**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the frequent flyer program that is currently being run down at the Federal Aviation Administration. But unlike other frequent flyer programs, you don't have to earn your free flight in this program—all you have to do is sign up. What I am referring to, of course, is the FAA's Liaison and Familiarization Training Program (FAM), a program that was originally created to give air traffic controllers an awareness of, and familiarization with, cockpit and pilot procedures by allowing them to ride in the cockpit's jump seat. This program, while laudable in purpose, has unfortunately turned into a "popular perk" for FAA employees who are more interested in getting free air travel for vacations and personal reasons than they are in observing and learning about cockpit and safety procedures. The abuses of this program were so bad, in fact, that the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation recently recommended a number of reforms be made to the program. It is, in the words of one airline's slogan, becoming obvious that FAA employees love to fly, and it shows. Today, I am introducing a bill that will implement the Inspector General's reforms in order to curb the rampant and widespread abuse of the FAM program by FAA employees.

In an August 3, 1998 memo to Jane Garvey, the FAA Administrator, Kenneth Mead, the DOT's Inspector General (IG), reiterated his concern over the "serious, continuing, and widespread lapse of ethics in the Liaison and Familiarization program (FAM)." This program, which dates back to the 1940's, was originally created in order to allow FAA employees, particularly air traffic controllers, to ride in an airline cockpit's jump seat in order to become familiar with the environment in which pilots operate. However, over the past two decades this program has been increasingly misused by employees. And, I don't think I need to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that accepting gifts of

free travel is in direct contravention to a host of laws, regulations, and executive orders.

Among the rampant abuses that were detailed in a February 20, 1996 IG report were the following: an employee that took 12 weekend trips in a 15-month period to visit his family in Tampa, Florida; an employee that took 10 weekend trips in a 9-month period to visit the city where he ultimately retired; an employee that took 7 trips to Fort Myers or Tampa, Florida, and 2 trips to Las Vegas, Nevada, utilizing weekends and regular days off to travel; travel by an employee that utilized annual leave or regular days off to take 7 trips to Los Angeles, California, and 1 trip to Munich, Germany; an employee that took 17 trips to travel to his military reserve duty stations; and 7 couples that took 21 flights for extended weekends and vacations. And, according to an article published in the Washington Post, 247,840 authorizations for travel under the auspices of this program were issued by the FAA between January 1993 and April 1994. Unfortunately, the FAA failed to act on this 1996 report, and that is why I am introducing legislation that will reform this program so that these abuses and ethical violations will not occur in the future.

The Inspector General's August 3 memo makes several recommendations for reform. I believe these recommendations are valid, reasonable, and absolutely necessary in order to curb the ethical lapses that have occurred, while still preserving the program's valuable training and safety benefits. My bill simply adopts the recommendations of the Inspector General and requires the FAA to transmit a report to Congress on the implementation of these reforms. Specifically, the IG's report makes the following recommendations precluding FAM travel that "(1) involve travel on leave days or days off; (2) involve scheduled leave of days off between the outgoing flight and the return flight except when management makes an affirmative documented determination that such is for legitimate purposes and will not create an appearance of impropriety; or (3) involve foreign overseas travel for an employee in a facility that does not work oceanic airspace." In addition, the IG report makes the further recommendation that "appropriate controls must require preapproval of FAM flights by supervisory personnel and only when the supervisor determines that the specific flight meets official training needs of the FAA."

It is time that we reform this program. The abuses have gone on far too long, so long, in fact, that the program is considered an entitlement by air traffic controllers in their contract negotiations with the FAA. This program has, according to the IG, become "what is widely understood to be a popular 'perk' for many FAA employees"—a perk that I believe needs to end.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
MORRISTOWN JEWISH CENTER—
BEIT YISRAEL, COUNTY OF MOR-
RIS, NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th Anniversary

of the Morristown Jewish Center—Beit Yisrael, County of Morris, New Jersey.

The Jewish community in Morristown first began meeting in the home of Abraham Mintz and for several years, held Hebrew school classes and religious services there. At that time Morristown was very underdeveloped and this meeting spot was quite inconvenient to access. Over the next several years, the Center relocated to several facilities including Eureka Hall, the Masonic Hall, Lippman Hall, Miller Hall and the estate of Heyward G. Hemmel.

The organization thrived throughout the first quarter of the century and offered numerous benefits of the surrounding community. During the 1920's the Rabbi Signer established the Jewish Center League for religious, cultural, physical and social purposes. In order to suit the diverse needs of the League, a new building was sought. With the help of local department store owner, Maurice Epstein, the cornerstone was laid on March 3, 1929 for a new multipurpose meeting space on Speedwell Avenue in Morristown.

In the 1950s, the Center enjoys a rather unique feature in that it housed Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Congregations with the building. As a result, it served as a model for like-sized communities throughout the nation.

The Morristown Jewish center has continued to grow throughout the century and continues its mission of the founders by being the religious, educational and social core of the Morristown Jewish community. Currently, 430 families comprise the membership of this prestigious congregation.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 100 years, the Morristown Jewish center has prospered enormously in order to unite the community and will continue to do so for many years to come. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to congratulate the members of the Morristown Jewish Center—Beit Yisrael, on this special anniversary year.

THE Y2K MILLENNIUM BUG

HON. JOHN LINDER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 359 Days, 11 Hours, 32 Minutes, and 26 Seconds until the Year 2000 computer problem affects computers and computer chips worldwide on the morning of January 1, 2000.

As we know, many computers will be unable to process dates beyond December 31, 1999, making the year 2000 indistinguishable from the year 1900. The potential technological turmoil could cause computers to generate incorrect data or stop running. Credit cards, ATM cards, security systems, hospital equipment, telephone service, electricity, and paycheck systems could be affected. I don't think anyone is sure what will happen.

Fortunately, in the year 2000, we have a few days to recover after the Y2K problem hits because January 1st falls on Saturday. However, we lose one potential additional day because the New Year's Day holiday—by law—must be observed on the previous Friday, December 31, 1999.

I have re-introduced legislation that will provide the public and technology professionals with an additional day, prior to the start of the first workweek in January 2000, to work on repairs on failed computer systems caused by the Year 2000 computer problem. My proposal will move the New Year's Day holiday in the year 2000 to Monday, January 3, 2000.

Mr. Speaker, congressional committees have been successfully working to prepare the nation for Y2K, and this is just another proposal that may help ease the difficulties we face. It is not a silver bullet to solve the problem. It is vital that all businesses and government agencies continue to mobilize and work to repair computers in the remaining 359 days before the Y2K problem strikes. This proposal simply ensures that businesses, the public and computer experts have an additional 24 hours to respond to problems that may arise.

STATEMENT ON THE ARTICLES OF
IMPEACHMENT

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Articles of Impeachment before this House. I urge Members to step outside the passion of your convictions and think about our obligations to the Constitution, to our constituents, and our place in history.

Mr. Speaker, I hoped this moment could be avoided and that Members of the Judiciary Committee, after carefully examining the evidence, history and their consciences, would recognize that the charges do not rise to the level of an impeachable offense. With this vote, we have the opportunity, by censure, to live up to the Framers' vision and honorably close a sad chapter in our Republic's history, or open a new, more perilous one in which the private lives of public figures become fair game for scrutiny and prosecutorial entrapment.

The House Judiciary Committee process was unfair. It relied exclusively on material gathered by the Independent Counsel and failed to interview material witnesses or subject them to the rigors of cross examination.

Some Committee members abandoned the most fundamental precept of fairness—the presumption of innocence. While paying homage to the law and constitutional responsibilities, some of our colleagues are even pointing to the President's unwillingness to give up his constitutional right to avoid self-incrimination by demanding that he admit to perjury.

Can we call this process fair?

The shortcomings of our process: abrogation of basic tenets of jurisprudence; an unfair and flawed process; reliance on hearsay; abandonment of the presumption of innocence; and release of materials in a prejudicial manner indicate the need to exercise great caution.

Do we really think these charges rise to the level of impeachable offenses envisioned by the Framers? I fear we are falling victim to what Alexander Hamilton called "the greatest danger"—the danger of partisan impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, the American people and history will judge us!

As Members of the People's House, we must never forget that we were sent here by the American people to represent them. The majority of Americans have resoundingly said they do not support the impeachment. A vote for impeachment under these circumstances would go against the fabric of representative democracy and would overturn the will of the American people—a grave measure indeed!

As we vote, let us reflect on our own experiences, perceptions of fairness, justice, and our understanding of the facts, to conscientiously apply the requisite tests to determine our vote. We can ill afford to so endanger the future of our democracy by voting to impeach the President of these United States.

You have the votes to impeach. But can your conscience withstand the scrutiny that history will bring to bear on your vote?

TRIBUTE TO HOWARD L. OWENS

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise in tribute to Mr. Howard L. Owens of Sacramento, California. Today, Mr. Owens will be presented the "Lifetime Health Care Advocate Award" by Health Access of California. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in saluting him for this important accomplishment.

In 1984 Mr. Owens retired as Assistant Regional Director of the United Auto Workers after providing 35 years of health care advocacy for the working men and women of that union.

Since then, he has given an even greater amount of his time to the vital cause of health care advocacy. Mr. Owens has served as president and legislative chair of the Congress of California Seniors. Under his leadership, this organization has become a strong and constant voice for health care access and quality improvements.

Mr. Owens was also one of the chief proponents of Proposition 186, California's universal health care initiative which appeared on the 1992 ballot. Today he is a very prominent advocate for the Patients Bill of Rights in Congress.

He is the current president of Health Access California and has served in this capacity for more than five years. Additionally, Mr. Owens is the Regional Director of the National Council of Senior Citizens and the Executive Director of the Consumer Federation of California.

As a tireless advocate for these organizations, he directs their efforts to maintain and enhance Medicare coverage and supports other efforts to ensure that adequate health care is available to all.

Mr. Owens' many awards include the prestigious "Consumer Advocate of the Year" award which he received from the California Trial Lawyers Association.

In his efforts to keep energy affordable and accessible for all of California's citizenry, Mr. Owens has also devoted much time to his service on the boards of both Southern California Edison and Pacific Gas & Electric.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Howard Owens. He is a fine advocate for the senior citizens and working families of California. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me

in congratulating him as he is honored today with the "Lifetime Health Care Advocate Award" in Sacramento.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE SUAREZ, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF MADISON HEIGHTS

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mayor George Suarez who is resigning after 25 years of faithful and dedicated service to the City of Madison Heights and its residents.

Mayor Suarez has governed the City of Madison Heights almost half of its city's 44 year history, and under his leadership and guidance, their residents have benefitted from new and expanded facilities.

A senior citizen center, a district court building, a "state-of-the-art" police station, a branch library, a second fire station, and a nature center built in Friendship Woods that proudly bears the Suarez name, are just a few of his outstanding accomplishments.

In addition, George Suarez has served on innumerable boards and committees, not merely as a member, but as an active participant. And on a more festive note, Mayor Suarez had the honor of performing 1,925 wedding ceremonies.

Mr. Speaker, I have known and worked with Mayor Suarez from my very first term in the United States House of Representatives and have seen first-hand his community's development and progress. My staff and I have worked closely with the Mayor and his administration throughout the years, and we have always enjoyed a friendly and productive relationship.

Serving the public has been a priority in the life of George Suarez and indeed, it will continue as his title changes from Mayor to Commissioner. In November, he ran and won the seat as Oakland County Commissioner for the 24th District and will begin serving in January 1999.

As he reflected on his retirement, he said, "Although I'm stepping down as your Mayor, I plan to be an active part of the community for the foreseeable future, helping Madison Heights to continue to be the city of progress." I agree, and with a bit of a twist to an old saying—you can take the man out of Madison Heights, but you can't take Madison Heights out of the man.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me first, in thanking George Suarez for his friendship and all that he has accomplished for the residents of Madison Heights and second, to wish him good health and success in fulfilling his new assignment. We will miss you, Mayor Suarez.

HONORING WILLIAM D. "BILL" FARR

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the most important pioneers of

water development in Colorado history—William D. "Bill" Farr. Mr. Farr epitomizes the foresight of pioneering the water movement in Colorado. On January 11, 1999, W.D. Farr will receive the 1999 "Citizen of the West," award for his work on water issues for Colorado. This annual award is given to the person who exemplifies the spirit and determination of the western pioneer. W.D. Farr is recognized as a longtime leader and visionary in the area of water conservation and is also credited with pioneering the method for successful year round cattle feeding.

W.D. Farr was born in 1910 in Greeley, CO. He grew up managing his family's Crystal River Ranch in Carbondale, CO. The challenge of operating a ranch with a 13-mile irrigation ditch system, plus years of interest in water management, resulted in Farr's lifelong commitment to water policy. W.D. served as director of the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District for more than 40 years, and was director and the first President of the Colorado Water and Power Development Authority.

W.D. Farr is additionally a renowned leader in the cattle industry. He served as a founder and director of the Colorado Cattle Feeders Association and a director and president of the American National Cattlemen's Association. His inestimable contributions to Colorado in both water and cattle are unequalled and we as a state owe a great deal to his efforts. Thank you W.D. Farr for all of your contributions to Colorado, and congratulations on receiving the "Citizen of the West" award, you truly deserve it!

U.S. IMMIGRATION COURT ACT

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to establish a new United States Immigration Court. The title of the bill is the "United States Immigration Court Act of 1999." This bill would remove the immigration adjudication functions from the Justice Department and invest them in a new Article I court. The court would be composed of a trial division and an appellate division whose decisions would be appealable to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

The system for adjudicating immigration matters has matured tremendously over the last 15 years. Special inquiry judges have become true immigration judges. The Board of Immigration Appeals has been greatly expanded, and the whole Executive Office for Immigration Review has been separated from the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Yet much of this system, including the Board of Immigration Appeals, does not exist in statute. And while separated from the INS, aliens still take their cases before judges who are employed by the same department as the trial attorneys who are prosecuting them.

It is time to take the next logical step and create a comprehensive adjudicatory system in statute. Such a system should be independent of this Justice Department. This is not a new concept—in fact, I first introduced legislation to take this step back in 1982. I continue to believe that an Article I court would allow

for more efficient and streamline consideration of immigration claims with enhanced confidence by aliens and practitioners in the fairness and independence of the process.

The bill introduced today provides a solid framework on which to build debate on this important and far-reaching reform. I look forward to working with all interested parties in fine-tuning and further developing this proposal where necessary and enacting this much needed reform. It is my hope to see real progress made on this matter and I urge my colleagues to support the United States Immigration Court Act of 1999.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA PRISON SAFETY
ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Prison Safety Act, a bill to assure the safety of the District of Columbia and other Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) inmates, who may be placed in private prison facilities, as well as the communities where the prisons are placed. This provision has become necessary as a result of § 11201 the 1997 District of Columbia Revitalization Act (P.L. 105-33). That bill requires that BOP house in privately contracted facilities at least 2000 D.C. sentenced felons by December 31, 1999 and at least 50 percent of D.C. felons by September 30, 2003. Under the Revitalization Act, the Lorton Correctional Complex is to be closed by December 31, 2001, and the BOP is to assume responsibility for the maintenance of the District's inmate population. My bill would give the Director of BOP the necessary discretion to decide whether to house D.C. inmates in private prison facilities, and if so, when and how many. This mandate would mark the first time that BOP has contracted for the housing of significant numbers of inmates in private facilities. The extremely short time frames were placed in the statute without any reference to the BOP capabilities, but rather, in order to meet the 6 year limit for the closure of Lorton. I am introducing this bill because recent events have driven home the necessity for informed expert judgement before decisions to contract out inmate housing are made.

On December 3, 1998, the Corrections Trustee for the District of Columbia released a report on the investigation of problems arising from the placement of D.C. inmates in the Northeast Ohio Correctional Center (NEOCC). This highly critical report followed numerous violent confrontations between guards and inmates, an escape by six inmates, and the killing of two other inmates. The Trustee's report strongly and unequivocally criticized virtually all aspects of the operations of NEOCC. The company that runs this facility, Corrections Corporation of America (CCA), is the most experienced in the country.

The industry is a new one with relatively few vendors. The NEOCC experience is fair warning of what could happen if BOP proceeds on the basis of an automatic mandate in spite of the evidence that has accumulated here and around the country. The mounting troubles

have been so great that the BOP was forced to revise the original request for proposal (RFP). The new process employs two RFPs, thereby separating low security male inmates from minimum security males, females and young offenders. Furthermore, the RFP for low security inmates now requires the BOP to consider prior performance of the vendors before awarding the contract.

However, this action puts BOP behind schedule for privatization mandated by the Revitalization Act. The experience of the private sector argues for a much more careful approach than Congress was aware of at the time the 1997 Revitalization Act was passed. Whereas 50 percent of D.C. inmates are to be privatized in 5 years time, the 50 percent far exceeds any comparable number of inmates currently housed in any private facility.

My provision does not bar privatization, but it could bar further disasters that have surrounded such privatization contracts. BOP may still decide to house the same, or different number in private facilities. The only point in this provision is to keep the BOP from believing it must go over the side of a cliff even if there would be a more sensible path.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to repeal a legislative provision included in P.L. 105-277, the omnibus bill making appropriations for Fiscal Year 1999. This provision directs the Office of Management and Budget to amend Section—36 of Circular A110 to require Federal agencies to ensure that all data produced under grants made to institutions of higher education, hospitals, and non-profit organizations will be made available to the public through procedures established under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

This provision should be repealed on the basis of both the flawed process through which it was adopted and because of the damage it is likely to do to the publicly funded research structure which we have developed over the past fifty years. This scope of this provision has never been examined in public and has never been the subject of a hearing. And, if protests from the research community are correct, this provision poses a major threat to academic freedom in the United States.

On the process issue, it is ironic, that a provision which some have described as a sunshine provision was tucked into a 4,000-page bill in the dead of night. There were no bills introduced in the 106th Congress containing this provision. There were no hearings held to determine whether there was a problem with the current situation with regard to data availability in the scientific community. We do not know what the scope of any existing problem is, or whether using the Freedom of Information Act is the best way to address this alleged problem. No one in the university, hospital, or non-profit community was provided an opportunity to comment on this legislative provision or the need for it. To alter the rules that the scientific community has operated under for decades without providing them an opportunity to speak

to the need for this change or to participate in developing it, is not only unwise, it is unfair.

I fully support the free and open exchange of information, as I believe all Members do. I doubt we could have made the progress we have in science without sharing of new knowledge. Scientists, both publicly and privately funded, routinely use a variety of mechanisms to share data and information with one another and with the public. The proliferation of scientific journals, increased scientific programming on television and radio, and routine science coverage by daily news journals are all evidence of this. However, I believe there are numerous reasons to question the wisdom of mandating the application of the Freedom of Information Act to data generated under this category of federal research funding as a mechanism for achieving the laudable goal of facilitating the dissemination of scientific information.

A number of my colleagues joined me in sending a letter to the Administration to express some specific concerns regarding the implementation of this policy change, and I am appending this letter at the end of these remarks. One area of concern pertains to research involving human subjects. Public health and bio-medical research requires the voluntary participation of human subjects. Volunteers currently make agreements with researchers and their institutions to divulge personal medical information on the condition that their information will remain strictly confidential. They do this with the understanding that they are making this agreement with the research institution and not with the federal government. Although FOIA provides protections for some types of information, the provisions may not be adequate to ensure confidentiality. Even if they were, I believe individuals will be reluctant to divulge sensitive personal information knowing that this information effectively becomes the property of the U.S. government as an official government record. Significant loss of voluntary participation in public health and bio-medical research would be devastating.

I am also concerned that this provision could facilitate the theft of intellectual property. We have numerous statutes, such as the Bayh-Dole Act, which provide protections for the intellectual property of researchers receiving federal awards. Mandating the accessibility of all data produced under a federal award would undermine the protections for researchers' intellectual property rights guaranteed under copyright and other technology transfer laws. Although Circular A110 does not cover federal awards to businesses and contractors, there are numerous instances of university-private sector partnerships in which private and federal dollars are intermingled within research projects. While privately-funded research will not be subject to FOIA, companies may be reluctant to continue some areas of joint research with federally-funded institutions who must comply with this mandate because of ambiguities created in the determination of which data would or would not be subject to FOIA.

I am also concerned about the potential for increases in administrative burdens and costs for granting agencies and for award recipients. Universities and other grant receiving institutions are likely to feel compelled to create formal, centralized procedures for responding to requests for data and for implementing the requirements of FOIA. While the language of the

Omnibus Bill indicates that agencies could charge a user fee for obtaining data at the request of a private party, there appears to be no mechanism available to award recipients to offset the administrative costs of complying with the required change in policy. Increased administrative costs associated with grants come at the expense of research. Increased administrative costs are not, in themselves, a reason not to move forward with policies in the public interest. However, we should have taken the time to consider what the nature and level of the costs of compliance with this provision were likely to be.

Obviously, some groups feel that an information-sharing problem exists. They may now feel that their concerns have been addressed. However, documentation of this problem has been no more than anecdotal. What we do know is that our nation has derived immeasurable public and private benefits from government-sponsored research. We should not jeopardize this enterprise by taking a hasty, ill-considered approach to remedy an alleged problem. If this problem is serious enough to require legislative remedy, then it is certainly serious enough to receive reasoned consideration by Congress. I encourage my Colleagues to join me in repealing this provision, and giving this issue the attention it deserves by proceeding through the normal process which gives all groups an opportunity to participate in the legislative process.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 7, 1998.

Hon. JACK LEW,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Old Executive Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. LEW: We are writing to you concerning the provision included in H.R. 4328, Making Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for FY 1999, which requires OMB to amend Section -3.6 of Circular A110 to require Federal agencies to ensure that all data produced under grants made to institutions of higher education, hospitals, and non-profit organizations will be made available to the public through procedures established under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

While we all support the free and open exchange of information, we have concerns that there may be a number of negative, unintended consequences for the conduct of research under federal awards if this Circular is amended in haste and without sufficient input from federal grand-awarding agencies and grant recipients. An amendment of similar intent was offered and defeated in the House Appropriations Committee one year ago because of Members' concerns about negative impacts of making this policy change on federally-funded research. At that time, a number of agencies provided comments indicating numerous potential problems associated with making all data from federal awards subject to FOIA. We believe these concerns were and are still valid. We urge you to consider the agencies' concerns as you develop the required proposal.

One area of concern pertains to research involving human subjects. Public health and bio-medical research requires the voluntary participation of human subjects. Volunteers currently make agreements with researchers and their institutions to divulge personal medical information on the condition that their information will remain strictly confidential. They do this with the understanding that they are making this agreement with the research institution and not with

the federal government. Although FOIA provides protections for some types of information, the provisions may not be adequate to ensure confidentiality. Even if they were, we believe individuals will be reluctant to divulge sensitive personal information knowing that this information effectively becomes the property of the U.S. Government as an official government record. Significant loss of voluntary participation in public health and bio-medical research would be devastating.

We are also concerned that this provision could facilitate the theft of intellectual property. We have numerous statutes, such as the Bayh-Dole Act, which provide protections for the intellectual property of researchers' receiving federal awards. Mandating the accessibility of all data produced under a federal award would undermine the protections for researchers intellectual property rights guaranteed under copyright and other technology transfer laws. Although Circular A110 does not cover federal awards to businesses and contractors, there are numerous instances of university-private sector partnerships in which private and federal dollars are intermingled within research projects. While privately-funded research will not be subject to FOIA, companies may be reluctant to continue some areas of joint research with federally-funded institutions who must comply with this mandate because of ambiguities created in the determination of which data would or would not be subject to FOIA.

We are also concerned about the potential for increases in administrative burdens and costs for granting agencies and for award recipients. Universities and other grant receiving institutions are likely to feel compelled to create formal, centralized procedures for responding to requests for data and for implementing the requirements of FOIA. While the language of the Omnibus Bill indicates that agencies could charge a user fee for obtaining data at the request of a private party, there appears to be no mechanism available to award recipients to offset the administrative costs of complying with the required change in policy. Increased administrative costs associated with grants come at the expense of research. Increased administrative costs are not, in themselves, a reason not to move forward with policies in the public interest, but we would like to ensure that the benefits of making this change are commensurate with the costs. We encourage your office to explore this question and to work with agencies and award recipients to keep any required administrative costs to a minimum.

The above-mentioned concerns represent a few examples of the problems that we wish to see avoided in implementing this provision. Consequently, we urge you to solicit input from all federal grant-awarding agencies, and from the higher education, hospital, and non-profit grant recipient community before moving forward with this change.

Unfortunately, Congress did not hold hearings to examine whether the scope of potential problems with existing practices with regard to data sharing is sufficient to have warranted this type of change. Obviously, some groups feel that a problem exists; however, documentation of this problem has been no more than anecdotal. What we do know is that our nation has derived immeasurable public and private benefits from government-sponsored research. We do not wish to see this enterprise jeopardized by taking a hasty, ill-considered approach to remedy an alleged problem.

We encourage you to take every opportunity to explore methods of implementing this policy change in a way that serves the laudable goal of facilitating the dissemina-

tion of information without causing undue burdens or creating barriers to the continued pursuit of new knowledge through federally-funded research.

We also request that you contact Anthony McCann (Appropriations Committee; 225-3508) and Jean Fruci (Science Committee 225-6375) to schedule a meeting for interested Hill staff to brief us on your plans for implementing this provision. Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

JOHN EDWARD PORTER, JAMES T. WALSH,
SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT, CONSTANCE A.
MORELLA, VERNON J. EHLERS, GEORGE
E. BROWN, JR., NITA M. LOWEY, DAVID
E. PRICE, HOWARD L. BERMAN,
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, BOB FILNER, LYNN C.
WOOLSEY, CAROLYN MCCARTHY, MAURICE
D. HINCHEY, MAJOR R. OWENS,
HENRY A. WAXMAN, ALBERT R. WYNN,
LYNN N. RIVERS, LOIS CAPPS, JAMES A.
TRAFICANT, JR., LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER,
JOSE E. SERRANO, STEVEN C.
LATOURETTE.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE THE WORKFORCE SHORTAGE IN THE HIGH TECH- NOLOGY SECTOR

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we have been privileged to live in a time of unparalleled economic growth. Much of this growth is directly attributable to the high technology sector.

The information technology sector contributes a larger share of our gross domestic product than almost any other industry. U.S. firms dominate the world market in both high tech products and high tech services. Over 3.3 million Americans are directly employed in high technology jobs.

The workforce shortage faced by the technology sector threatens both our world dominance in the technology sector and our continued economic prosperity.

Over the next ten years, the global economy is projected to grow at three times the rate of the U.S. economy. Basic high technology infrastructure needs, in just eight of the fastest growing countries, are expected to reach \$1.6 trillion. If the U.S. does not seize the opportunity to supply the goods and services to these emerging markets, others will.

But U.S. firms simply cannot compete if they do not have access to a highly trained workforce. There can be no doubt that our current workforce is failing to keep pace with the needs of industry. Some ten percent of high technology jobs are now vacant. U.S. firms who cannot find enough domestic workers are sending more and more contracts overseas. It is incumbent upon us to stop this trend.

The 105th Congress helped mitigate this problem by enacting legislation which would raise the annual limit on temporary immigrants who are skilled in jobs for which there are a shortage of American workers. However, we cannot reasonably expect to eliminate the workforce shortage without addressing the crux of the problem: our failure to adequately train and re-train American workers.

Existing government training programs have not sufficiently trained or placed workers in

those sectors of our economy with the greatest need. To rectify this problem, I am introducing a legislative package to ensure that training programs provide the skills that American employers need by bolstering industry-driven training programs, creating incentives for successful placement, and providing for the special concerns that multi-state regions, such as the Washington Metropolitan Area, experience as they seek qualified workers.

The bills I have introduced today are:

H.R. , TO ESTABLISH FOR REGIONAL SKILLS TRAINING ALLIANCES

Modeled after the successful Manufacturing Extension Program, this bill recognizes that in rapidly expanding industry, employers are best positioned to identify the skills and knowledge needed for emerging jobs. It would provide matching funds to encourage companies to participate in consortia that would address their industry's specific skill needs. Every dollar in federal support will be matched by a dollar in state or local government support and a dollar in direct industry support.

H.R. , TO ESTABLISH REGIONAL PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCILS FOR LABOR MARKET AREAS THAT ARE LOCATED IN MORE THAN ONE STATE

This bill allows the Secretary of Labor to establish Regional Private Industry Councils (PICs). PICs play a constructive role in addressing the workforce needs within a state. These organizations, however, are state organizations and not formed to address problems that may cross state lines. To remedy that situation, this bill would allow the Secretary of Labor to certify, and fund, regional PICs that address regional problems. The new PICs would be funded directly by the Secretary of Labor to ensure that they do not take from existing state programs.

H.R. , TO PERMIT PAYMENT OF INCENTIVE BONUSES TO CERTAIN JOB TRAINING PROVIDERS THAT PLACE LARGE PERCENTAGES OF INDIVIDUALS IN OCCUPATIONS FOR WHICH A HIGH DEMAND EXISTS

This bill would ensure that the federal government's investment in training is well spent by allowing Private Industry Councils to reward bonuses to training providers with a high percentage of placement. This will help establish a more outcome-based system to ensure that training providers emphasize placing their students. This bill would amend JTPA to allow funds to be used for bonuses for training providers of specific direct training services. This creates an incentive for training providers to provide up-to-date training opportunities that coincide with market needs, and to help place trainees after they have completed their training.

H.R. , TO ALLOW EMPLOYERS A CREDIT AGAINST INCOME TAX FOR HIGH TECHNOLOGY JOB TRAINING EXPENSES

This bill would offer employers who train employees for information technology jobs a tax credit for 50 percent of the training costs up to \$2,500 per year, per employee. The credit provides an important incentive, yet requires that industry bears at least half of the training costs.

IMPROVING OUR NATION'S RETIREMENT SAVINGS

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which will help all Americans save for their retirement years. It is no secret that our current savings rate is among the lowest in the industrialized world. A low savings rate not only adversely impacts a person's retirement, it does not create much capital available for savings and investment. Without this capital, our economy cannot expand at its optimal rate. It is my hope that this legislation, if enacted, would help correct this problem.

My legislation would do several things. First, it would increase the amount of money one may contribute to an Individual Retirement Account (IRA), from \$2,000 to \$4,500, and still receive full deductibility. This amount is also indexed to inflation to protect its value from that silent thief of inflation. This would also remove a disincentive to establishing an IRA, that being the fear that the money will not be available without paying a substantial penalty when you need it. A person with an IRA would be able to make withdrawals, without penalty, for long-term care, financially devastating health care expenses, and during times of unemployment. Furthermore, no taxes would be paid on these withdrawals if they are repaid to the IRA within 5 years.

Current law offers no incentive for many people to establish IRA's. My bill would allow people who do not have access to a defined contribution plan—e.g., a 401(k) plan—to establish a tax-preferred IRA, regardless of their income. The legislation would also encourage the middle class to establish IRA's by raising the income phase-out levels from \$25,000–\$40,000 for joint filers—to \$75,000–\$120,000 for joint filers. This will provide not only incentives, but needed tax relief for the middle class. Again, these levels are indexed to inflation.

Turning to 401(k) reforms, currently folks are hit with tax liability when taking their 401(k) benefits as a lump sum when leaving a job even if it is rolled into an IRA. This is not fair. Therefore, under this proposal, people would not be exposed to tax liability if the lump sum distribution is rolled into an IRA within 60 days.

Just as contribution limits have been increased for IRA's in this legislation, they are increased for 401(k) plans as well. The tax-deductible contribution limits would be \$20,000—in 1992 dollars—indexed to inflation. This would also encourage more firms to establish defined contribution plans by injecting some common sense into the law. It would allow firms to meet antidiscrimination requirements as long as they provide equal treatment for all employees and ensure that employees are aware of the company's 401(k) plan. This is truly nondiscriminatory as everyone would be treated the same.

Finally, this proposal would correct some of the serious problems involved with IRA's and 401(k)'s when the beneficiary passes away. As someone who believes the estate tax inherently unfair, indeed I advocate its abolishment, I feel that IRA and 401(k) assets should

be excluded from gross estate calculations. This bill would do that. Furthermore, an IRA that is bequeathed to someone should be treated as the IRA of the person who inherited it. Current law forces the disbursement of the IRA when the deceased would have turned 70½ years old. This would change that pointless provision, allowing the inheritor to hold the money in savings until he or she turns 70½.

Similarly, anyone receiving 401(k) lump sum payments as a result of a death would not have the amount counted as gross income as long as it is rolled into an IRA. That amount would not be counted against the nondeductible IRA limit of \$4,500.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited about this legislation. I expect to introduce this legislation again at the beginning of the next Congress and look forward to hearing debate on it. It is absolutely essential that we continue to encourage personal savings and this is certainly a step in the right direction.

COMMENDING BEACON COLLEGE IN LEESBURG, FLORIDA

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, one of the world's greatest documents is our Declaration of Independence. It proclaims our unalienable rights, among them "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." This is one of the central components of the American experience, the right to use your God-given abilities to pursue your goals. As Americans, we are entitled to go as far as our talents will carry us. That is why it is imperative to ensure that every individual has the chance to succeed.

A few weeks ago, I had the privilege of visiting Beacon College in Leesburg, Florida, a school in my district dedicated to providing opportunities. Beacon College offers the opportunity of a higher education to students with learning disabilities.

Learning disabilities can affect a person's ability to read, write, speak, or compute math, and can impair socialization skills. This disability can be a life-long condition affecting how that person functions in school, at home, or in the work place. And this is not a rare occurrence; 15 to 20 percent of the U.S. population have some form of learning disability.

People with learning disabilities can and do excel in their individual pursuits, they just need the chance. Beacon College is committed to working with a diverse student population, assisting each with an individual approach, taking into consideration differences in experiential backgrounds, pace and readiness to learn, learning styles, and individual strengths and weaknesses.

Beacon College offers Associate of Arts and Bachelor of Arts degree programs in Human Services and Liberal Studies. The Human Services program stimulates the student's interest in intellectual, philosophical, social, and public issues. This program concentrates on human development and public services. The Liberal Studies program provides a well-rounded liberal arts education. Both programs are designed to help students achieve their career goals.

Through small class sizes, with an average of eight students per class, the faculty can interact better with their students, leading to better academic success. However, the College is more than a learning institution, it also promotes responsibility and self-reliance. Beacon students are called upon to identify their own learning styles as well as their strengths and weaknesses to prepare them for their roles in society.

Beacon College goes beyond teaching, it prepares its students for a meaningful career and an independent lifestyle. I am glad that I am able to share with my colleagues the commitment of Beacon College to providing opportunities for those with learning disabilities. Through its efforts, the College is making a richer life for its students and their families.

REMARKS ON IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to strongly oppose the impeachment of the President of the United States. My President. The People's President.

Today we embarrass the memory of our country's Founders as we torture the intent of the genius of their system of *balancing* the awesome powers of Government. Once our votes are cast on this despicable issue, no longer will we be able to look upon ourselves and our House as honorable; or even as men and women who are here to serve as a *check* on the power of the Executive. Instead, we will have become a House that sits in moral judgement over another man, meting out *punishment* for personal deeds which we deem unacceptable. The Majority party, however, has decided that this course is pre-determined, because we must uphold "the rule of law." Otherwise, our country will descend into chaos.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, no one is above the law—and there is no question that the law must be followed. But we also serve a greater document: and that is the Constitution of the United States. And it is the words within that great document that we must follow in this case as we decide whether the disgraceful behavior by the President merits his impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, under your leadership and that of your party, we stand here—small men with petty careers, and partisan of purpose, to diminish our great Republic. Devoid of a sense of proportion and overburdened with an excess of hubris, you claim conscience as your exclusive domain, and deny us the right to offer the People's Will—a motion of censure. I can only surmise the answer to that is because the Republican leadership is being driven by a core of short-sighted, bitter, and small-minded people who would do away with the *high-minded* principles espoused and framed for time immemorial by the Founders of this Nation. And they would do this for the sole reason that they do not agree with the President's actions. However, the President's behavior does not put him in the category of those who would commit treason, except perhaps in the minds of those conspiracy theorists who are consuming the Majority party.

Let me be clear that what we do here today is an oligarchical act that attempts to recreate a presidency that would serve at the Majority's *whim*, rather than at the *will* of the people. Mr. Speaker, please believe me that the gravity of this action will not go unnoticed by the public that we purport to serve.

To be sure, the President has shamed himself greatly.

To be clear, it is we who are about to become the shame of the Nation.

EXCELLENCE IN MILITARY SERVICE ACT

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the "Excellence in Military Service Act."

This legislation would increase the active duty service obligation (ADSO) of Military Service Academy graduates from five to eight years. Many Americans do not realize that this free and highly competitive college education costs the average taxpayer over \$270,000 per cadet/midshipman. While I believe that investing in our military is critical to the future stability of our nation, I do not think it is fair to burden the taxpayer with this expense without requiring academy graduates to exhibit a similar commitment in their ADSO. I maintain that it is not unreasonable that for a free education, with a monetary allowance, that a graduating cadet/midshipman be required to commit to a longer period of obligated service upon commissioning.

As college tuition continues to skyrocket, I believe our U.S. military academies will become even more attractive to prospective college students. In light of this fact, we need to ensure that a free education does not become a primary motivation for future applicants. I maintain that increasing the ADSO is an effective way to accomplish this without jeopardizing the viability of these historic institutions.

I hope my colleagues will join with me to protect the U.S. taxpayers' investment in one of our nation's most precious resources.

12-YEAR TERM LIMITS

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a proposed amendment to the Constitution that will limit the number of terms a Member of Congress may serve to a uniform, lifetime term limit of 12 years in the House and 12 years in the Senate. This is a proposal I have enthusiastically pushed for over the years and one I continue to support. I am firmly convinced that this is the single biggest obstacle to making some of the tough decisions that have to be made as we move into the 21st century. Term limits is not a partisan issue. It is a sound proposal with broad popular support.

The arguments for term limits are numerous and persuasive. Volumes could be written on

the issue but I would like to stress one point. Term limits are not simply to create turnover for the sake of turnover. It is important to get fresh blood in Congress, but it is more important to change the institution as a whole in a manner that only term limits can achieve. Term limits would end the pervasive careerism in Congress.

The status quo in Congress encourages longevity in service. One's impact in Congress is almost directly related to the length of time the Member has served. This is due to the fact that the House and Senate are directed primarily by the elected leadership and the full and subcommittee chairmen. Few rise to these levels without significant time served. Therefore, many Members will do their best to stay in Congress as long as possible, making it a career. Consequently the tendency of most will be to try to please every interest group in order to get reelected. While term limits would not completely end this attitude, it would mitigate it considerably because term limits would mean that when somebody is elected to Congress they would know that they were only coming here to serve a short period of time, not to make a career of it. I favor term limits not because of a hostility toward Congress but as an affectionate measure to restore Congress to its rightful role as a deliberative branch of government which governs with the next generation, not just the next election, in mind.

Term limits will give us the citizen legislature the Founding Fathers envisioned and effect fundamental reform in the attitude of those serving in Congress as well as in the attitude about service in Congress. Term limits will inject fresh ideas in Congress, ensure a rotation of influence and give people more choices with more open seat elections.

Congress has both an opportunity and an obligation to make fundamental changes which improve the way in which Congress works for the American people. Fighting for term limits is central to that effort and I urge my colleagues to support this proposal.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AUTISM STATISTICS, SURVEILLANCE, RESEARCH, AND EPIDEMIOLOGY ACT OF 1999 (ASSURE)

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am re-introducing legislation that will provide \$7.5 million to establish several centers of expertise in autism in an effort to quantify the incidence and prevalence of autism, as well as develop new ways to treat and prevent pervasive developmental disorders such as autism. My legislation—The Autism Statistics, Surveillance, Research, and Epidemiology Act of 1999 (ASSURE)—will empower the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) in the fight against autism.

This bill was crafted in close cooperation with the National Alliance for Autism Research (NAAR), the developmental disabilities experts at CDC, as well as with service providers from New Jersey. It is a health care and medical research bill which is long overdue, and I urge all of my colleagues to lend it their support.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "autism is a serious lifelong developmental disability characterized by impaired social interactions, an inability to communicate with others, and repetitive or restrictive behaviors." It is estimated that autism affects one out of every 500 children, although precise rates are unknown. There is also a general consensus that autism rates seem to be increasing, although it is not known whether these increases represent a better understanding of the developmental disability (i.e., better diagnosis), or an actual increase in developed cases of autism.

Under the Smith ASSURE legislation, CDC will uncover and monitor the prevalence of autism at a national level by establishing between three and five "Centers for Research in Autism Epidemiology" across the country. These centers would conduct population-based surveillance and epidemiologic studies of autism. Periodic screenings of the population (5- to 7-year-old children) would be undertaken to examine prenatal, perinatal, and postnatal factors that contribute to autism development.

These centers would combine data from multiple sites to gain a better understanding of how autism differs from other developmental disabilities and disorders. Because autism is suspected to be caused by a combination of both genetic and environmental factors, the ASSURE legislation would help CDC track the trends of autism and determine which factors are responsible for the apparent rise in autism cases nationwide. In short, the ASSURE legislation will build the research infrastructure critical to finding the cause or causes of autism. And once the cause or causes are identified, prevention strategies can be developed and a cure becomes more likely.

The collaborative efforts by CDC and state health departments will help scientists better understand which environmental exposures, if any, are most likely to cause children to develop autism in the womb. In addition, each center established under this legislation would tend to develop a certain niche of autism expertise. Such areas could include: specific genetic markers; early prenatal maternal drug and other exposures; and other autism spectrum disorders.

The story behind the creation of this legislation is in many ways illustrative of why we need to pass and enact the ASSURE act this year. For it was only after I had a meeting with a pair of courageous parents of autistic children in Brick Township that I realized the pressing need for better autism research.

Mr. and Mrs. William Gallagher, the parents of two beautiful children with autism, met with me to share their concerns that Brick Township seemed to have an abnormally high number of children diagnosed with autism. After presenting me with preliminary data suggesting that as many as 27 children may have been diagnosed with autism in Brick over the last decade, I relayed their concerns personally to Len Fishman, Commissioner of New Jersey's Department of Health and Senior Services (NJDHSS). I asked him to initiate a preliminary inquiry to determine if an autism "cluster" investigation was warranted.

Commissioner Fishman was very receptive to the concerns of the Brick parents, but after a few weeks of preliminary research by state officials, it became apparent that the current level of scientific knowledge in the United

States about autism was inadequate to the task at hand. Quite simply, no one knew for certain what the national rate of autism was supposed to look like, and therefore no one could tell parents whether the rate of autism in their town was at, above, or below the national average.

This news came as a surprise to me and to the parents of autistic children. Although there are rough estimates of autism rates from studies in foreign countries, CDC and the NJDHSS did not have enough information to determine if the alleged autism "cluster" in Brick was a real public health problem or an illusion of chance. And without knowing whether or not a problem exists, it makes it tough for public health officials to respond to a community's concerns because the cause of autism and how to prevent it remain shrouded in mystery. Mr. Speaker, the experience of Brick should serve as a wake-up call that more autism research is needed if the causes of the disorder and a cure are to be found anytime soon.

As a first step, an intensive effort by CDC and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) is underway to try to derive national autism rates and to determine if an autism "cluster" exists in Brick. The study is one of the first of its kind ever undertaken in the United States, and the results of the investigation will prove invaluable for other communities that may be affected by similarly high numbers of autism cases.

But we need to take the second step and enact this legislation if we are going to generate real progress in the fight to eliminate autism. Mr. Speaker, CDC has already established a pilot program—an autism epidemiology center—near Atlanta, Georgia. The limited but promising results from this initiative points to the fact that current understanding of autism is woefully inadequate and that better surveillance and monitoring of developmental disabilities like autism are critical to providing answers and hope for the nearly 500,000 autistic persons in America.

SUMMARY OF AUTISM STATISTICS, SURVEILLANCE, RESEARCH, AND EPIDEMIOLOGY ACT OF 1999 (ASSURE)

\$7.5 million in authorization for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to create the National Autism and Pervasive Developmental Disabilities Surveillance Program.

Authorizes CDC to create between three and five "Centers of Excellence in Autism," which would: (1) monitor the prevalence of autism at the national level, (2) assist in development of state autism surveillance programs, (3) provide education and training for health professionals to improve treatment of autism, and (4) develop center-specific expertise in one or more areas of autism research.

Establishes CDC as the nation's clearinghouse for autism research and policy development.

Establishes an advisory committee and authorizes annual reports to Congress on the state of autism research.

ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY
BURIAL ELIGIBILITY ACT

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today with the gentleman from Arizona, the

Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, to introduce the Arlington National Cemetery Burial Eligibility Act. This important legislation is deserving of the strong support of each Member and I am hopeful this measure will receive prompt attention and consideration early in the 106th Congress.

The measure which Chairman STUMP and I are introducing today is similar to legislation approved by the House last year. This measure, like the legislation approved by the House during the 105th Congress, establishes eligibility rules for burial at Arlington National Cemetery—one of our Nation's most hallowed sites.

As noted by the General Accounting Office, the eligibility requirements for burial at Arlington National Cemetery need clarification and the act introduced today provides that clarification. In particular, this important legislation is intended to eliminate the inconsistency in the granting of waivers for burial at Arlington National Cemetery which has occurred in the past.

As both a Marine and a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I know that Arlington National Cemetery is truly sacred ground, especially for our Nation's veterans and their loved ones. Like many others, I was extremely concerned by reports, later shown to be totally without any substantiation, that waivers for burial at Arlington National Cemetery had been granted in exchange for major political contributions.

While an expedited examination of this allegation by the General Accounting Office found "no evidence" of waivers for contributions, it did highlight some of the serious flaws in the existing process for burials at Arlington National Cemetery.

The Arlington National Cemetery Burial Eligibility Act which Chairman STUMP and I are introducing today addresses those concerns by removing most of the discretion, ambiguity and guesswork for eligibility for burials at Arlington National Cemetery. This legislation will also make it easier for the public to understand the requirements for burial at Arlington National Cemetery.

I commend the gentleman from Arizona, Chairman STUMP, for his strong and effective leadership and his stalwart efforts to establish, in law, eligibility for burial at Arlington National Cemetery. I invite all of my colleagues to support and cosponsor this most important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO AHMED SAMAWI

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1998, the Greater Cincinnati religious community lost one of its finest leaders. Ahmed Samawi, a friend and a man who treasured his faith and the freedom to worship without consequence, passed away at the age of 65. A devoted family man and successful businessman, he will perhaps be best remembered for his vision of better understanding and closer relations between the Christian, Islamic, and Jewish communities.

Born in Damascus, Syria, Mr. Samawi realized that simple misunderstandings could create problems among people of different religions. His dream was to build an Islamic Center in the Cincinnati area to help bring an end to those misunderstandings. He spent his own resources and the last years of his life working towards that goal. His dream became a reality in 1995. What began as a plan for a modest meeting place blossomed into a glorious building. However, it was not the building for which he will be remembered for, but rather his vision for a better understanding of the Islamic religion.

One of the Center's missions, in addition to providing a place of worship for Muslims in the Cincinnati area, is to reach out to area Christians and Jews. Mr. Samawi felt that the Islamic faith was plagued by misunderstanding. He spent a great deal of his life trying to remove the barriers of misunderstanding so that all faithful people could live together. When he passed away, he was working toward expanding the Center to include a museum, library, and school. He wanted to create a place that Muslims would be proud of, and Christians and Jews would be comfortable exploring.

Mr. Samawi has inspired us all with his vision for a more spiritually united Greater Cincinnati. He will be missed by the entire religious community.

CONGRESSIONAL AND EXECUTIVE BENEFITS MUST BE CONTROLLED

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in 1985, I took to the well of the House to protest members' perks. In particular, I cited the congressional pension plan and the federal employees Thrift Savings Plan as "overly generous at best, outrageously extravagant at worst." Although I've been waging this battle for fourteen years, no action has been taken to date to reduce either benefit.

So, once again, I am introducing a package of bills designed to relieve beleaguered taxpayers from footing the bill for certain congressional and executive branch benefits.

The first bill eliminates the congressional pension for members who are not yet vested. I do not believe extravagant retirement benefits are necessary to entice qualified Americans to run for Congress. They are costly and excessive.

The second bill revises former presidents' benefits. I am proposing to end Secret Service protection for future former presidents after one year; their spouses and minor children will no longer be entitled to Secret Service protection after Inauguration Day. We estimate this will save \$15 million per year once it is implemented.

The bill also changes the law prospectively to prevent presidents from double- or tripling from the federal government. Specifically, it requires a former president to waive the right to each other annuity or pension to which he (or she) is entitled under any other Act of Congress (that is, any other federal pension which he earned), in order to receive the presidential pension. The value of the presidential pension is equal to the annual

rate of basic pay for cabinet-level officials. As of January 1, 1999, that figure is \$151,800.

Finally, the bill will deny a presidential pension until a former president reaches the prevailing retirement age under Social Security.

Here is an example of the costs the taxpayers face following President Clinton's service. President Clinton will be in his mid-fifties at the end of his second term. Since his presidential pension kicks in immediately upon his leaving office on Inauguration Day, he could draw over two-and-one-quarter million dollars in pension benefits before he reaches retirement age.

Please don't misunderstand me. I hope that all current, former and future presidents lead long and fruitful lives upon leaving office. However, the vast majority of Americans struggle to make ends meet, and often are unable to save for their own retirement. Nevertheless, they are forced to contribute to the retirement packages of former presidents and members of Congress.

Over the years, my constituents have shared with me their outrage over the lavishness and cost of these benefits. I believe elected officials need to make real sacrifices if we hope to gain the support of the American people for shared sacrifice to keep our country on the path to fiscal prosperity.

I believe these bills represent bold and dramatic proposals. That is why I hope my colleagues will join me in pushing this legislation to passage.

TERM LIMITS WITH THREE 4-YEAR TERMS

HON. BILL MCCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a proposed amendment to the Constitution that will not only limit the number of terms a Member of Congress may serve. This proposal would extend the length of a single term in the House from 2 to 4 years. Senators would remain in 6-year terms.

The arguments for term limits are well-known. The Founding Fathers could not have envisioned today's government, with year-round sessions and careers in Congress. Term limits would eliminate the careerism that permeates this institution, enticing Members to work toward extending their careers—a goal sometimes at odds with the common good. There are simply too many competing interests groups.

However, my proposal takes the essence of term limits to limit the influence of careerism and the incessant campaigning it requires, by increasing the length of a term in the House of Representatives. Currently, each Member of the House serves 2-year terms. That means that after each election, a House incumbent must begin campaigning again almost immediately. This dangerous cycle almost never stops. A 4-year term would mitigate this to a certain degree. Looking at it another way, a person would have to run only three times to serve the maximum number of years. That is certainly an improvement, especially when tied to term limits.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that a 4-year term will not eliminate the House of Rep-

resentatives' function as the people's House. Today's technology almost instantly allows people in Washington, DC to know how the people they represent in their district feel about issues of the day. No longer must Representatives periodically make the trek home to put themselves back in touch with the local wants and needs. Now we fly home on weekends, read our local papers in DC, receive countless polls and tune in to the news.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, there will be no loss of service by lengthening the term of office while limiting them. Indeed, it will improve as more attention is paid to legislating instead of campaigning. This is a complete reform package deserving of our attention.

MEDICAL CLINICAL TRIAL LEGISLATION

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation, the Medicare Clinical Trial Coverage Act of 1999, that would provide Medicare coverage for patient costs related to participation in clinical trials. Clinical trials are research studies that test new medications and therapies in clinical settings and are often the only treatment available for people with life-threatening diseases such as cancer, AIDS, heart disease, and Alzheimers.

As the representative for the Texas Medical Center, where many of these life-saving trials are being conducted, I believe there is a real need for this legislation to guarantee that patients can receive the cutting-edge treatment they need. I believe we must ensure that Medicare beneficiaries can obtain the best available treatment for their illnesses. Without this guarantee, patients must work aggressively to make sure that they receive the care they need. We must end this uncertainty and guarantee the best available care for all Medicare patients.

I have been contacted by many researchers at the Texas Medical Center, including the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, University of Texas Health Science Center, Baylor College of Medicine, and the Children's Nutrition Research Center, about the need for this legislation. These researchers are conducting clinical trials to test new medical therapies and devices such as gene therapy, bone marrow transplantations, and targeted antibody therapy that will lead to better medical care and save lives.

Although there may be costs associated with more access to clinical trials, I believe that we should ensure access to clinical trials as a means to ensure quality health care services. I also believe that this Medicare reimbursement policy would encourage other health plans to cover these routine costs.

It is also important to note that providing Medicare coverage for clinical trials will increase participation in such trials and lead to faster development of therapies for those in need. It often takes three to five years to enroll enough participants in a cancer clinical trial to make the results legitimate and statistically meaningful. In addition, less than three percent of cancer patients, half of whom are over 65, currently participate in clinical trials.

This legislation will likely increase enrollment and help researchers obtain meaningful results more quickly.

This legislation would apply to all federally approved clinical trials, including those approved by the Departments of Health and Human Services, Veterans' Affairs, Defense, and Energy; the National Institutes of Health; and the Food and Drug Administration.

There are currently three types of costs associated with clinical trials—the cost of the treatment or therapy itself, the cost of monitoring such treatments, and the cost of health care services needed by the patient. Clinical trials usually cover the cost of providing and monitoring the therapies and medications that are being tested. However, such programs do not cover routine patient care costs—those medical items and services that patients would need even if they were not participating in a clinical trial. Under current law, Medicare does not provide coverage for these costs until these treatments are established as standard therapies. Medicare does not consider these patient costs to be reasonable and necessary to medical care. My legislation would explicitly guarantee Medicare coverage for patients' costs associated with clinical trials. Such costs serve as a significant obstacle to the ability of older Americans to participate in clinical trials.

As I stated earlier, Medicare claims for the health care services associated with clinical trials are not currently reimbursable. A recent GAO report concluded that Medicare is currently reimbursing for certain costs associated with clinical trials, even though the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), the federal agency responsible for Medicare, has stated that Medicare policy should not reimburse for these medical services. In fact, the GAO report estimates that HCFA reimburses as much as 50 percent of claims made under Part B and 15 percent of the claims made under Part A. While some physicians and hospitals have been able to convince Medicare to cover some of these patient care costs in certain trials, such coverage has been uneven and there is no firm rule governing them. I believe we must end this inconsistency and ensure that patient costs are fully covered. My legislation will also require all types of Medicare plans, including Medicare managed care plans, to guarantee such coverage.

My legislation would also ensure that all phases of clinical trials are explicitly covered under this new benefit. Under the New Drug application process, there are three types of clinical trials—Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III trials. Phase I trials test the safety of a potential treatment. Phase II and III trials examine both the efficacy and the safety of a treatment. Phase II trials are generally smaller and involve fewer patients. Phase III trials include a larger number of patients to ensure that the proposed treatments help patients. My legislation requires that Medicare pay for all types of clinical trials.

Last year, I was contacted by a constituent about the need for this legislation. Mr. Keith Gunning contacted our office regarding his mother-in-law, Mrs. Maria Guerra. Mrs. Guerra is suffering from pre-myelodysplastic (AML), a type of leukemia that is common among senior citizens. Mrs. Guerra was enrolled in a Medicare HMO that would not permit her to join a clinical trial at University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center for the treatment she needed. After much effort, Mrs. Guerra

dropped her Medicare HMO coverage and returned to traditional, fee-for-service Medicare. With her new Medicare coverage, Mrs. Guerra petitioned MD Anderson to join a clinical trial. After much effort on the part of her son-in-law, Mr. Gunning, Mrs. Guerra joined a clinical trial. It is still unclear whether all of the cost associated with her clinical trials will be covered by Medicare. My legislation would guarantee that Mrs. Guerra would get the services she needs and would require all types of Medicare plans to provide coverage for clinical trials, including Medicare managed care plans. I have visited with Mrs. Guerra and she is currently undergoing treatment.

My legislation also includes a requirement that the Secretary of Labor and Health and Human Services prepare a report to determine how many group health plans currently cover the patient care costs associated with clinical trials and how much it would cost to cover all federally approved clinical trials. I believe that this report to Congress will show how cost-effective these treatments are and ensure that all health care plans provide access to clinical trials.

President Clinton has also proposed similar Medicare coverage for patient care costs related to clinical trials, but the Administration's plan is limited to cancer clinical trials and is a capped entitlement. My legislation would include more types of federally-approved clinical trials, so more patients would be able to participate in these cutting-edge therapies.

THE TRUTH IN BUDGETING ACT

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my good friend and colleague, BUD SHUSTER, in introducing legislation to take the aviation, harbor maintenance, and inland waterways trust funds off-budget. This legislation will ensure that all revenues contributed by users of our transportation system to develop and maintain those systems are spent for their intended purposes.

For aviation, this legislation has a very simple, but critical, goal; ensuring that the American public continues to travel safely, securely, and efficiently in our nation's aviation system.

The airline and aerospace industries are important contributors to the U.S. economy, providing highly skilled, high paying jobs. They directly employ approximately 1.5 million people, and generate more than \$100 billion in wages. The total, worldwide economic impact of air transport was \$1.14 trillion in 1994 and this is expected to increase to \$1.7 trillion by the year 2010.

However, these economic gains will only be achieved if we have the air traffic safety, security, and airport infrastructure to take advantage of them. Problems in the current system are already appearing and are projected to be even greater in the future. In 1987, the FAA estimated that there were 21 airports at which air carrier flights were delayed by a total of more than 20,000 hours; by 1997, there were 27 airports, and that number is expected to grow to 31 by 2007. In addition, according to Delta Airlines, air traffic inefficiencies cost it approximately \$360 million a year. Further-

more, FAA's lack of progress on air traffic control (ATC) modernization has led to suggestions in international forums that current U.S. management of oceanic ATC be taken away. And as the National Civil Aviation Review Commission found "although 19 out of 20 of the busiest airports in the world are in the U.S., the nation can no longer claim that it has the world's most modern air traffic control system."

We tried to begin addressing these challenges in 1990, by passing legislation that would have increased investment in airports and air traffic modernization. Under that law, a plan was established to allow new revenues coming into the aviation trust fund to be fully spent and the trust fund surplus, that existed at the time, to be gradually drawn down. In a spirit of cooperation, the reported bill also eliminated the penalty clause that the then-House Committee on Public Works and Transportation used to limit funding of operations from the trust fund if capital development was insufficient. As the report accompanying the bill said at that time: "We believe that we can best meet our common goals by working cooperatively, rather than relying on penalty clauses and other legal forcing mechanisms."

Unfortunately, that agreement was violated by the Office of Management and Budget and the Appropriations Committee. In 1990, we set out modest amounts of funding for facilities and equipment (F&E) and the airport improvement program (AIP), but they soon went by the wayside. By 1994, rather than spending \$2.1 billion for AIP and \$2.5 billion for F&E, instead \$1.69 billion was spent for AIP and \$2.12 billion for F&E. In fiscal year 1991, capital investment was 50 percent of the FAA budget, by FY1998, it was 42 percent. And rather than drawing down the trust fund balance, the uncommitted balance in the trust fund is now estimated to be \$22 billion by 2004 and \$53 billion by 2008.

Additionally, the General Accounting Office has confirmed that airport capital needs are \$10 billion a year. The present system of aviation financing provides about \$6–7 billion a year, with the AIP program contributing less than \$2 billion a year to those needs. Furthermore, funding for F&E is woefully inadequate. In fact, F&E is appropriated at \$2 billion for FY1999, a level \$400 million below an F&E level of \$2.4 billion in FY1991. These inadequate levels of F&E and AIP funding contribute to delays for passengers and increased costs for airlines, and increased maintenance costs for FAA due to delayed replacement of obsolete equipment. These results are shameful, especially when money dedicated for investment in airports and air traffic equipment sits idle because of budget constraints unrelated to the needs of the aviation system. In effect, trust fund revenues are withheld to balance the rest of the budget.

To remedy this, we need to build on last year's historic TEA 21 legislation which established that revenues collected from users of the highway system for the Highway Trust Fund should be spent only for the purposes for which they are collected, the development of our highways and transit systems. The same principle should now be applied to the aviation system.

The bill we are introducing today is the first step to reversing the unfortunate recent trends in aviation funding and ensuring that we invest sufficiently to protect an irreplaceable economic jewel: our nation's aviation system. With

Members' support, we will again be able to make the kind of investments we need in airport development and air traffic control modernization. If we are to ensure an efficient safe aviation system, we must begin to use aviation revenues for their collected purposes: to maintain and enhance our nation's aviation system.

In addition, historically, a general fund payment averaging about 30 percent has been made to support our aviation system. This payment has been made in recognition of both the direct and indirect benefits of our aviation system to our nation's security and economic health. These benefits should be funded by the nation as a whole not exclusively by users of the aviation system. Any off-budget plan passed by this Congress must guarantee this general fund payment continues.

We must also ensure that the money provided to the FAA is well-spent. Full implementation and validation of a cost accounting system, and effective use by FAA management, will be an important step forward. In addition, appointment of the Management Advisory Council—which has been delayed for two years—is absolutely essential. Other reforms will get my full consideration but we must ensure that the critical safety function of the FAA is not compromised or weakened.

The other critical component of this legislation will allow the nation's waterborne transportation system to remain among the best in the world. The nation's coastal ports provide access to foreign and U.S. markets for virtually all international trade, while the inland system provides safe and efficient transportation for both domestic and foreign products.

The contribution of the U.S. navigation system to the economy is impressive. The value of foreign trade exceeds \$600 billion annually, creates 16 million jobs, and generates more than \$150 billion in annual revenues for the Treasury. Yet, for all these benefits we continue to under invest in maintaining and improving this transportation system.

The inland waterway system is in particular need of investment. By the year 2000, 40 percent of the locks on the inland waterway will be more than 50 years old; 26 locks will be over 100 years old; and, the Nation's two oldest locks opened in 1839. Unfortunately, because of budget constraints, only about 75 percent of the funds available for investment are actually used, and the surplus continues to grow.

The Truth in Budgeting Act will change that.

For coastal ports, the failure to spend receipts is even greater. As vessel drafts increase, there is a continuing need for maintaining and deepening channels. Unfortunately, budget constraints have forced expenditures from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to little more than one-half of available revenues.

The benefits of fully spending the trust fund extend beyond navigation. The Water Resources Development Act of 1996 expanded the uses of the fund to address critical needs related to disposal of dredged material. Environmental concerns dictate that increasing amounts of dredged material not be disposed of in open waters because of contamination of the sediment. Making the trust fund fully available not only benefits navigation, but the environment as well.

In closing, I urge all Members to sign on as co-sponsors of this legislation. Your support will be critical to ensuring the safety, security,

and efficiency of our nation's aviation system and waterways.

HONORING UAW LOCAL 599

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the 106th Congress on behalf of a group of men and women who proudly represent the best of working America. On Sunday, January 10, 1999 the members of United Automobile Workers Local 599 in Flint, Michigan will honor an historic milestone. On that day they will celebrate the 60th anniversary of their charter as a UAW local.

If you have ever visited my birthplace, Flint, Michigan, you would be greeted by a sign welcoming you to "Buick City." This sign embodies the long, deep-rooted tradition and history that is UAW Local 599. For the men and women of Local 599, this history involves a high level of pride in the Buick name, their product, and the community in which they have invested much of their lives.

Over the years, the products that have been produced by the members of Local 599 have received numerous accolades. One of their products, the 3800 Engine, is largely considered by experts to be the best 6-cylinder engine in the world. In addition their products have won awards from J.D. Power and Associates, Consumer Reports, and Smart Money Magazine, among others. Each of these citations have recognized the members of Local 599 for the excellent quality of their workmanship and product.

The members of Local 599 have worked diligently to improve their facility's productivity and quality. They have established initiatives to cut in-factory repairs by over 90% and cut the time it takes to build a car by 25%. It is because of steps such as these that have allowed Buick City to be highly ranked in national quality standings, including a recent study in which it placed second of all General Motors factories.

Mr. Speaker, I have a personal reason to be very proud of the achievements of UAW Local 599. My father was a founding member of the Local, joining the UAW in the 1930s. From my own family's experience, I know the difference the UAW has made in the quality of life for the Kildee household.

Mr. Speaker, we in the great State of Michigan are more than proud of our reputation as the automotive capitol of the world, having recently celebrated the 100th anniversary of the automobile. Just as we are proud of the product, we are proud and grateful for the men and women who day-in and day-out work to provide these quality products for our Nation and the world. As the U.S. Representative for Buick City, and as the proud owner of a Buick LeSabre, I ask my colleagues in the 106th Congress to join me in recognizing the accomplishments of the men and women of UAW Local 599.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN L. HOLDEN

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 29, 1998, the Greater Cincinnati area lost one of its finest citizens. John L. Holden, an inspiration to many people, passed away at the age of 75. He was many different things to many different people: author, philanthropist, Navy officer, a national leader in camping, and business executive. But it was his fervent desire to counsel and provide learning experiences to young people that has left a lasting impression on a countless number of people throughout the community.

Mr. Holden graduated from Cornell University in 1943. He served his country as a communications officer in the Pacific Ocean during World War II, and later commanded a Landing Ship Tank which supported Chinese Nationalists in their fight against Communism. Upon his return home, he founded and directed Standard Laundry and Linen Service. He also served as a Vice President of Krause Hardware Company and as an estimator for Fisher-DeVore Construction Company.

However, as anyone who was acquainted with him knows, his real love and passion was camping. In 1948, he and others purchased Camp Kooch-i-ching. He later succeeded his mentor, Mr. Bernard S. Mason, as director of the camp, as well as the Wasaka Boys Club, a year-round program of camping and sports in Cincinnati. He later founded the Camping and Education Foundation to which he donated the camp. In 1969, he founded the Kee-Way-Din Ski Club, of which I was a member. This group takes youngsters on skiing trips throughout the western and northern United States.

Most importantly, however, was Mr. Holden's ability to be a positive role model in the lives of so many young people. Leading by example, he helped guide many children in their search for the difference between right and wrong. Mr. Holden had an uncanny way of opening the eyes of his campers if a problem existed. He would then lead them in finding a solution to that problem on their own. By helping them help themselves, Mr. Holden bolstered their self esteem and self worth. It also instilled a problem solving method in the children that could be used well into adulthood.

Mr. Holden's unfailing leadership and dedication to the youth of Cincinnati has touched and inspired many people. Mr. Holden's life is proof positive that one person can certainly make a difference. That difference will surely be felt for years to come.

INTEGRITY IN VOTER
REGISTRATION ACT

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce the Integrity in Voter Registration Act. Unfortunately, the issue of voter registration and the integrity of our election system sometimes goes overlooked. Indeed, the

issue of who may vote and where they may do it is at the very heart of our democratic system. Preserving the integrity of this process is critical. But, there is significant evidence that vote fraud is not a rare occurrence.

There is a much bigger picture involving voter fraud that we do not always read about. However, I would recommend to my colleagues that they read a well-written book, "Dirty Little Secrets," by Larry J. Sabato and Glenn R. Simpson. Mr. Sabato is a well respected political scientist at the University of Virginia and Mr. Simpson used to work for the bi-weekly paper on Capitol Hill, Roll Call. These two authors tackle numerous topics, including voter fraud. And it's scary.

Vote fraud issues include dead people voting, people being able to game the system and lousy verification procedures. The tale of how a person was able to register his dog by mail is one of my favorites.

The election registration process is generally handled at the state level. However, Congress asserted itself quite boldly when we passed the so-called "motor-voter" registration legislation, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. This legislation requires states to establish motor registration procedures for federal elections so that eligible citizens may apply to register to vote (1) simultaneously with applying for a driver's license, (2) by mail, and (3) at selected state and local offices that serve the public. I certainly have no problem with making it easier for people to register to vote. Of course, if someone would not take the time to register to vote prior to the change, I question whether he or she would actually vote once registered, but that debate has already been had.

The question we must now face deal with the potential for fraud in voter registration. To quote Sabato and Simpson, "[v]oting fraud is back, is becoming more serious with each passing election cycle, and soon—because of the recent changes in the law—is destined to become even worse." The reason why motor-voter will make voting fraud an issue that we will not be able to ignore is the same reason why the bill was so popular: it makes it easier to register to vote. Any one of my colleagues could sit at home and mail in voter registration cards with different addresses with little problem. I could even register my dog. As I said, it's been done.

To relate this another way, when I am back home doing precinct walks, my campaign will purchase voter rolls and have them sorted by household. In the past, there used to be a few duplicates or outdated names on the list, but nothing overwhelming. Nowadays, it is not uncommon to see several different names listed for one address. These people may or may not have really lived at the address given, but certainly not all of them are living there now. The rolls are filled with outdated names and addresses. It is no longer an error here, an outdated address there. To put it in fiscal terms, in California alone, "deadwood" voters cause state and local governments to waste \$5 to \$8 million of taxpayers' money printing and mailing voter pamphlets, unneeded ballots, and the like.

The more we allow our voting rolls to get out of hand, the less secure our election system will be. Some of this can be done locally by improving databases or centralizing the system. However, the federal government can also allow state and local governments to use

a few tools at absolutely no cost to the taxpayer. This is what my legislation aims to do.

Mr. Speaker, the Florida State Association of Supervisors of Elections came to me toward the end of the 104th Congress with suggestions as to how the federal government can assist them in doing their jobs. I have turned their suggestions into the Integrity in Voter Registration Act. First, this bill would require applicants registering to vote in federal elections to provide their Social Security numbers. Second, a state would be allowed to remove a registrant's name from the list of eligible voters if the registrant has not voted in two consecutive federal general elections after having received a notice requesting confirmation of the registrant's address.

The Social Security number requirement would allow each person to have a unique identifier with their name. It would make it easier to spot duplicate registrations. The notification requirement gives guidance to states since federal law is currently a bit vague.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal was given to me by the Florida State Association of Supervisors of Elections and I have gotten letters from other people outside of Florida, including Texas and Illinois. These two changes would go a long way toward helping keep the voter rolls clean. Surely this is no silver bullet. Nothing is. But this proposal would make a serious dent in duplicative and sometimes fraudulent registrations, ensuring the integrity of our electoral system. I urge my colleagues to support the Integrity in Voter Registration Act.

THE CIDCARE ACT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing CIDCARE, in an effort to effectively stimulate the demand for higher quality care for our Nation's children while simultaneously removing barriers and providing resources to improve the quality of child care in the United States.

Child care continues to be a worry for most families as stories continue to surface about the lack of quality child care. Moreover, research has clearly demonstrated that a high-quality child care program is one that makes the healthy development and education of children its first objective and strives to stimulate the learning process of all children through developmentally appropriate activities that foster social, emotional, and intellectual growth. In addition, families in today's society are increasingly required to have both parents enter the work force. The demand for quality child care is increasing as is the need for credentialed and accredited child care providers.

Accordingly, CIDCARE will stimulate the demand for higher quality child care for our Nation's children while simultaneously removing barriers and providing resources to improve the quality of child care in the United States.

Many of my colleagues may have read about the tragic circumstances surrounding the Fiedelhotz family in Florida. The Fiedelhotz' son Jeremy died after only 2 hours at a day care facility. Through this tragedy should have never happened, it is an unfortu-

nate example of what can and may continue to happen unless we encourage and inform all parents about the need for accredited and credentialed child care providers and facilities.

CIDCARE through the Tax Code will encourage the demand for accredited or credentialed child care. This will be accomplished in the following manner: First, by increasing the amount which an employee can contribute to a dependent care assistance plan if a child is in accredited or credentialed child care; second, changing the dependent care tax credit to allow parents to receive a higher and more equitable dependent day care credit; third, providing tax benefits for employers which provide quality child care; fourth, extending eligibility for businesses to take a qualified charitable deduction for the donation of educational equipment and materials to public schools, accredited or credentialed nonprofit child care providers; fifth, establishing a \$260 million competitive grant program to assist States in improving the quality of child care; sixth, expanding public information and technical assistance services to identify and disseminate to the public what is important for child development in child care; seventh, providing \$50 million to create and operate a technology-based training infrastructure to enable child care providers nationwide to receive the training, education, and support they need to improve the quality of child care; eighth, creating a child care training revolving fund to enable child care providers and child care support entities to purchase computers, satellite dishes, and other technological equipment which enable them to participate in the child care training provided on the national infrastructure; ninth, requiring that all Federal child care centers will have to meet all State and local licensing and other regulatory requirements related to the provision of child care, within 6 months of the passage of this legislation; and tenth, extending the Perkins and Stafford Loan Forgiveness Program to include child care workers who are employed full time providing child care services and have a degree in early childhood education or development or receive professional child care credentials.

I urge all of my colleagues to review this bill and to join me in cosponsoring this important measure. Our children are our future and we insist that they receive the best care possible, especially during their early development years.

Accordingly, I will welcome your support.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM ACT OF 1999

HON. JOHN R. THUNE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with my colleagues Representative MINGE from Minnesota and Representative LATHAM from Iowa, am pleased to introduce the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System Act of 1999. This legislation would authorize the construction of the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System which, when completed, will serve over 180,000 people in 22 communities, covering almost 5,900 square miles throughout South

Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa. The project and legislation recognize the tremendous need the people of this region have for access to clean, safe, affordable drinking water. 1

The need for water development in South Dakota is great. In our state, water is a matter of health, economic development, and rural development. The ability of rural America to survive and grow is directly related to the ability of rural areas and growing communities to have access to adequate supplies of safe drinking water. Without a reliable supply of water, these areas cannot attract new businesses and cannot create jobs. In a rural state like South Dakota, the link between the creation of jobs and adequate water supplies cannot be emphasized enough.

Some cities and towns throughout the Lewis and Clark project region are preventing new building and development, just to preserve the existing water supplies. Because of these limitations, these same communities have permanent restrictions on the use of water for washing cars and watering the laws—something most of us take for granted. Further, over 75 percent of the population relies upon shallow wells and limited water supplies, posing the risk of exposing these residents to dangerous levels of contamination. Each of these factors point to the strong need for a comprehensive, regional solution to meet this most basic of needs.

The people of these three great states recognized this same need when they organized to form the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System almost nine years ago in 1990. Since that time, they have worked tirelessly to see their dream of clean, safe water become a reality. The project has been supported strongly by all three states, with the South Dakota legislature having already committed \$400,000 to Lewis and Clark. The state legislatures of Minnesota and Iowa have authorized similar levels of support. The support of the Members of this body who represent the Lewis and Clark service area further demonstrates the regional cooperation at play. The regional approach offered by the Lewis and Clark System maximizes the number of people that can be served, and it also serves to offer the most cost-efficient manner to provide water.

This legislation, originally introduced in the 104th Congress and reintroduced in the 105th Congress, has been the subject of numerous hearings in the House and Senate and countless hours of discussions and negotiations between the project sponsors, the Administration, and many of our colleagues in Congress. Last September, the Senate companion bill met important success in its approval by the full Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I am optimistic that we will see similar action on this important legislation here in the House.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate the importance of this vital project. People most familiar with the project have clearly seen that the need for water is great and indisputable. Likewise, the roll of the federal government in both participation and funding rural water supply has been set by numerous and lengthy historical precedents. Now it is up to the House to respond to this need. Congress has the opportunity to do so by supporting this important piece of legislation and moving forward with plans that will allow over 180,000 hard-working taxpayers the opportunity to turn on their taps and receive what

many of us take for granted—a cool glass of clean, fresh water.

I look forward to working with each of you in seeing this dream for many South Dakotans, Minnesotans, and Iowans come to fruition.

YOUTH TOBACCO POSSESSION PREVENTION ACT

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing the Youth Tobacco Possession Prevention Act today because I believe we have fallen well short of our responsibility to protect children from tobacco marketing. Last year, we considered a variety of "comprehensive" solutions to reverse the trend of youth smoking—all of which failed.

Now that the States have settled their cases with the tobacco companies, it is even less likely that the federal government will pass such broad legislation. However, there is one very important issue that still needs to be addressed that could significantly reduce the number of youth smokers is the issue of youth possession of tobacco products.

It is estimated that 3,000 young people start smoking every day. Worse yet, one third, or 1,000 of these people will eventually die from tobacco related disease. Consider the emotional and financial strain these horrible situations will place on American families in the future. In response to this national crisis, the public health community, State attorneys general, the U.S. Congress and even the tobacco industry proposed a variety of methods to reduce youth smoking rates during the 105th Congress.

Most of the proposals would have spent money on counteradvertising, tobacco cessation programs and tobacco education programs—all worthy and necessary components of comprehensive tobacco legislation. However, the leadership of the American government has been sending a mixed signal to America's youth and nothing in the proposed settlement would change this.

Under current law, it is illegal to sell tobacco products to anyone under the age of 18 in all 50 States. However, if a person under the age of 18 is somehow able to obtain tobacco products—which it is painfully clear they are easily able to do—there are only a few States that have enacted laws regarding the possession of tobacco by these young people. I find it incredibly hypocritical that we, as a government (either Federal or State), are so willing to make buying tobacco illegal but are virtually silent on possessing tobacco.

Despite the strides that were been made by the recent states settlement, this is still a huge problem. Barely half of the states have enacted tobacco possession laws that actually make it illegal for someone under the age of 18 to possess tobacco products.

The Youth Tobacco Possession Prevention Act will help solve this problem. There are two key components to this bill. First, in dealing with the youth, it focuses on education rather than punishment. For first and second time offenders, youth will be required to complete tobacco education and cessation programs, as

well as tobacco related community service. If they continue to disregard the law and their health, their driver's license would be suspended from three to six months. This last resort was suggested during one of our Subcommittee hearings by a local teenager, who told the Commerce Health Subcommittee that kids would only respond to this type of approach.

Second, the bill would require States to enact stern punishments for people over the age of 18 who provide tobacco products to youth. At that same hearing, many of our teen witnesses admitted one of the primary sources of tobacco are older people who buy for teens. This is simply not acceptable. I believe every adult has the responsibility and moral obligation to do whatever we can to prevent our nation's youth from starting this deadly habit.

Unlike many proposals, this bill will not punish States who choose not to enact the outlined legislation. It will, however, reward those States which act responsibly and do. Each State that passes the provisions outlined in this bill will receive 5 additional points on their Health and Human Services competitive public health service grant applications. This incentive will hopefully encourage States to take action and do the right thing.

THE LIBERTAD ENFORCEMENT ACT

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the LIBERTAD Enforcement Act and to reflect on the actions of the Clinton Administration toward Cuba.

Just yesterday, January 5th, the President announced several new measures to "assist and support the Cuban people without strengthening the regime." While I understand that the regulations regarding these measures have not been developed, I am concerned about the proposal that would allow sales of food and agricultural inputs. Not only is it unclear whether President Clinton has the authority to make this change, but it is unlikely at this point that these sales would have much effect on the Cuban people, who it is designed to help. Without a private sector and very few non-governmental organizations, it will be difficult to get food to the people and keep it from Castro and his regime.

Cuba has been a dictatorship under Fidel Castro for some 40 years. During that time I think the world is fully aware of the many human rights violations this dictator has committed and his regime has committed. I think the world is probably also fully aware that Cuba and Fidel Castro remain only one of two Communist dictatorships left after the fall of the Soviet Union and changes around the world and tendencies towards more democracies, as we have seen in the last decade or so.

We have tried numerous times in small, incremental ways, to either oust Fidel Castro or to change his policies. It should be abundantly clear to anyone who has observed this man over the years that he is not about to change his stripes. He is not about to give up his ruthless power. And if he does, it will not be voluntarily.

For those who wish democracy in Cuba, I can only say I hope so too. However, it is wishful thinking if you think it is going to come about as long as Fidel Castro is in power. The only way to see democracy in Cuba and to see our hemisphere democratic and to have normal relations again with that small Nation state to the south is for Fidel Castro to leave office and for those who supported him for all these years to end that support.

Castro may make modest changes in how he does business, which have no bearing in reality upon ever becoming truly democratic or allowing a true market system to work, and he is given a reward to do this by the continued open door policies of these allies who pour these dollars in through the businesses that operate there.

In Title III of the law that is known as Helms-Burton that was passed in 1996, there was a provision very important to stopping this continued support of the Castro regime. That provision allows U.S. nationals to sue in U.S. Federal court those persons that traffic in property confiscated in Cuba. Unfortunately, the President is allowed to grant waivers of up to six months for implementation of this provision. Since Helms-Burton was enacted, President Clinton has routinely waived this section.

There can be no lawsuits, no litigation in American courts against foreign corporations, foreign business interests that invest in previously owned American property in Cuba or American interests in Cuba. That is a horrible decision by the President. It is outrageous what he did. It is something that kowtows to the big business interests of our allies and is detrimental to everything that we believe in and to the best interests of our national security and our interests in this hemisphere.

Our interest is in having democracy in Cuba and that can only happen when the noose is tied tightly enough around Castro and the current Cuban regime that he is ousted and that a new government comes into place. The economy of that country is dependent upon these investments and anything we can do to stop the money from flowing and the support from flowing into this government and into its economy is essential and important and critical, not only to the freedom-loving people who want to be free in Cuba, Cuban Americans and Cubans everywhere, but also to America, the United States' national security interest.

There is no real progress being made. Castro's playing us for a sucker and this administration is blind to that fact. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too, Mr. President. You must understand that if we are to end this tyrannical dictatorship south of the United States, only 90 miles off our coast, a true embargo has to be enforced, a true economic embargo. And this provision, Title III of the Helms-Burton law allowing Americans to sue in court companies abroad that are doing business and investing in American interests, formerly American interests in Cuba, has to be allowed to go forward. And if it does, then and only then do we have a chance of ousting Castro in some more peaceable manner other than short of some invading force, which none of us is predicting or expecting or advocating.

I hope and pray that my colleagues will join with me in the next few months as we go back and revisit this issue legislatively. If the President is not willing to enforce title III of Helms-Burton and is going to continue to waive it, then I would suggest it is within our power and

this Congress should pass a law that says that title III is no longer eligible for waiver, that it indeed is the law of this land, that Americans who formerly had an interest in Cuba can sue foreign companies investing in those property interests in Cuba.

I would urge my colleagues to examine it. It is a very important ingredient in our foreign policy. We should never have allowed a dictatorship to exist for 40 years of such a vile nature as we have in Castro south of here, just 90 miles off our coast. And there is no reason, no reason to allow our allies and their business interests to continue to prop up that dictatorship with its human rights violations any longer. The time has long since passed to do something about it. Let us act in this Congress to force the hand of this President and to allow American citizens to sue, at the very least to try to bring some pressure that can be legitimately brought on the Cuban regime in addition to enforcing the embargo and whatever else we can do within our powers.

NAMING THE THOMAS S. FOLEY
FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED
STATES COURTHOUSE AND THE
WALTER F. HORAN PLAZA

HON. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR.
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation, designating the federal building located at West 920 Riverside Avenue, Spokane, Washington, as the "Thomas S. Foley Federal Building and United States Courthouse." The bill also designates the plaza located immediately in front of the building as the "Walter F. Horan Plaza." Rep. Foley had offices in this building and Rep. Horan was instrumental in securing funding for its construction.

Many Members will recall the long and distinguished career of Rep. Tom Foley, who now serves as our nation's Ambassador to Japan. Mr. Foley was a Member of this body for 30 years, concluding his service as Speaker of the House in the 103rd Congress. He also served as Speaker in the 102nd Congress, and in prior years held positions as Majority Leader, Majority Whip, and as Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. Foley personified the high ideals to which all of us aspire as Members of Congress. First and foremost he was a gentleman who sought consensus among all Members. He loved Congress, believing it to be the best forum for democracy in the world.

Tom Foley is a native son of Spokane, Washington, having attended local schools earned his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Washington. His parents were dignified and highly respected citizens of Spokane. He was first elected to Congress in 1964 and served in the House for 30 years. In 1997 he was nominated by President Clinton and confirmed by the Senate to serve as Ambassador to Japan.

Tom Foley was—and continues to be—widely regarded in eastern Washington State and has left a lasting legacy.

Today we also honor another native son, Walter F. Horan. He served 22 years—spanning the years 1943 to 1965—as the Con-

gressman from eastern Washington. He was born in a log cabin on the banks of the Wenatchee River in an area settled by his father, a fact he proudly boasted of, raised in Wenatchee, served in the Navy during the First World War, graduated from Washington State University in Pullman, and returned to Wenatchee to raise apples on his family farm.

Following election to Congress he served on several committees, but for most of his tenure he sat on the Appropriations Committee, rising to third in seniority on the Republican side. He paid particularly close attention to agriculture and conservation interests and continued to share in the operation of his family farm while serving in Congress.

Rep. Horan was a consummate advocate of western interests, especially those of eastern Washington, and he also conducted himself with dignity and honor as a Member of Congress. He died in 1966 and is buried in his beloved hometown of Wenatchee.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES GROUP
LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE
ACT OF 1999

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, I am pleased to introduce this important legislation that will provide long-term care insurance to federal employees. Long-term care refers to a broad range of health, social, and environmental support services and assistance provided by paid and unpaid caregivers in institutional, home, and community settings to persons who are limited in their ability to function independently on a daily basis. The need for long-term care insurance is evidence as the population ages and older Americans need assistance for their daily living.

The number of Americans over 65 will leap from 34 million in 1995 to 60 million by 2025. Americans will find it impossible to afford nursing home care which will increase from \$40,000 today to \$97,000 by 2030. Under current law, a family would have to deplete all their financial resources to qualify for medicaid which would only pay for a portion of needed long-term care services. By offering long-term care as a benefit option for its employees, the federal government, as the nation's largest employer, can set the example for other employers whose workforce will be facing the same long-term care needs.

The "Federal Employees Group Long-Term Care Insurance Act of 1999" would authorize the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to purchase a policy or policies from one or more qualified private-sector contractors to make long-term care insurance available to federal employees and retirees, and family members whom OPM defines as eligible, at group rates. Coverage would be paid for entirely by those who elect it.

OPM will select a single or a very small number of carriers based on quality, service and price to offer a high-quality benefits package to eligible participants. This benefits package would be consistent with the most recent National Association of Insurance Commissioners standards. OPM will be open to various financing arrangements proposed by the

carrier(s), such as the use of consortia or reinsurance arrangements to ensure the financial stability of the program. OPM would have broad flexibility to determine appropriate benefits and to contract competitively for benefits with one or more private carriers, without regard to section 5 of title 41, United States Code, or any law requiring competitive bidding. OPM needs the flexibility to capitalize on complex market factors to procure the best value for federal enrollees. OPM will ensure that resulting contracts are awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications, price, and reasonable competition to the maximum extent practicable. Qualified carriers shall: (a) be licensed to do business in all States and the District of Columbia to offer long-term care insurance; (b) agree to provide coverage for all eligible enrollees consistent with requirements for qualified long-term care insurance contracts and issuers enacted under subtitle C of Title III of the HIPAA; (c) propose rates which in OPM's judgment reasonably reflect the cost of benefits provided; (d) maintain funds associated with the federal employees contract separate and apart from the carriers' other funds; and (e) agree to all risk.

The contract or contracts would be for a duration of 5 years, unless terminated by OPM. OPM will issue regulations to provide for opportunities to enroll and benefit portability. With this statutory and regulatory authority, OPM will have the flexibility needed to administer the program as the market for long-term care services and protection evolves over time.

The program would be available to federal employees and retirees, and other spouses; a former spouse who is entitled to annuity under a federal retirement system; parents, and parents-in-law. All participants other than active employees would be fully underwritten as is standard practice with products of this kind. Coverage made available to individuals would be guaranteed renewable and could not be canceled except for nonpayment of premium. Though each participant would be responsible for paying the full amount of premiums, based on age at time of enrollment, group rates will save an estimated 15–20 percent off the cost of individual long-term care policies.

OPM will be responsible for the administrative costs of the program, which is estimated to be \$15 million over a 5-year period. Initial year costs include developing and implementing a program to educate employees about long-term care insurance, procuring a contract or contracts, and validating the reasonableness of rate proposals. Employee and annuitant premiums would be withheld from salary or annuity and transmitted directly to respective contractors, and those enrollees could also elect withholdings for coverage of their spouses.

Any eligible enrollees shall, at the discretion of OPM, submit premiums directly to the appropriate contractor. As with the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, the bill would require participating contractors to provide benefits when OPM finds the individual is entitled to benefits under the terms of the contract. Participating carriers would be required to reimburse OPM's expenses for adjudicating claims disputes.

The proposal would provide a substantial benefit to federal employees and retirees by providing access to quality long-term care insurance products at cost savings, group pre-

miums. I urge members to support this important legislation.

RETIREMENT OF FORMER SATURN
CHAIRMAN RICHARD G. "SKIP"
LEFAUVE

HON. ED BRYANT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, as you may know, my district in Tennessee is the home of one of the most innovative automobile companies in the world—The Saturn plant of Spring Hill. Since its inception, it has changed the automobile industry enormously, from labor and management relations to how customers shop for cars on a showroom floor.

Former Saturn Chairman, Richard G. "Skip" LeFauve, has announced his retirement from the automobile industry. Mr. LeFauve was elected to a new position of senior vice president for Global Leadership Development and Global Human Resources Processes. He was also appointed president of the newly created GM University, effective April 1, 1997.

Richard G. "Skip" LeFauve was named President of Saturn, a wholly-owned subsidiary of General Motors on February 3, 1986, with additional responsibilities on October 4, 1994, when GM vice-president and group executive in charge of the North American Operations (NAO) Small Car Group, and a member of the NAO Strategy Board. He was appointed Chairman of Saturn Corporation on August 8, 1995.

Prior to joining Saturn, he was vice-president of Manufacturing Operations for GM's former Buick-Oldsmobile-Cadillac (B-O-C) Group.

He began his General Motors career in 1956 as an engineer with Packard Electric Division in Warren, Ohio. In 1957, he joined the United States Navy and earned his wings as a Naval Aviator in 1958. Following six years of active duty, he rejoined the Packard Electric Division of GM, becoming plant manager in 1968. He was appointed manager of Production Engineering for the division in 1969. Two years later, Mr. LeFauve became director of manufacturing engineering and was promoted to general manufacturing manager in 1978.

Mr. LeFauve was appointed general manager for the former Diesel Equipment Division, Grand Rapids, Michigan, in 1980 and in the following year, he was named general manager for the former Rochester Products Division (now AC Rochester), Rochester, New York.

In 1983, he was named general manufacturing manager for Chevrolet Motor Division. He joined the former B-O-C Group the following year, and was named a GM vice-president in 1985.

A native of Orchard Park, New York, LeFauve was born November 30, 1934. He earned a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering from Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland in 1956 and attended the Senior Executive Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT).

LeFauve is a board member of the International Student Exchange Program—University of Illinois at Chicago, the Council of Competitiveness, and the Harley Davidson Board of Directors.

THE BANK EXAMINATION REPORT
PROTECTION ACT

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation I am introducing, the Bank Examination Report Protection Act [BERPA] of 1999. This bill would establish that all confidential supervisory information shall be the property of the Federal banking agency that created or requested the information and shall be privileged from disclosure to any other person. The Federal banking agency may waive this privilege at its discretion. There are other appropriate exceptions in the bill, such as for the Comptroller General of the United States and for law enforcement.

Essentially, the issue of privilege is one that must be addressed. The fact that financial institutions may lose their privilege on information turned over to a regulator has made them more hesitant to share all relevant information with their regulators. This, in turn, makes it more difficult for the regulators to do a thorough job in their examinations of the institutions. In fact, this legislation is strongly supported by the affected Federal banking regulators.

I would like to make sure my colleagues are aware that this legislation would maintain existing privileges and protect any materials created by the regulators. This would not prevent litigants from discovering the underlying facts of any action. All nonprivileged sources would still be available in discovery. This would simply ensure that examination materials—the critically important function of which is facilitate free-flowing communication between the examiner and the institution to maximize the effectiveness of the supervisory process—are not turned into a weapon against the regulated financial institution.

BERPA would ensure that the safety and soundness of our institutions is maintained through a vigorous and thorough supervisory process. This process is not complete when institutions are not forthcoming with information for fear of having information that was at one time privileged suddenly become subject to subpoena. Therefore, not only does this help the supervisory process, but also the consumers and taxpayers that insure these institutions. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

IN HONOR OF MAESTRO RAUL
ANGUIANO

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Mexico's greatest living muralist, the highly acclaimed artist, Maestro Raul Anguiano. It is also my great pleasure to welcome the Maestro to The Bowers Museum in Santa Ana, CA, where he will place the first brush stroke on a mural for the Museum.

The Maestro is known throughout the world as Mexico's ambassador of art. He has exhibited in major museums and galleries around

the world including the Palace of Fine Arts, the National Museum of Prints and the Museum of Plastic Arts in Mexico City, the Museum of Man in San Diego, the Carnegie Art Museum, the Institute Italo, Latino Americao (Rome), Casas Reales Museum (Santa Domingo), and the Armand Hammer Museum in Los Angeles. His solo exhibits include Moscow, Leningrad, Peking, Rome, Assissi and Venice. His work has also been exhibited at the Santora Arts Center in Santa Ana, CA.

His works are included in permanent exhibits in many major museums around the world. Most recently his painting the "Crucifixion" was accepted by Pope John Paul II and is now in the collection at the Vatican.

Raul Anguiano was born in Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico, February 26, 1915. He began painting at the age of twelve. As a child, he would paint or draw on any space available; his creativity and genius could not be contained. His mother, Abigail, recognized her son's early signs of genius and encouraged him by providing him with sketch books. The young Raul was driven by sheer talent and desire to create the visions that were given to him.

Along with his contemporary, Diego Rivera, Maestro Anguiano has influenced other Mexican artists here in the United States. R.C. Gorman has credited Anguiano with his "aesthetic influence as well as subject matter."

Maestro Anguiano has given to the world a precious gift of beauty that will live on forever by creating a mural for the permanent collection of the Bowers Museum. I commend Maestro Raul Anguiano for his significant artistic contribution to the history of art and his impact on contemporary artists around the world.

USING CHILDREN AS HOSTAGES

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to address a problem that is plaguing our nation—children being taken as hostages. Far too many scenarios have been documented in which children are exposed to violence, emotional trauma or physical harm at the hands of adults.

For example, in New York, a woman's estranged husband took her and their three children hostage at the point of a loaded shotgun. He held them for nearly four hours, and at one point, he even allegedly traded his seven-year-old for a pack of cigarettes.

In Texas, a man took 80 children hostage at an area day care facility, including two of his children. They were held at gunpoint and released over a 30-hour period before the standoff was brought to a non-violent conclusion.

In Florida, a suspected drug addict and murderer held two children, ages two and four, hostage for two-and-a-half days. An entire Orlando neighborhood was evacuated during the standoff. Only when he threatened to use the children as human shields did a SWAT team rescue the children in a raid that resulted in the death of the suspect.

In Baltimore, a man broke into a second-floor apartment, stabbing a young mother and holding her nine-month-old child hostage for two hours before a Quick Response Team

could rescue the baby and apprehend the suspect.

Situations like these are unacceptable, and should not be tolerated by anyone. All over the country, children are being used as pawns in actions played by violent adults. We in Congress must do our part to help prevent these scenarios from developing in the first place.

My legislation will give new protections to children—our nation's most precious resource. I have joined forces with Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE to establish the strictest punishments for those who would evade arrest or obstruct justice by using children as hostages. This bill will toughen penalties against any person who takes a child, 18 years of age or younger, hostage in order to resist any officer or court in the United States, or to compel the federal government to do or to abstain from any act. Such a person would serve a minimum sentence of ten years to a maximum of death, depending on the extent of injury to the child.

Please join me in this important effort to protect the lives and well-being of our nation's young. I hope that together we can make our nation a safer place for everyone, especially those in our society least able to protect themselves.

CONGRATULATIONS TO NOLAN RYAN ON HIS ELECTION TO THE BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

HON. RICHARD K. ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and pay tribute to a true Texas legend. Yesterday, former Texas Rangers pitcher Nolan Ryan was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

During Mr. Ryan's illustrious career, he became not only one of the greatest pitchers to play the game, but also one of the most beloved and respected. He struck out a record 5,714 batters, won 324 games, and played for 27 years—longer than any other player in history. These accomplishments earned him the second highest voting percentage ever for a Hall of Fame nominee.

His most important accomplishment, however, was the way he conducted himself as a player. Nolan Ryan played baseball with dignity and sportsmanship second to none. He showed our children that good guys do win. Tom Schieffer, President of the Texas Rangers, said it best: "Players like Nolan Ryan are the way the game endures. They renew people's faith in the sport."

Congratulations to Nolan Ryan, a true gentleman of sport. I know if he picked up a baseball at his ranch today, he'd still be good for twenty strikeouts a game.

HELP COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY BASE CLOSURE

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will facilitate the

swift transfer of closed military bases to local communities. This action is necessary because current law hinders the large and complex transfer of military base property with economic redevelopment in mind.

Many of the laws governing the reuse of military bases are antiquated and filled with confusing terms and conditions. One major existing hindrance is a clause prohibiting the obtaining of profit by local communities. This is a problem because it prevents local communities from generating profits through subleasing for the purpose of reinvestment to maintain and improve landscaping, maintenance, and infrastructure. The remedy for this situation is to replace the clause with legislation embodying the provisions of the base closure laws and amendments of the 1990's.

The interim lease provisions have not been as successful as planned because many of the terms and conditions act as disincentives to economic development conveyance. For example, there is no commitment for final ownership by federal agencies upon assumption of control or occupancy of transferred property. Commercial firms are willing to enter into leases, but are refusing this option because of the lack of commitment for final ownership. In addition, the new occupants of closed base property are unable to conduct major renovations unless they agree to restore the property to its original condition. Many of the facilities require major alterations from their original condition just to bring them to local code standards. Why are we requiring restoration of undesired conditions? This makes no sense and ultimately results in taxpayer waste.

Prior to 1996, departure of federal agencies reverted property to the federal government for disposal by GSA. A "leaseback provision" was established in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year '96 to protect communities from a federal agency revolving door. Under this law, property approved for federal usage would be transferred to the local redevelopment agency, then leased to a federal agency at no cost for up to fifty years. The reasoning behind this is to ensure transfer of property to local communities in the event of departure by federal agencies. The lack of a mandatory requirement for leaseback acceptance allows for circumvention of the legislative intent. In Orlando, Florida, the Veterans Administration (VA) requested Orlando Naval Training Center property through the federal screen process. VA refused to enter into a long-term lease with the city. This created major problems for community redevelopment authorities as it limited their ability to finalize reuse plans. My legislation guarantees an option for communities to obtain reuse property after the departure from the property by the first federal agency lessee.

We must allow common sense to prevail in this base reuse process. There are some instances where it makes sense to lease to organizations affiliated with the branch of service that previously occupied the base property. This is currently prohibited; yet doesn't it make sense to relocate recruiting stations, reserve centers, and military processing centers onto closed base property?

The four branches of the U.S. Armed Forces are currently able to contract with local governments for fire and police services for only the last six months prior to the closure of a base. Many times a base is phased out over a long period of time and the military eliminates military fire and police services much

longer before the base is fully closed. Families and military personnel remaining need fire and police services from the local community. The military should be able to contract for these services throughout a long closure process.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I'm introducing today will make major strides in reforming the base closure reuse process. We must enact this legislation to protect our local communities. I urge my colleagues' support.

IN SUPPORT OF THE 1999 TRUST
FUND OFF-BUDGET BILL

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR in introducing a bill that will take the remaining user financed transportation trust funds off budget. Specifically, this bill removes three transportation trust funds—Aviation, Harbor Maintenance, and Inland Waterways—from the unified federal budget. These trust funds are user-financed, self-supporting funds which provide important federal assistance for infrastructure preservation and improvement projects. This bill would restore the integrity of the trust funds by allowing the full, prompt utilization of collected user fees for transportation improvements rather than artificially limiting their use to help mask the federal deficit. In other words, this bill puts the "trust" back into the trust fund.

This bill also launches off what Chairman SHUSTER has referred to as the "Year of Aviation." Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member OBERSTAR, Chairman DUNCAN and I will be working hard this year to significantly increase capital investment funding for our national aviation system. More and more people are flying each day. In fact, a record 600 million people will fly this year. Yet because of a lack of capital investment, our national aviation system will not be able to meet the increased demand that is expected in the near future. The Federal Aviation Administration has not modernized our air traffic control system. Our airports do not have an adequate number of gates or runways to accommodate future growth and competition. It is obvious that something need to be done to make sure our national aviation system is ready for the 21st century.

It is our belief that by lifting the artificial spending constraints on the aviation trust fund—by taking the aviation trust fund off-budget—the federal funds necessary to ensure that our national aviation systems survives well into the 21st century will finally be spent on aviation needs and aviation needs only. A strong aviation system is key to our strong economy. Aviation and aviation-related activities account for six percent of the United States' Gross Domestic Product. Businesses depend on aviation as the fastest way to move both people and goods. In addition, the tourism industry, which is one of the fastest growing, most successful industries in the world, would not survive without a strong national aviation system.

I look forward to the year ahead as we work to take the aviation trust fund off budget in order to significantly increase capital invest-

ment in aviation. We do not have much time. The Airport Improvement Program, one of the most important federal aviation capital investment programs, will expire on March 31, 1999. For this reason, I am proud to again join Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman DUNCAN and Ranking Member OBERSTAR in introducing a bill to authorize the AIP program through Fiscal Year 1999. Although the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Aviation Subcommittee are committed to working on putting together a larger reauthorization bill before the end of March, Congress is not known for meeting tight schedules. It would be an indelible mark on the Year of Aviation if the AIP program expired at the same time Congress was working on increasing federal funding for our national aviation system.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to take the remaining three transportation trust funds off budget. The future of our national aviation system depends on it.

THE LONG-TERM CARE
ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 1999

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am re-introducing the Long-Term Care Advancement Act to provide real assistance to families and jump-start debate over how to best prepare Americans for their long-term care needs.

Although the worsening long-term care situation in this country does not get a lot of media attention, it is very real and millions of families will find themselves under tremendous emotional and financial pressures unless measures are adopted now to address it. The rapid expansion of the group of Americans defined by the Bureau of the Census as "the oldest old"—those senior citizens aged 85 and above—is slated to double by the year 2030. In fact, the fastest growing demographic age group in the United States are the "oldest old," and about half of such individuals will eventually require assistance with various activities of daily living (ADLs).

The Long-Term Care Advancement Act of 1999 will assist Americans as they prepare for their future long-term care needs. To help families keep more of what they have earned over the years, my bill allows penalty-free withdrawals from IRAs and 401(k) plans when the funds are used to pay for "qualified" long-term care (LTC) insurance premiums (as defined by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996).

In addition, my legislation will enable a family to make an IRA/401(k) withdrawal to pay for an LTC insurance policy premium and a portion of the withdrawal will be excluded from their taxable income. Depending on one's tax bracket, age, and type of policy purchased, the savings on an LTC insurance policy under my bill are considerable.

Lastly, the Long-Term Care Advancement Act will provide a refundable \$500 tax credit for families caring for a dependent elderly spouse or parent in the home. This tax credit is important because most of the long-term care provided in America is provided by families in the home, and these families des-

perately need and deserve tax relief. In my view, families trying to take care of their loved ones should be rewarded by the tax code, not punished as they are now.

The tax breaks contained in this legislation will help families provide the peace and security they want and need against the massive costs of professionally provided long-term care, including nursing home care, home health care, respite care, and adult day care services.

Last year, this legislation secured the support of the 60 Plus Association, the American Health Care Association, and the Home Health Assembly of New Jersey. The Health Insurance Association of America (HIAA) has also supported the concept behind the bill.

This year, I was very pleased to see the President Clinton has decided to join my colleagues and I in the long-term care debate by proposing a tax credit for elderly disabled persons as part of his fiscal year 2000 budget. Many will recall that the Republican "Contract with America" called for providing "tax incentives for private long-term care insurance to let older Americans keep more of what they have earned over the years." They say that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, so Republicans should be flattered that Mr. Clinton has decided to make a plank in of the "Contract with America" the centerpiece of his new domestic initiatives contained in his budget.

However, in addition to providing a tax credit, I believe a vital part of any comprehensive proposal on long-term care must also be the promotion of private long-term care insurance. Although the number of persons insured under LTC policies has nearly doubled between 1992 and 1996, this growth is from a very low base. The fact of the matter is that the overwhelming majority of Americans still do not have any private LTC insurance coverage at all. This needs to change, and soon.

Unless it does, changing demographics will put an enormous strain on our nation's fragmented system of long-term care. Already, our Medicare and Medicaid programs have demonstrated their financial shortcomings when providing long-term care services to increasing numbers of the frail elderly. The Medicaid program already spends over \$41 billion on nursing home care services for senior citizens. Medicaid expenditures are projected to double over the next 10 years, with nursing home care driving much of the growth.

By encouraging more Americans to plan for their future care needs, I believe we can improve the medical, social, and financial well being of families, as well as provide substantial future savings to the Medicaid and Medicare programs. According to the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company, there is a 48% chance of any given individual needing long term care in one's lifetime. And the costs of nursing home care for one year is approximately \$40,000. If we can successfully encourage families to purchase LTC insurance, the potential for savings to American families, as well as the Medicaid and Medicare programs, is simply enormous.

I look forward to working on and discussing long-term care issues with my colleagues throughout the 106th Congress, and urge all of my colleagues to support this important initiative.

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE LONG-TERM CARE ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 1999

SECTION 1: SHORT TITLE

SECTION 2: EXCLUSION FROM INCOME FOR RETIREMENT PLAN WITHDRAWALS USED TO PURCHASE LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE

Penalty taxes are waived on IRA/retirement plan withdrawals used to pay for LTC insurance policy premiums.

IRA/retirement plan withdrawals will not be included as taxable income if the withdrawal is used to pay for "qualified" LTC insurance policy premiums. The amounts excludable from taxation are as follows (the amounts are identical to the LTC tax breaks contained in P.L. 104-193):

Age of LTC policyholder	Exclusion from income allowed on IRA/401(k) withdrawals for "qualified" policies under HR—
40 or less	\$200.00
41 to 50	375.00
51 to 60	750.00
61 to 70	2,000.00
71 and up	2,500.00

"Qualified" LTC plans eligible for the incentives contained in this bill are defined by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA, or P.L. 104-193).

Double tax benefits are prohibited. For example, a taxpayer otherwise eligible to take a deduction for LTC premiums could either take the tax deduction allowed by P.L. 104-193, or make a tax-excludable withdrawal from their IRA or other retirement plan. They cannot do both.

Only the amounts withdrawn to pay for actual LTC premiums are eligible to receive tax benefits under LTCAA. Amounts withdrawn in excess of those needed to pay LTC premiums would be subject to normal tax rules (including applicable penalties, if any).

Provisions effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1998.

SECTION 3: TAX CREDIT FOR TAXPAYERS CARING FOR A DEPENDENT PARENT OR SPOUSE IN THE HOME

A \$500 tax credit (refundable) can be claimed for each chronically ill spouse/parent who cannot perform two or more activities of daily living (ADLs) due to a physical or mental impairment.

Dependent spouse/parent must reside in the taxpayer's principal place of residence for more than half of the taxable year.

'Elder-care' tax credit phased in over the next five years as follows:

Calendar year	Applicable 'elder-care' tax credit amount
1999	\$250
2000	350
2001	400
2002	450
2003	500

The tax credit is indexed for inflation after 2003. It will be indexed to the medical cost component of the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

Income limits for 'elder care' credit are identical to \$500-per-child tax credit included in Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (P.L. 104-34).

Provisions effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1998.

TRIBUTE TO JOE MORAN

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished educator from

Northeastern Pennsylvania, Joe Moran. This month, Joe's colleagues, family, and students will gather to honor him as he retires. I am pleased to have been asked to participate in this tribute.

Joe Moran grew up in Luzerne County and had a distinguished athletic career at the University of Scranton. After earning his degree, he went to work as an engineer for Martin Aircraft of Baltimore, Maryland. Not long afterwards, Joe became a teacher in New Jersey and in 1959, he returned to Wilkes-Barre to teach. Joe spent twenty-four years as a physics teacher and coach at Coughlin High School. During Joe's tenure as coach, Coughlin's football team went to seven city championships and one Wyoming Valley Conference championship. As a result, Joe was named coach of the year in 1960 and 1966. He also led the track and field team to several championships. From 1973 to 1978, he was the Athletic Director at Coughlin High School. He later coached the defensive line at Wilkes College, helping to garner three Mid-Atlantic Conference crowns.

In 1982, Coughlin High School made Joe an Assistant Principal and he helped integrate computers into the academic program. A few years later, Joe became principal of the G.A.R. Memorial Junior High School, also in Wilkes-Barre. There, he was instrumental in establishing the state-of-the-art technology center. In 1998, he became principal of the High School.

Joe's love of sports and long career has helped shape the nature of high school athletics in the Wyoming Valley. He cofounded the Scholastic Tennis conference and was Co-Commissioner of the Wyoming Valley Track and Field Conference for two decades. He organized the first junior high girls track meet in the state. He served on the State Committee for Scholastic Football, the Commission of the Wyoming Valley Football Conference, and the Eastern Football Conference. Joe has been a swimming official for more than twenty years and was executive director of the Wyoming Valley Track and Field Officials Association. During this time, he and his wife, Fran, have raised six children who have, in turn, produced six grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Moran deserves our gratitude for the dedication he has shown our area youth for almost forty years. Not only is he an educator and administrator, but he is an inspiration to our young athletes. I am proud to join with his family, his friends, and the community in congratulating Joe on a job well done. I send him my very best wishes for a happy and healthy retirement.

THE WISE BILL

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I take great pride in introducing the Women's Investment and Savings Equity Act of 1999, the WISE bill. Joining me in this effort is my colleague from Washington, Ms. JENNIFER DUNN.

The old proverb "a penny saved is a penny earned" has more truth today than people realize. Savings is not only a critical part of

American's retirement security, but our long-term economic growth depends largely on what we save today. After all, the economy cannot grow unless there's an adequate supply of capital to invest. Money saved for retirement, whether it is through savings accounts, IRA's or employer-sponsored pensions, is a primary source of private investment capital.

Unfortunately, today's punitive, complex Tax Code encourages consumption while savings and investment are generally discouraged. Low savings rates means reduced growth potential. It also means a lower quality of life when the retirement years arrive.

In an effort to stimulate savings, the WISE bill would make some much needed changes to our Tax Code as it pertains to savings for parents, especially women. Right now, parents who take unpaid maternity or paternity leave have no way of making up pension contributions once they return to the work force. Many parents also realize that it may not be possible for both parents to work while raising a child. Even if both do, there may not be enough money to make pension contributions.

The lack of savings opportunities I have just described would be removed if we enacted the WISE bill. The WISE bill would allow those coming off of unpaid maternity or paternity leave to make up contributions to their employer-sponsored pension, for example, 401(k), that they would have been able to make had they not been on leave. The legislation would allow the person 3 years to make up the missed contributions.

The WISE bill would also allow parents who do not make contributions to their pension while raising a child, regardless of whether the parent has left the work force or if they simply cannot make a contribution due to other expenses, to make up those contributions at a later date. After all, piano lessons will sometimes come before retirement savings. For example, if a parent does not make contributions for 13 years while raising a child, he or she will have 13 years to make up the contributions. The make-up contributions will be equal to the lesser of what the parent could have otherwise contributed, of 120 percent of the contribution limit minus what is being contributed that year. For example, a \$50,000 earner with a 401(k) allowing for a 5-percent deferral, \$2,500, as defined by the employer could contribute his or her normal \$2,500 plus another \$2,500 if it is a make-up year. The added \$2,500 is the lesser of the plan limit, \$2,500, or 120 percent of the legal limit, \$11,400, minus \$2,500, the contribution already being made. The legal limit of a 401(k) is \$9,500.

These reforms are needed to remove the inequities that parents, especially women, face when it comes to savings for retirement. This would clearly spur additional personal savings. More savings equals an increase in retirement income, a reduction in dependence on entitlements and much needed economic growth. For all these reasons, it is imperative that we make retirement savings more attractive and easier for parents who face unique financial strains. The WISE bill does just that. I urge my colleagues to support this needed reform.

CONGRATULATING TENNESSEE
VOL PLACE KICKER JEFF HALL**HON. VAN HILLEARY**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate an outstanding young man from my district, Jeff Hall of Winchester, Tennessee.

Jeff Hall is many things. He is a captain of the National Champion Tennessee Volunteer football team. He is the all-time leading scorer in the history of the Southeastern Conference (SEC) and a four-time All-SEC team member. He is one of the best place kickers in America, who time after time has displayed grace under pressure, kicking last-minute, game-winning field goals against Syracuse and Florida in this perfect, 13-0, National Championship season.

However, Jeff Hall is more than just a great place kicker. He is a true student-athlete who has been named to the Academic All-SEC team and who recently graduated with a degree in marketing. He is a community servant who has participated in more than 150 community service events, including serving as president of UT's chapter of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes and visiting children's hospitals, speaking in anti-drug programs and youth clinics and Boy Scout chapters. For all his good deeds in the community, he has been named to the Football Good Works Team by the American Football Coaches Association (AFCA) and the SEC. He is also a man who has the courage to stand on his religious principles and make it known that his relationship with God is the most important part of his life.

Mr. Speaker, Jeff Hall is the kind of person we should encourage all our young people to emulate. He embodies a dedication to excellence, community service and moral values which would make our nation a better place if everybody demonstrated that same dedication.

SALUTING COLONEL "IRONMAN"
LEE**HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, at his death, all Americans need to be reminded of the career and valor of Col. William A. Lee, who died on December 27, 1998 at the age of 98 after a long battle with cancer.

Col. Lee, nicknamed "Ironman," was among my most distinguished constituents, and one of the most decorated Marines in the history of the Corps. He also was one of the last living World War I veterans in Virginia's First District. He resided for many years near Fredericksburg, Virginia.

In Colonel Lee's younger days, he gained renown as a knife fighter and expert marksman known for his toughness and endurance. He enlisted in the Marines in 1918 at the age of 17 and after serving in World War I, he fought in the Nicaraguan "Banana Wars" of the late 1920s and early 1930s at the side of another legendary warrior from Virginia's First District, the late Lewis B. "Chesty" Puller. It

was Puller who bestowed upon Lee the nickname "Ironman" for his valor in battle. Col. Lee earned three Navy Crosses for his service in South America alone.

At the outbreak of World War II, Col. Lee served as chief gunner with the "Horse Marines" mounted infantry in China. On the day of the attack on Pearl Harbor, he and 200 other Marines were taken prisoner, herded into boats and trains and beaten. He remained in a Japanese prison camp for 44 months until the United States dropped atomic weapons on Japan. He retired from the Marines in 1950.

During his service, Col. Lee earned dozens of awards, including three Purple Hearts and two Medals of Valor. Mementoes of his long military career such as the Stetson hat he wore in South America and his World War II Smith and Wesson .44 caliber revolver are on display today at the Marine Corps museums at Quantico and in Washington. The rifle range at Quantico is named in his honor.

Col. Lee was a great American patriot who loved his country. His career is a shining example to all who respect those who have served in the military and still serve with a devotion to honor and duty. As the curator of material history for the Marine Corps said upon Colonel Lee's death, "His name is beyond legendary to Marines."

I was extremely proud to have had him as a constituent. Every American should be reminded of his patriotism and valor.

HONORING GEORGE HOWARD
BRETT'S ELECTION TO THE
BASEBALL HALL OF FAME**HON. KAREN MCCARTHY**

OF MISSOURI

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and I rise today to join my constituents in the Fifth District of Missouri and all baseball fans around the country in congratulating George Howard Brett, the first member of the Kansas City Royals to be elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, New York. This well-deserved recognition is the highest honor in baseball. I salute George Brett, his family, and the entire Kansas City Royals organization on this achievement.

George Brett's unique combination of talent, dedication, and commitment to one team, and his desire to give back to our community illustrates his worthiness of this honor. He played his entire career as No. 5 for 21 seasons in Kansas City where he achieved a career batting average of .305. Mr. Brett holds 3 American League batting titles and is a 13-time All Star. He is the only player in Major League history to have earned at least 3,000 hits, 300 home runs, 600 doubles, 100 triples and 200 stolen bases. Mr. Brett powered the Kansas City Royals to a World Championship in 1985 with a .370 batting average for the Series. The members of the Baseball Writers' Association of America voted 98.19 percent in selecting Mr. Brett to the Hall of Fame. This is the fourth highest percentage in history.

As a first and third baseman, George Brett was bigger than life when out on the field.

Baseball fans remember when he chased the magical .400 batting average record set by Ted Williams of the Boston Red Sox. Mr. Brett was so admired during his playing days that around town there were "George Brett for President" bumper stickers. Hard work and dedication made him a sports hero that kids from all over the Midwest and the nation still look up to as a role model. He truly is an inspiration to the young people of our nation and has made the game exciting for fans of all ages.

We are all very proud of Mr. Brett and his accomplishments. Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mr. Brett, his family and the Kansas City Royals for this monumental achievement.

DESIGNATING THE FLORIDA PANTHER
AS AN ENDANGERED SPECIES**HON. BILL MCCOLLUM**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would declare the Florida Panther, specifically, to be an endangered species. As a longtime supporter of the recovery plan to restore the Florida Panther population, I believe that the Panther should be named by statute as a protected species under the Endangered Species Act.

The Florida Panther is one of the most seriously endangered subspecies in the United States. Like most endangered species, there are multiple problems threatening the Panther and its recovery. Along with the usual issues of habitat loss, the Florida Panther also suffers from genetic isolation and inbreeding. The Fish and Wildlife Service has been initiating a Habitat Protection Plan along with the genetic restoration effort for the Panther. I believe that we need to support this endeavor to restore the Florida Panther population and name this species by statute as an endangered species. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

STOP SWEATSHOPS—NOW

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with 26 of my colleagues to introduce legislation to curb the re-emergence of sweatshops in the domestic garment industry. This legislation is identical to a bill I introduced in the last Congress, H.R. 23.

Sweatshops have returned to the apparel industry in the United States in numbers and forms reminiscent of the turn of the century. A decade and a half ago, the General Accounting Office (GAO) documented the re-emergence of sweatshops. The GAO has identified sweatshop activity across the country, from California to New York and from Chicago to Texas and Florida. Despite significant and commendable enforcement efforts by the Department of Labor under the Clinton Administration, sweatshops continue to be a serious

problem, particularly within the garment industry. Even my Republican colleagues on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODLING, and the Gentleman from Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, have noted the re-emergence of sweatshops.

The re-emergence of sweatshops has impoverished workers and their families and has driven reputable contractors out of otherwise profitable businesses. It represents a problem that cannot and should not be tolerated.

The "Stop Sweatshops Act" establishes joint liability on the part of manufacturers in the garment industry who contract with sweatshop operators for violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). This legislation strengthens the ability of the Department of Labor to enforce the law and improves the ability of garment workers to obtain redress where violations occur. As importantly, by encouraging manufacturers in the garment industry to deal with reputable contractors, this legislation acts to balance market pressures that have encouraged the re-emergence of sweatshops.

One hundred of my colleagues joined me last Congress as cosponsors of this legislation. I urge those of my colleagues who have supported this legislation in the past to do so again. And, I urge those who have not previously cosponsored this legislation to do so now. We cannot continue to allow unscrupulous employers to drive responsible employers out of business. Nor should we continue to tolerate working conditions that undermine rather than promote the well being of workers. As we near the end of the 20th Century, we must eliminate this vestige of 19th Century exploitation.

THE CHILDREN'S ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to protect the health of America's children, the Children's Environmental Protection Act.

In 1996, Congress unanimously passed the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) which requires the Environmental Protection Agency to consider children's exposure to pesticides in food limit pesticide exposure to children. While the FQPA focused on protecting children by ensuring that the food they eat does not contain harmful levels of pesticides, this bill establishes guidelines to help reduce and eliminate exposure of children to environmental pollutants in areas reasonably accessible to children. The bill also requires the collection of toxicity data by the EPA Administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services so that we can begin to understand, with some level of accuracy, the long-term health effects and toxicity of pesticides and other environmental pollutants on children.

For too long risk assessments have been performed using the average, robust 170 pound male as a model. As a result, we really have no idea how these chemicals impact a child's system. This leaves our children at risk

because their physiology, play habits, and patterns of exposure make them more vulnerable to toxic harm. For example, children breathe in more of an air pollutant per pound of body weight. They eat more fresh fruit by body weight and drink proportionally more tap water, juice, and milk.

This bill addresses that problem by requiring that all EPA standards for environmental pollutants be set at levels that protect children. In addition, the Act requires EPA to publish a "Safe for Children" list of products, in addition to providing parents and the public with advice on how to minimize a child's exposure to harmful pollutants.

This bill also helps families educate themselves about potential threats to their children's health through the creation of a family right-to-know information kit. The kit will include a summary of helpful information and guidance to families and practical suggestions on how parents can reduce their children's exposure to environmental pollutants.

This bill will begin to provide the essential information we need to quantify and evaluate the impact of environmental pollutants in children. The more we know about potential risks and the less toxic burden we put on the environment the healthier our children will be. This legislation has been endorsed by Administrator Browner and by several environmental and health organizations. I urge your support and co-sponsorship of this important legislation.

ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY BURIAL ELIGIBILITY ACT

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Arlington National Cemetery Burial Eligibility Act." I invite members to join me as a cosponsor of this important legislation. It is my expectation that the VA Committee will take prompt actions so that the House may consider this legislation early in the Congress.

This bill is almost identical to the legislation passed by the House during the 105th Congress by a vote of 412-0. The VA Committee learned as a result of its investigative efforts that the practice of allowing burial of persons who did not meet Army regulations prescribing eligibility for burial at Arlington National Cemetery (ANC) had become the subject of serious controversy. Further, the practice of allowing burial of persons without military service at ANC has caused considerable anguish on the part of members of military and veterans organizations. As a result, the VA Committee recommended this legislation to codify existing burial regulations for ANC with two significant changes. First, there would not be authority to grant exceptions, or "waivers," under the proposed legislation. No one—not the Superintendent of ANC, the Secretary of the Army, or the President of the United States—could authorize the burial of a person who is not eligible under the proposed legislation. However, Congress could enact subsequent legislation on behalf of an individual whose accomplishments are deemed worthy of the honor of being buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

Second, this bill eliminates the "politically well-connected" category of eligibility now

found in existing Army Regulations. Under existing Army regulations, veterans who do not meet the military criteria for burial at ANC are nevertheless eligible if they served as a member of the House or Senate, as a Federal judge, a diplomat, or a high-ranking cabinet officer. This legislation eliminates future eligibility of such persons so that Arlington will once more be the final resting place for those with distinguished military service.

As indicated, this bill passed the House by an overwhelming margin and had the active support of all the major veterans service and military organizations. Unfortunately, the other body did not debate the issue during the 105th Congress. By introducing this bill and planning for its early consideration by the House VA Committee, we hope to give the Senate ample opportunity to consider it and reach agreement on what the nation's policy should be on this issue of abiding importance to veterans and their families.

EXTENDING COVERAGE OF THE FMLA

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to expand the protections afforded by the Family and Medical Leave Act. The bill I am introducing is identical to legislation I introduced in the 105th Congress, H.R. 109.

The Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA) grants employees the right to take unpaid leave in the event of a family or medical emergency without jeopardizing their jobs. As a former Chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Education and Labor, I was privileged to work closely with the Hon. MARGE ROUKEMA, Senator DODD, Senator BOND, our former colleagues the Hon. Pat Schroeder and the Hon. William D. Ford, and many others to bring about the enactment of this important law. Necessarily, however, many compromises were made to bring about this precedent setting legislation.

Among the most important of those compromises was one that limited the applicability of the law to employers of 50 or more employees. My original intention had been to extend the law to employers of 25 or more employees. However, because of uncertainty regarding the impact of the law on employers and in order to increase support for the legislation, I agreed to accept the 50 employee threshold.

The effect of this compromise was to leave tens of millions of employees and their families outside of the protections afforded by the FMLA. In fact, only 57% of the workforce is protected by the FMLA. The fact that an employee may work for an employer of 40 rather than 50 people does not immunize that employee from the vicissitudes of life nor diminish that employee's need of the protections afforded by the FMLA. For my part, this was a very difficult and reluctantly entered compromise. However, it was my hope at that time that experience under the law would prove that the law does not unduly or unreasonably disrupt employer operations.

The FMLA was signed into law on February 5, 1993. Experience has shown that the law

does not unduly disrupted employer operations. Not only are the costs to employers of complying with the law negligible, but in many instances FMLA has led to improvements in employer operations by improving employee morale and productivity and reducing employee turnover. Experience has also shown that the protections afforded by the law are not only beneficial, but are essential in enabling workers to balance the demands of work and home when faced with a family or medical emergency. In short, we have now had sufficient experience under the law to justify extending the law to employers of 25 or more employees.

Beyond expanding the number of workplaces that are protected by the FMLA, the bill I am introducing would permit employees to take parental leave to participate in or attend their children's educational and extracurricular activities. In effect, employees subject to the FMLA would be able to take 4 hours of leave in any 30-day period, not to exceed 24 hours in any 12 month period, in order to participate in important educational activities undertaken by their children. In this way, the law would more effectively enable workers to meet parental responsibilities without sacrificing their economic security.

Despite the enactment of the Family and Medical Leave Act, too many workers continue to face an impossible dilemma, pitting the emotional and physical well-being of a family against its economic security, when faced with a family or medical emergency. Enactment of this legislation would extend coverage to 73% of the workforce. A mother should not unreasonably or unnecessarily be forced to choose between caring for a new born and maintaining her job. A husband, recovering from a heart attack, should not also needlessly face the loss of his job and the resulting financial insecurity that would mean for his family.

Requiring employers of 25 or more to provide temporary, unpaid leave to workers who face a family or medical emergency will not impose an unreasonable burden on those employers. Such a modest expansion of the law, however, will significantly benefit families in crisis by extending the protections of the FMLA to 15 million workers and their families. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

THE GUN SHOW SAFETY &
ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of 25 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reintroduce the Gun Show Safety & Accountability Act, the nation's first legislation aimed at closing a deadly loophole that allows criminals to purchase firearms at gun shows without undergoing Brady background checks.

While it is unfortunate that my bill was not acted upon by the 105th Congress, it is our hope that with new leadership and a showing of bi-partisan support, the 106th Congress will pass this legislation and help me to cut off the deadly supply of firearms to violent criminals that result in the countless deaths of innocent American citizens every year.

When a person buys a handgun from a gun store, they must fill out a Brady Form, undergo a background check, show proof of identification and a record of the sale is also kept. What most people don't know is that a loophole in the federal law allows that same person to buy a handgun at a gun show without doing any of these things.

The gun show loophole has created a situation that is both dangerous and unfair. It allows gun show participants to sell guns with little, if any, legal obligation to insure that they aren't putting deadly weapons into the hands of violent criminals or juveniles. Furthermore, it creates unfair business competition between law-abiding gun store owners whose time-consuming background checks and sales records are much less attractive to potential customers than a quick purchase from a gun show participant.

Hundreds of thousands of firearms are sold at gun shows every year, and experts believe participation to be on the rise. As gun shows have grown, so has evidence illustrating that a lack of regulation is creating a black market for violent criminals. Knowing that background checks would prevent them from buying guns from a gun store, criminals have found that they can obtain unlimited numbers of firearms at gun shows with ease. Because no sales records are kept at gun shows, these firearms can be resold on the street and used in crimes without being traced.

A one-year study conducted by the Illinois State Police indicated that at least 25 percent of illegally trafficked firearms used in crimes originate at gun shows, and national news accounts indicate similar situations across the nation. Most recently, a 17-year-old Kentucky boy shot and killed another youth with a handgun that he told police he was able to purchase at a gun show with cash, no waiting period, and "no questions asked." In Florida, an escaped prison inmate was even able to purchase a handgun at a gun show.

As the link between guns used in crimes and gun shows grows, it makes sense that our nation should be rewarding gun store owners for taking time to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals—not penalizing them. As stated by Bill Bridgewater, former executive director of the National Alliance of Stocking Gun Dealers, "The Grand Bazaar approach that we now have ensures that every pugnacious child with a grudge to settle and every other form of human predator have easy access to all the firearms that they might desire, while the legitimate firearms dealer is saddled with more and more onerous restrictions."

Aimed at keeping guns out of the hands of violent criminals and bringing fairness and accountability to gun shows without creating new, onerous restrictions, the "Gun Show Safety & Accountability Act" is a fair and reasonable solution. By requiring gun store owners and gun show participants to comply with the same laws, the bill would promote fair business competition, while cutting off a deadly supply of firearms to our nation's dangerous criminals.

I urge my colleagues to make public safety a priority this Congress and join me in cosponsoring this groundbreaking piece of legislation.

UNIFORMED SERVICES FORMER
SPOUSES EQUITY ACT OF 1999

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to restore a small measure of balance to the way military retired pay is handled during a divorce.

Under the Uniformed Services Former Spouses Protection Act, courts, were given the authority to divide military retirement pay as property. Since then, the Courts have almost uniformly taken advantage of that provision. This has resulted in certain injustices to military retirees. Chief among them is the fact that former spouses continue to receive a share of the retired pay even after one or more remarriages, regardless of the respective financial positions of the former spouse and the retiree. Moreover, there is no limitation on when former spouses can seek a division of retired pay.

My bill has three principal components addressing problems created by the original legislation. First, it would terminate payments made as a division of property from retired pay upon remarriage of the former spouse. Second, it would require computation of the former spouse's portion of retired pay based on the rank and longevity of the individual at the time of divorce, not at the time of retirement. Third, it would limit the time in which a former spouse may seek a division of retired pay.

I urge my colleagues to join me in seeking equity for military retirees.

IN TRIBUTE TO JEAN FROHLICHER

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with unfortunate news. While returning from West Virginia with her husband following the New Years weekend, I am sorry to report that Jean Frohlicher, the first president and general counsel of the National Council of Higher Education Loan Programs (NCHLP), passed away in Elkins, West Virginia. She is survived by her husband John, niece Sandra Neuse and two nephews, Lee and Carl Neuse.

Since coming to Congress, I have worked hard to enhance educational opportunities for students across the nation. I believe that it is imperative that we ensure access to a higher education for every child in America. And though I have done what I can to reach this goal, my efforts have been dwarfed by those of Jean Frohlicher.

As the Executive Vice President and General Council of NCHLP, Jean recognized early on that we truly are facing a crisis in the cost of higher education and need to provide more assistance to students. Working with her colleagues in the education community and my colleagues on Capitol Hill, Jean has helped reform and expand our student loan programs, making more money available to students each year. Her advice and guidance on higher education financing has been invaluable to me.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago when my father died, I found the words of Angelo Patri, the American educator and columnist very comforting. He said, "in one sense there is no death. You will always feel her life touching yours, her voice speaking to you, her spirit looking out other eyes, talking to you in the familiar things she touched, worked with, loved as familiar friends. She lives on in your life and in the lives of all others who knew her."

Jean's passing will truly be a loss to our country and our students. My thoughts and prayers go out to Jean's husband, John, as well their family and friends. She has left behind many who respected and admired her, and her absence will certainly be felt by all.

BLACK LUNG BENEFITS SURVIVORS EQUITY ACT

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation aimed at providing equity in the treatment of benefits for eligible survivors of recipients of black lung benefits. In past Congresses, I have introduced legislation to make more comprehensive reforms to the federal black lung benefits program in an effort to make it more responsive to those who suffer from this crippling disease. However, in light of a pending Labor Department rulemaking in this area, I am withholding the introduction of that comprehensive bill at this time. In this regard, I believe that some comity is in order as we wait the promulgation of final rules under that proceeding. In the interim, the bill I am introducing today is very limited in scope.

In 1981, Congress amended the Black Lung Benefits Act in several respects. Facing insolvency, at the time the driving motivation for the legislation was to shore up the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund through which benefit payments are made to beneficiaries where mine employment terminated prior to 1970, or where no mine operator can be assigned liability. Through a variety of measures, solvency was restored as a result of those 1981 amendments which had the support of the United Mine Workers of America as well as most of the coal industry. Yet, one provision of the 1981 Act in particular was most troublesome. This provision involved the treatment of surviving spouses of deceased coal miner beneficiaries and the manner by which they could continue to receive black lung benefits.

As it now stands, due to the 1981 amendments, there is a dual and inequitable standard governing how benefits are handled for surviving spouses of deceased beneficiaries. In the event a beneficiary died prior to January 1, 1982—the effective date of the 1981 Act—benefits continued uninterrupted to the surviving spouse. However, if the beneficiary dies after January 1, 1982, the surviving spouse must file a new claim in order to try to continue receiving the benefits and must prove that the miner died as a result of black lung disease despite the fact that the miner was already deemed eligible to receive benefits prior to death. This is illogical, unfair and outright insane.

The legislation I am introducing today simply removes the requirement that a surviving

spouse must refile a claim in order to continue receiving benefits. It provides for equitable treatment and recognizes that since the Black Lung Trust Fund is very solvent, there is no need to penalize beneficiaries any further.

SEATS BELTS ON SCHOOL BUSES

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce legislation to require seat belts on school buses. My bill would prohibit the manufacture, sale, delivery, or importation of school buses that do not have seat belts, and impose civil penalties for those that do not comply.

The children of this country deserve safe transportation to and from school, and their parents deserve peace of mind. My fellow colleagues, we have the responsibility to do all we can to give it to them.

Since 1985, nearly 1,500 people have died in school bus-related crashes. School bus occupants accounted for 11 percent of these deaths.

Every year, approximately 394,000 public school buses travel about 4.3 billion miles to transport 23.5 million children to and from school-related activities. These numbers argue for the highest level of safety we can provide. I believe my bill is a step in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to also support this important legislation, which has been endorsed by the American Medical Association and the American College of Emergency Physicians.

New Jersey and New York are the only two states that have school bus seat belt laws, but only New Jersey makes their use mandatory and enforces the law statewide. A New Jersey study concluded that despite the relative safety of school buses, they could be made safer. I agree, and so did the AMA when it wrote me, "We believe that, if enacted, your bill would provide millions of American school children with the same basic safeguard which has long been mandatory in all automobiles."

We must work together, at the local, State, and Federal level to prevent school bus injuries.

THREE NORTH CAROLINIANS HONOR FORGOTTEN AMERICAN HERO

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, so often the brave men and women who fought on the front lines of American wars are forgotten by our government and ignored in our society. People who risked everything to preserve our freedom now make up a significant portion of the homeless population, languish in hospital suffering from multiple disorders, and are laid to rest without the honors they have rightly earned. I rise today to honor three strong North Carolinians who fought to ensure that such a veteran received a proper burial.

Robert Joseph Burke, known around his community as Sarge, was a highly decorated,

but down on his luck, veteran of the Korean War who passed away on November 5, 1998 in an apartment fire. His body laid unclaimed for weeks, the victim of government bureaucracy, until Dennis Rogers, a journalist for Raleigh's *The News & Observer*, learned of his plight from Mr. Burke's friends at the Scramble Dog Inn, his local hangout. Debbie Jernigan, the owner, had helped him over the years with food and medical care and was there with him the night he died from his burns. Mr. Rogers contacted a member of my staff, Miyoshi Jones for help. Ms. Jones worked untiringly fighting the bureaucratic red tape that held his remains hostage, and her efforts resulted in Mr. Burke's burial at the Sandhills Veterans Cemetery at Fort Bragg.

I would like to enter into the record two articles written by Mr. Rogers that beautifully articulate the story of the valiant efforts of these brave North Carolinians to honor the memory of one of America's heroes.

[*News & Observer*, December 23, 1998]

DENNIS ROGERS: LIFE'S LESSONS, PART ONE

Every day at 2 p.m., Robert Joseph Burke would come through the doors of the Scramble Dog Inn on Western Boulevard. The bartender didn't have to ask: a hot beer and a bottle of Texas Pete on the side.

He'd leave about dark, easing his way to his nearby apartment. There he'd try again to chase the memories away with cheap wine.

The cops say he was drunk Nov. 5 when he fell asleep in his apartment with a cigarette in his hand. They took him to the burn center in Chapel Hill, but he died the next day.

He was 68.

He was also a pain in the neck, a hopeless flirt and a proud man who once was a hero. Oh my, the stories he could weave of those days when he was a kid from Brooklyn, back when he was a soldier and young and sober.

He liked to be called Sarge.

"You'd sit there all day and listen to his stories," said Debbie Jernigan, his friend and the owner of the Scramble Dog. "There was so much kindness in him. And so much bull."

But barroom war stories don't earn you the Silver Star for heroism. Or the Bronze Star, either. His military records say he once wore them both, along with the two Purple Hearts he earned for being twice wounded in combat in Korea. And there was his Combat Infantryman Badge and his Ranger insignia, solid proof that once this tale-telling old man was as tough as a cob, and brave, too.

That could be the end of this story, I guess.

But a remarkable thing happened when Sarge died. He may have lived his later years as a forgotten man from a forgotten war, a barely taking up space, talking to anyone who'd listen and killing himself one beer and one cigarette at a time in a roadside tavern. But because of two strong women, he did not go quietly into that long, long night. Not Sarge.

The first is Debbie Jernigan, the den mother of the Scramble Dog crew. She is the best friend a down-and-outer ever had. She had turned the old bar that opened in 1956 into a working-class refuge, a place to see a friendly face smile when the real world turned mean and cold.

She is quick to give others the credit, but they know what she's done for them, how she nagged and mothered and fed them and paid for a cab to take them home on those nights when the beer and good times got too good. That's why they felt such a loss when the Dog burned to the ground earlier this year.

"We took care of each other there," Debbie said. "We took up collections or held cookouts or poker runs. We tried to help people

stand on their feet and get back a little of their pride.

"Sarge was living in an old pickup truck behind the bar when we first got to know him. When the people in the bar found out he was homeless, they chipped in and bought him a tent."

Sarge proudly moved his new tent to the woods behind the Scramble Dog where, of course, he set it on fire with his hard drinking and endless smoking.

"You know what he did then?" Debbie asks. "His false teeth had been burned in the fire and he brought them to me and asked me to clean them. Can you believe that?"

Well, yes, because it wasn't the last time Sarge would test Debbie's patience.

Look for the rest of the story in this space Friday.

[News & Observer, December 25, 1998]

DENNIS ROGERS: FINALLY, A FAREWELL FOR SARGE

Robert Joseph Burke died in an apartment fire Nov. 5, just another old man who went to sleep with a cigarette in his hand.

Sarge, as he liked to be called, spent his days drinking at the Scramble Dog Inn on Western Boulevard and telling war stories that few people took seriously.

But the stories were true and he had the medals to back them up: the Silver Star, the Bronze Star and two Purple Hearts that proved he was everything he said, a combat-tested Ranger who fought bravely in Korea.

"He was a sweet old man," said Debbie Jernigan, the bar owner who had befriended him. "There was so much kindness in him. And so much bull."

"I had to ban him from the bar several times. He just would not leave the women who came in there alone. I wouldn't put up with mess. But when I'd throw him out, he'd go stand across the street and look at the front door like a sad puppy. I was hard on him sometimes, but he needed that."

Debbie let Sarge eat free when the bar had a charity cookout. She got him medical care. Once she learned that his war stories were true, she fought with the Veterans Administration to get him help. And when he died, she held his hand to help him through the last dark night of his life.

Sarge was dead. But other than Debbie and those who were his family at the bar, nobody seemed to care. His body was taken to the medical examiner's office in Chapel Hill, where it lay unclaimed for several weeks. Desperate, his friend Jerry Rengler called me for help.

I tried, but the bureaucracy would not be moved. That's just terrible, one suit after another said, and then came up with reasons why it was always someone else's responsibility.

Then came Myoshi Jones, who works for Rep. Bob Etheridge of the 2nd district. When I couldn't find anyone in government willing to do the right thing, I did what thousands do every day: I called my congressman. Myoshi, who works in Etheridge's Durham office, was assigned the case.

Standing maybe 5 feet tall and weighing about 100 pounds, she took on the entire government and it was not a fair fight. As a government official said of her later. "Who is that woman? She's chewing on people from one end of town to the other."

"They made me mad," Myoshi said. "They weren't treating that man right. I'm from a military family, and I'm sensitive to veteran issues."

The battle took a month, but on Monday, six weeks after he died, Robert Joseph Burke, American soldier and bona fide hero, was laid to rest in the Sandhills Veterans Cemetery at Fort Bragg. He was interred with the quiet dignity and honor he was due.

Rep. Etheridge, in the classiest move I've seen a congressman make lately, was there to pay his respects. When the brief service was over, Rengler accepted the flag that had covered his remains. He presented it to Myoshi Jones for her untiring efforts.

To all who helped, like Lois Raver, veterans service officer for Orange County, and my neighbor Alex Lee, who took care of the funeral arrangements, my gratitude. Thanks to you, an old soldier, almost forgotten by the nation he served so valiantly, is finally at rest with his comrades.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PROTECT AMERICAN JOBS THROUGH THE FOREIGN TRADE ANTITRUST IMPROVEMENTS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1999

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague, Commerce Committee Ranking member JOHN DINGELL, in introducing today the "Protect American Jobs Through the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Amendments Act of 1999." This bill clarifies one of our most important U.S. antitrust laws in order to enshrine the principle that U.S. law reaches anti-competitive foreign cartels, acts, and conspiracies designed to unfairly exclude American products from overseas markets. The principle aim of my bill is to codify the U.S. Department of Justice's current and correct interpretation of the Foreign Trade Anti-trust Improvements Act ("FTAIA") which is embodied in footnote 62 of the International Antitrust Guidelines. The footnote makes it clear that there are no unnecessary jurisdictional or legal roadblocks to challenging anti-competitive acts and conspiracies that take place outside our borders.

We live in an era of economic globalization. Today, America's prosperity depends, not just on vigorous competition within our territorial borders, but on free and fair access to markets in Japan, Europe, Africa, Latin America, China, Russia, and a host of other countries. Anti-competitive practices that block foreign markets to U.S. exporters are just as much a threat to the U.S. economy, as the purely domestic cartels and combinations that the Sherman Act sought to address at the turn of the century.

The opening of global markets has advanced America's current economic prosperity, but it also poses fundamental challenges for U.S. antitrust laws. One example is the U.S. flat glass industry. For the better part of a decade, America's leading flat glass producers have been seeking access to the Japanese market, the biggest and richest in Asia. This isn't a situation where America doesn't have a good product, American companies are leaders in producing and selling high-quality innovative glass products around the world; and in fact, have succeeded in Europe, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, but not Japan. The fact is that securing distribution effective channels for American glass products has not proved to be a significant barrier to entry in any country but Japan.

My bill aims to address this situation by making an important clarification in the U.S.

antitrust laws that govern jurisdiction over foreign firms. It does not change U.S. antitrust law. Instead, it is designed to codify and clarify U.S. antitrust doctrine. Although most observers would agree that the FTAIA established conclusively that DOJ and U.S. firms have jurisdiction to bring an antitrust case against foreign firms engaged in anti-competitive conduct that harms U.S. exporters, enforcement officials misinterpreted the law and said so in a footnote to the International Antitrust Guidelines. That footnote—footnote 159—created a higher burden for U.S. exporters than Congress intended by requiring that they show harm to U.S. consumers in order to get their day in court. The bill would ensure that the will of Congress and the plain meaning of the FTAIA could never again be misconstrued by the federal antitrust agencies, a foreign litigant or a U.S. court. In doing so, it would assist in breaking down anti-competitive foreign barriers to U.S. exports.

While the correction to Footnote 159 was drafted by Assistant Attorney General Jim Rill in the Bush Administration, it has been fully endorsed by the Clinton Administration. I commend Assistant Attorney Generals Rill, Bingman, and Klein for their strong leadership in strengthening international antitrust enforcement and for bringing cases under the authority of the FTAIA.

By clarifying the jurisdictional requirements of the FTAIA, I hope to encourage the Department of Justice and injured industries to make any necessary use of this important power by challenging cartels, such as those blocking distribution of the U.S. courts, before U.S. juries, under U.S. law.

My bill makes a simple and straightforward point. Anti-competitive foreign cartels and conspiracies are subject to the long arm of U.S. antitrust law. Foreign producers can run...but they can't hide. The global economy may be a reality, but U.S. law applies fully to anti-competitive international cartels, combinations and conspiracies.

This bill already has the support of industry leaders, including Kodak, PP&G Industries, and Guardian International Corporation, and the National Association of Manufacturers. I look forward to working with other interested parties to bring U.S. law into a new era of international economic globalization, and to ensure that American firms and workers have a timely and effective remedy against those who engage in anti-competitive acts designed to exclude American products or services from the international marketplace.

CELEBRATING THE PRINCIPLES OF KWANZAA—A TRIBUTE TO DR. E. ALMA FLAGG

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to inform my colleagues of a special event and a special person. In the African American community Kwanzaa, a festive, non-religious celebration, is held reflecting upon our rich heritage. It begins on December 26 and lasts for seven days. Each day focuses on one of seven principles; unity, self-determination, collective work and responsibility,

cooperative economics, purpose, creativity and faith.

The Beta Alpha Omega Chapter (Newark, NJ) of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority in cooperation with the New Jersey Performing Arts Center sponsored the Second Annual Kwanzaa Festival honoring community elders. The person chosen to be honored on the first day of the 1998 Festival, December 17, was Dr. E. Alma Flagg. Dr. Flagg is truly deserving of this honor. She has spent most of her years in New Jersey working for the betterment of many. On May 2, 1995, I had the privilege and pleasure of bringing Dr. Flagg and her work to the attention of my fellow American citizens through remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is not often that we are able to pay such important homage to the same individual within a short period of time. Dr. Flagg is one of the very few for whom a school has been named while still active.

Last year, Kwanzaa was recognized by the United States Postal Service with the printing of a postage stamp. Established in 1966, this celebration of family, community and culture is taking an important place in our diverse culture. I would like to thank Dr. Mabel B. Perry and Mrs. Greta D. Shepherd, Tribute Coordinators, for affording me this opportunity and bringing attention to this important commemoration.

As I stated on Tuesday, May 2, 1995, "Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues would have joined me as I gave my best wishes to an outstanding human being and consummate role model, Dr. E. Alma Flagg".

THE WORLD WAR II GENERATION

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to share with my colleagues a commencement speech delivered at the University of Georgia, entitled "Reflections from the World War II Generation," by former Attorney General and retired Federal appellate judge Griffin B. Bell, on December 19, 1998. I hope each Member of the House of Representatives will take a moment and read this inspiring document.

REFLECTIONS FROM THE WORLD WAR II GENERATION

I am from the World War II generation. My youth was in the Great Depression, which tempered all who lived it.

The discipline of military service, indeed, the service itself in World War II, had a marked effect on some 14 million Americans who served. Following our service, our country educated many of us under the GI Bill of Rights. Ours was the first generation of Americans to include substantial numbers of people who had graduated from college.

The electronic revolution had its genesis in World War II and has continued to develop at a rapid rate until this day. Much of it was developed in the vast defense and space enterprises, which followed World War II and in the Cold War with the Soviet Union.

Some of our generation had to participate in the Korean War along with many other Americans who had not been in World War II.

We sent our sons to Vietnam if our sons wanted to serve. Vietnam was the first of our

peculiar wars where almost anyone could dodge service and, if all else failed, could run away to Canada. This meant that the Armed Forces during the Vietnam War were made up of poor people who did not know how to escape and those Americans who were patriotic enough to go even though they could have escaped.

The Vietnam War was the beginning of the sharp divisions in our country between those who served and those who did not or who did not support the war effort. It was during this era that we began to question values that had served us well for generations. Patriotism, to some, meant protest. The idea sprung up that there was no such thing as absolute truth; that truth was a relative term and therefore depended on the circumstances. We learned that there was such a thing as situational ethics; that ethics depended on the particular setting.

Our own children, known by some as the Yuppie Generation, were badly split over Vietnam and social mores. Many turned to drugs and the hippie life.

Our World War II generation had a large role in the civil rights revolution of the 60's. Many of the Yuppie Generation participated as well, thus a joint effort which reached across the two generations. The revolution was momentous in the history of our country. It stands as one of the nation's highest achievements—a revolution engaged in under law and contained within the law.

The Yuppie Generation has never had to face hard problems of war or depression. Its problems are smaller but still important. Our education system is in disrepair despite prosperous times, ill serving substantial numbers of people who are in the public schools. We experimented with leaving the neighborhood school concept and let the federal government into local education. We seem to have either lost the ability to manage the schools and the system or have lost the will to correct the problem. The school problem is exacerbated by poverty.

We are turning into a sound bite people. We catch the television news or hear the kibitzing on the radio. We are not readers. We are losing the ability to write well.

Politicians have learned to use the television and radio as a means of spinning the news to suit their purposes. A gullible populace seems to be taken in by the spinners. This is much like the medicine shows which passed through the small towns during my youth. As Oliver Goldsmith said in his poem, *The Deserted Village*, referring to the village schoolmaster when he spoke on the village square: "Amazed the gazing rustics ranged around; And still they gazed and still the wonder grew, How one small head could hold all he knew."

We must ask: Have we lost our capacity to govern in a representative government? Have the pollsters and polls taken over? Is there a need for us to have representatives or are representatives mere rubber stamps to obey the will of the polls? Pure democracy was a form of government rejected by the Founding Fathers. We must remember Jefferson's words that our representatives owe us their best judgment, not their votes. Their judgment is important.

During this period has come an era of bad manners—incivility and rancor in our private and political life, extremism in entertainment and sensationalism in the arts and in the media. How can we improve our discourse? What has happened to old fashioned courtesy? Nowhere is conduct worse than among the too-clever-by-half lawyers where the smart aleck and ill-mannered so-called advocate is destroying the nobility and high calling of the law, and perhaps the last vestige of good manners as taught us under the English Common Law practice. Sir Matthew

Hale, a British judge who died in 1676, in writing on ethics, gave us a rule that would serve us well today. This was his rule: In all my actions, I will seek to know and follow my better instincts, never my worst; the nobler course, never the baser; [I will seek to know and follow] the high purpose, never the meaner.

I suggest this as a good rule for all people of good will and good manners. We should expect no less from our leaders, whether public or private; that they take the high road.

Our country is passing now into your hands. We call you Generation X, and we wonder what your values will be and what your aspirations will be for our country and for your fellow citizens.

Based on my observations of my own grandchildren, I believe that Generation X will be one of our greatest. Your values will increasingly be in the public interest. You will accept the challenge of doing something about the poor public schools and about the fifteen percent of our population who live below the poverty level. You are our hope—our highest hope. How will you deal with our greatest failure: the scourge of drugs? Poor education and poverty will weaken our country, but drugs can destroy it. The prisons are filled, largely because of drugs. Using drugs is unpatriotic, but our leaders do not put the problem in those terms.

You have received a good education and are in a better position to serve others than many Americans. I hope that you will adopt the standard of noblesse oblige—"To those to whom much is given, of them is much expected."

Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell may have been the greatest Southerner of this era—and certainly among the greatest Americans. On the occasion of his death, the *Richmond, Virginia Times-Dispatch*, in an editorial of his life, quoted him as having written, "As to values, I was taught—and still believe—that a sense of honor is necessary to personal self-respect; that duty, recognizing an individual's subordination to community welfare, is as important as rights; that loyalty, which is based on the trust-worthiness of honorable men, is still a virtue; and that work and self-discipline are as essential to individual happiness as they are to a viable society. Indeed, I still believe in patriotism—not if it is limited to parades and flag-waving, but because worthy national goals and aspirations can be realized only through love of country and a desire to be a responsible citizen."

There is a chapter in Sandberg's *Life of President Lincoln* entitled "A Tree Is Best Measured When It Is Down." This chapter includes many of the tributes paid to President Lincoln after his assassination. One of the tributes was by the great Russian writer, Tolstoy, who, when asked by Russian tribesmen to tell them about President Lincoln, responded, "Lincoln was a great man. He was greater than Alexander the Great and greater than George Washington. The reason he was great was his values. Everything that he did was rooted in four great values: humanity and justice, truth and pity."

Truth is important. It is the bedrock of our legal system, and the legal system is the bedrock of our country.

I speak of a legal system as being different from justice. Justice is that which is rendered in the legal system. It is the redeeming virtue of our country; that no person is above the law and no person is below the law; we are all equal before the law. You must take care to see that no fellow citizen is ever denied justice. You must also take care to see that there are no preferred citizens in the sense that the rich and well-to-do can have a different kind of justice. I direct your attention to the latterday style of trial

where the witnesses or prosecutors or judges are attacked by packs of lawyers using the media as a way to avoid guilt, although the guilt is never denied. This will not do in a great country. It will not do among free people.

Humanity and pity are the two other values mentioned by Tolstoy. A strong feeling of humanity would make us evermore attentive to problems of poverty and education, and to seeing that every American is treated fairly and has a fair chance. Pity is more for the individual basis, but is a mark of decency—a standard to which we can all repair.

I hope that as you leave this great institution, you will take with you, as a part of your education, love of country and love of your fellow citizen. Even with its blemishes, ours is a great country; the greatest. I have always said that I am proud to be a Southerner, but am proudest of all to be an American.

And now ends your last lecture.

A TRIBUTE TO MINNETONKA POLICE CHIEF RICHARD W. SETTER UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JIM RAMSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Minnesotan who represents the absolute best in public service for his sterling leadership and remarkable professional career in law enforcement.

You see, Mr. Speaker, my hometown's Director of Public Safety and Chief of Police in Minnetonka, MN, Richard W. Setter, has had a profound impact on my career.

After 14 years in his current position, and following four distinguished decades in law enforcement, Richard Setter is retiring. He leaves an immense legacy.

Tough. Fair. Integrity. A real leader. Those are just a few of the descriptions that come to mind when you think about Dick Setter's impressive career.

He has superbly led the Minnetonka Police Department since April 30, 1984. In 1994, when he became Director of Public Safety as well as Chief of Police, he smoothly and effectively merged the police, fire and emergency management departments. With 149 full and part-time personnel serving our city of 53,000 people, Chief Setter has helped make the Minnetonka Department of Public Safety well known throughout Minnesota as a shining lighthouse of an example for other communities.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to implementing community-oriented policing, organizing neighborhood crime watch groups, forging cooperative anti-drug task forces and creating anti-crime programs at multiple housing and shopping center sites, Chief Setter's Minnetonka Public Safety Department has shown the way. And when it comes to steering youth away from at-risk behavior, Dick Setter has been a real trend-setter. He knows how important it is to prevent crime by fighting its root sources and by putting resources into the front end, which saves our communities and the nation expensive resources in the long run.

It has been a long and remarkable run for Chief Setter, who has been honored repeat-

edly for this pioneering, visionary police work. The Boy Scouts of America named him recipient of the Silver Beaver and Youth Services Awards. Rotary selected him as a prestigious Paul Harris Fellow. The NAACP has praised Dick's public service. And our area's largest radio station, WCCO, has chosen him for its well-recognized "Good Neighbor" award.

This record of excellence pervades all that Dick Setter touches. Starting with his first position as a patrol officer in rural Owatonna, MN, and continuing wherever he has gone—including 23 years as a patrol officer, investigator, supervisor and chief of police in nearby St. Louis Park—Dick has been successful in making our streets, schools, and neighborhoods safer.

Dick Setter's superior performance has resulted in his repeatedly being asked to lead important law enforcement and crime-fighting efforts. Most recently, Chief Setter served as President of the 1,500-member FBI Law Enforcement Executive Development Association. He has been a member of that group for 17 years and in a leadership position for 12 years, including as a counselor at the FBI Academy in Quantico. He has also served as Chair and Vice Chair of the Minnesota Peace Officers Standards and Training Board, President and Vice President of the Hennepin County Chiefs of Police, a member of the board of the Minnesota Chiefs of Police Association, and in many other leadership positions.

Mr. Speaker, by any measure of merit, Chief Setter is one of America's best and brightest law enforcement professionals, and he will be sorely missed by the people of Minnetonka.

I truly value all the wise counsel Chief Setter has provided me through the years on so many matters. It is not possible to find words adequate enough to properly convey my appreciation for all Dick Setter has done for me and for the people of our community and State.

Mr. Speaker, Dick Setter's influence on my career has been substantial. As a direct result of my interaction with him, I have made the fight against crime and drugs—a battle which has ravaged our cities, infiltrated our schools and dramatically affected our neighborhoods and families—my top priority over the past 18 years as a State senator in Minnesota and here in Washington.

Because of Dick Setter and other good friends in law enforcement, I have successfully sought leadership positions in government to make a real difference on crime and drug policy, such as my present position as Co-Chair of the House Law Enforcement Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I want to wish Dick Setter the very best in all his future endeavors, including his professorship at the Minnesota State University in Mankato—where he has been inspiring future law enforcement officers for two decades. I can't imagine a better role model.

Thanks again, Dick, for all you have done for the people of Minnetonka and for our State and Nation. God bless you and your wonderful wife Patty. You have made our community immeasurably stronger and safer, and we're deeply grateful!

INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICARE HMO IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Medicare HMO Improvement Act of 1999.

By the end of 1998, over 8,000 senior citizens in my district—and over 13,000 throughout Connecticut—received perhaps the most frightening news any American can get. Their Medicare HMO's informed them that they are terminating their health insurance by the end of the year. Some of these seniors were recruited only months before through aggressive company marketing campaigns.

Insurers came to the Federal Government in the early 1980's and said "We're private industry, we can run Medicare better than you can while giving more services to seniors. Give us a chance." Well, we gave them a chance and they let our seniors down. The companies thought they could just jump in and jump out of my district, and others around the country, without regard to the health and well-being of the seniors that they had signed up just months ago. Across our Nation, Medicare HMO's have terminated health insurance for nearly 440,000 seniors. That is not acceptable. That is not a responsible way to operate a business whose primary purpose is to ensure people's health.

The termination announcements sent shock waves through Tolland, Windham and New London counties. At a public meeting I hosted with Senator CHRIS DODD in September 1998 following the announcement that 7,000 seniors would lose their coverage by year's end, 400 seniors gathered to hear about their options for the future. The tension, anxiety and desperation of my constituents pervaded the room. One of my constituents, whose wife had recently had a stroke, was so upset about losing health insurance that after asking a question, he had a heart attack. That man, Frederick Kral, died on the way to the hospital.

Under the current system, Medicare HMO's can act with impunity. There no accountability, no responsibility. Profits are all that matter. Patients and quality health care are secondary. This is just wrong.

My legislation—the Medicare HMO Improvement Act of 1999—will inject some accountability into the Medicare HMO system. It will change the contract term from 1 year to 3 years. This change is designed to discourage HMO's from making short-term promises to seniors only to terminate coverage a year later when they don't make quite as much money as they hoped. It gives the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) authority to enjoin contract terminations for up to one year if public health will be seriously threatened, insurance coverage will be compromised, or the Governor of the state affected requests that the Secretary exercise this authority.

Moreover, my legislation is designed to discourage HMO's from "cherry picking" between regions within a State by offering coverage only in those areas with the highest reimbursement rates. It accomplishes this goal by requiring the Secretary of HHS to terminate all contracts a Medicare HMO has for a metropolitan statistical area (MSA) if that HMO terminates coverage in any portion of the MSA in

that state. I selected the MSA as the geographical unit because it is already used in the law and should discourage "cherry picking" without reducing coverage on a state-wide basis. Finally, if a company terminates coverage and a beneficiary is currently receiving treatment, this bill requires the HMO to provide 90 days of coverage to allow the patient to continue to receive such treatment. This will ensure that patients under active treatment will have a few additional months to make the transition to another doctor or health plan.

Mr. Speaker, what Medicare HMO's did in my district—and what they are doing across the country—is unreasonable and irresponsible. The Medicare HMO Improvement Act is a reasonable approach which will provide badly needed protection to older Americans. I invite my colleagues to join me as co-sponsors.

IN MEMORY OF HAL WALSH

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commemorate the many contributions Hal Walsh made to the Key West community. Hal was the executive director of Truman's Little White House Museum and a columnist for the Key West Citizen newspaper.

Hal came to Key West from New York City in 1993 after a career as a stock broker. His lifelong interest in American history drew him to the Truman Little White House Museum. In addition to his dedicated service as museum director, Hal was also an active member of the Lambda Democrats and was a founder of the Key West Gay and Lesbian Center. He never hesitated to keep me apprised of how politicians on every level of government were doing—right or wrong—regarding issues of concern to the gay community. He was an articulate and passionate advocate who was never afraid to speak his mind.

Hal's other affiliations include being first vice president of Old Island Restoration Foundation and a member of the Lower Keys Friends of Animals. His devotion to his cocker spaniels, Savannah and Sachem, rang clear in his weekly newspaper column which often included their antics.

A Key West Citizen editor Bernie Hun wrote, "Hal Walsh was a big man in every sense . . . in generosity and spirit." He will be truly missed by those whose lives he touched.

MUNICIPAL BIOLOGICAL
MONITORING USE ACT OF 1999

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, in this new Congress, I am again introducing the Municipal Biological Monitoring Use Act ("MBMUA" or "Biomonitoring Bill"). This bill amends the federal Clean Water Act ("CWA" or "Act"). I would respectfully request its consideration this year as separate legislation or in connection with other bills to amend the CWA.

The purpose of this legislation is to ensure that our nation's wastewater, stormwater and combined sewer facilities owned by local governments are not unfairly exposed to fines and penalties under the federal Clean Water Act when biomonitoring or whole effluent toxicity tests conducted at those facilities indicate an apparent test failure.

Similar legislation applicable to sewage treatment facilities was introduced in previous Congresses. In recent years, various offices of EPA have sought to apply WET test limitations to municipal separate storm sewer systems, combined sewer overflows, and other wet weather facilities. Therefore, as in the last Congress, this bill would also apply to wet weather facilities owned by local or state governments.

Enforcement of biomonitoring test failures is a concern of local governments nationwide. Where whole effluent toxicity is a NPDES permit limit, the limit is defined as a test method as provided in EPA regulations at 40 C.F.R. part 136. Any permit with whole effluent toxicity tests expressed as a discharge limit is subject to enforcement by EPA or a state delegated to implement the NPDES permit program, or under the Act's citizen suit provisions. Fines and penalties for such tests failures are up to \$27,000 per day of violation. These tests are known, however, for their high variability and unreliability. Furthermore, because the source of WET at any given facility is usually not known until the tests are conducted, local governments are unable to take appropriate action to guarantee against test failure, and hence permit violation, before such violation occurs.

The bill we reintroduce today would retain the use of biomonitoring tests as a management or screening tool for toxicity. Our bill would, however, shift fine and penalty liability from liability for test failures to liability for failure to implement required procedures for identifying and reducing the source of WET when detected. In so doing, this legislation would in the long-run strengthen environmental protection by removing the enforcement disincentive for its use.

BACKGROUND

EPA or delegated states regulate wastewater discharges from sewage treatment, separate storm sewers and combined sewer systems through the NPDES permit program. NPDES permits include narrative or numeric limitations on the discharge of specifically named chemicals. Treatment facilities can be and are designed and built in order to assure compliance with such chemical specific limitations before a violation occurs. Compliance is determined by conducting specific tests for these specifically known chemicals.

NPDES permits may also include limits to control the unspecified, unexpected, and unknown toxicity of the sewage plant effluent which is referred to as whole effluent toxicity or WET. The authority for biomonitoring tests was added to the Clean Water Act by the 1987 amendments. Since then, EPA has issued regulations describing biomonitoring or WET test methods under Part 136, permit requirements under Part 136, and enforcement policies for the use of WET tests as a monitoring requirement or as a permit effluent limitation at POTWs. Compliance with WET as limits is determined by the results of biomonitoring or WET tests.

Biomonitoring or WET tests are conducted on treatment plan effluent in laboratories using

small aquatic species similar to shrimp or minnows. The death of these species or their failure to grow or reproduce as expected in the laboratory is considered by EPA to be a test failure and therefore a permit violation.

Where such tests are included in permits as effluent limits, these test failures are subject to administrative and civil penalties under the CWA of up to \$27,000 per day of violation. Test failures also expose local governments to enforcement by third parties under the citizen suit provision of the Act.

WET test failures can also trigger toxicity identification and reduction evaluations that include additional testing, thus exposing local governments to additional penalties if these additional tests are expressed as permit limits and also fail. The use of biomonitoring test failures as the basis for fines and policies is the issue which this bill addresses.

WET TEST ACCURACY CANNOT BE DETERMINED

EPA recognizes that the accuracy of biomonitoring tests cannot be determined. An October 18, 1995 FEDERAL REGISTER preamble document issued by the Agency in promulgating test methods determined that: "Accuracy of toxicity test results cannot be ascertained, only the precision of toxicity can be estimated." (EPA, Guidelines for Establishing Test Procedures for the Analysis of Pollutants, 40 C.F.R. Part 136, 60 FR 53535, October 16, 1995.)

While the Agency cannot determine the accuracy of such tests, EPA still requires local governments to certify that WET test results are "true, accurate, and complete" in Discharge Monitoring Reports ("DMRs") required by NPDES permits. This is a true Catch-22 requirement.

Laboratory biomonitoring tests are known to be highly variable in performance and results. Aquatic species used as test controls may die or fail to reproduce normally during test performance through no fault of the POTW or its effluent. False positive tests occur frequently. Yet test failure is the basis for assessing administrative and civil penalties.

EPA also recognizes that WET is episodic and usually results from unknown sources. These unknown sources can include synergistic effects of chemicals, household products such as cleaning fluids or pesticides, and illegal discharges to sewer systems. Even a well-managed municipal pretreatment program for industrial users cannot assure against WET test failures.

The inaccuracy and high variability of WET tests is the basis of a judicial challenge to EPA Part 136 WET test methods brought by the Western Coalition of Arid States ("WESTCAS") in 1996. This litigation was settled by the Agency in 1998 but is still under court jurisdiction and supervision. Under the settlement, EPA agree to conduct additional tests as to the validity of WET testing and the test methods in Part 136. The responsibility for this new effort to justify the technical basis of WET testing is split between the EPA Office of Research and Development and the EPA Office of Water.

Scientific method blank or blind testing for WET tests was conducted by WESTCAS in 1997 preceding the settlement with EPA. These blind tests were conducted by a series of qualified laboratories throughout the United States. The purpose of these blind tests was to quantify the natural level of biological variability in test organisms and the variability inherent in the test procedures themselves.

Without the knowledge of the participating laboratories, all of the samples tested contained no reference toxicants of any kind, i.e. The samples were pure dilution water.

The results of these tests is highly revealing. Thirty-five per cent of the tests failed. Failure in this case means that toxicity was reported in non-toxic water samples. The 35% false positives among these tests demonstrated the high inaccuracy of the test methods used and the inappropriateness of their use as an enforcement weapon. Had any of these false positives occurred in actual samples from municipal facilities, they would have been subject to fines and penalties of up to \$27,000 for each violation of a permit limit.

Even if WET tests are improved, their use as enforcement tools is fundamentally unfair because the source of WET is usually unknown and cannot be controlled before test failures as permit violations, occur.

MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER FACILITIES

Municipal sewage treatment and combined facilities are designed to control specific chemical pollutants. Stormwater facilities are less able to control even specific chemicals. In any event, these local government facilities are not designed to control WET, especially in view of the fact that POTWs cannot be assured of knowing the specific nature of influent discharged to these facilities. To guarantee against these test failures before they occur, local governments would have to build sewage treatment facilities using reverse osmosis, micro filtration, carbon filtration or ion exchange, at great expense to citizen rate payers and with potentially very little benefit to the environment.

The CWA and EPA regulations (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(iv)) require that toxicity be determined based on actual stream conditions. An EPA administrative law judge decision issued in October, 1996, confirmed this interpretation in ruling:

Although some form of WET monitoring may be legally permissible, there must be a reasonable basis to believe the Permittee's discharge could be or become acutely toxic. In addition, the proposed tests must be reasonably related to determining whether the discharge could lead to real world toxic effects. The CWA objective to prohibit the discharge of "toxic pollutants in toxic amounts" concerns toxicity in the receiving waters of the United States, not the laboratory tank.

In the Matter of Metropolitan-Dade County, Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Authority, NPDES Permit No. FL00224805.

In actual practice, however, NPDES permits often restrict species for WET tests to a limited number of standard species which may not be representative of the stream-specific conditions to which local facilities discharge. This situation can also result in false test results. The failure to allow for the use of indigenous test species is a particular concern to POTWs discharging to ephemeral streams located in Western states where nationally uniform species could not survive.

POTWs cannot be assured of knowing what substances are discharged to their facilities, as can industrial dischargers. They are community systems with thousands or even millions of connections, absolute control over which is not feasible. The inability of sewage treatment facilities to know the cause of WET failures so that the appropriate controls can be

installed before test failures occur is fundamentally unfair because the local governments owning these plants do not have notice of what they must do to conform their behavior to the requirements of law. Constitutional fair notice in such situations is critical, and critical to fundamental fairness under the American legal system, whether at the federal or state level.

There is less basis for making WET test failures subject to fines and penalties for storm water-related discharges because local governments are able to exercise even less control over such storm sewer systems and over combined sanitary and storm sewage systems.

EPA may say that WET test failures often are not enforced under the Agency's exercise of administrative discretion. However, the opportunity for such enforcement remains, especially as more permittees are faced for the first time with enforceable WET permit limits and where an enforcement action is based on one or more alleged permit violations.

The Agency should not rely on a lack of enforcement or enforcement discretion to justify this fundamentally unfair enforcement method. Any legal requirement that is not based on fair notice lacks credibility and undermines basic due process principles whether enforcement occurs once or many times. Additionally, third party suits are not subject to the exercise of EPA review and discretion.

WET TESTS CAN BE USED AS EARLY-WARNING MANAGEMENT TOOLS

Procedures for locating and reducing the source toxicity can require accelerated testing which would expose local governments to additional penalty liability. Thus, the Agency's insistence on making WET tests subject to penalties has become counter-productive to preventing toxicity.

Nothing in the Clean Water Act requires EPA to make WET testing an enforceable permit limitation. As originally conceived by EPA personnel who developed biomonitoring test protocols, these tests, when made reliable, could be used as a screening or management tool for detecting WET, rather than for enforcement purposes. Since the 1987 amendments, however, through regulations and enforcement policies, EPA has persisted in making WET test failures violations of permit limitations even though these tests are technically unsound and fundamentally unfair for enforcement purposes. It is for these reasons that a legislative solution is necessary.

ALTERNATIVE, LEGISLATIVE SOLUTION NEEDED

One legislative alternative would make WET testing a monitoring-only permit requirement. Another alternative would shift the enforceability of WET permit requirements from WET tests failures to local government failure to implement a tiered compliance process and schedule for locating and reducing the source of toxicity.

The bill we reintroduce today adopts the second alternative and retains the use of WET as an enforceable part of the Clean Water Act by:

Amending Sections 303 and 402 of the CWA to prohibit the finding of a violation under the strict liability provisions of the Act for a failure of a WET test conducted at publicly owned treatment works, municipal separate storm sewer systems, and municipal combined sewer overflows, including control facilities, and other wet weather control facilities;

Requiring that criteria for WET must employ an aquatic species that is indigenous to the type of waters, a species that is representative of such species, or such other appropriate species as will indicate the toxicity of the effluent in the actual specific receiving waters. Such criteria must take into account the natural biological variability of the species, and must ensure that the accompanying test method accurately represents actual instream conditions, including conditions associated with dry and wet weather;

Authorizing NPDES permit terms, conditions or limitations to include enforceable procedures for further analysis, toxicity identification evaluation ("TIE") or toxicity reduction evaluation ("TRE") for WET where an NPDES permit authority determines that the discharge from the applicable facility causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numeric criterion for WET. Our bill would also direct that the NPDES permit must allow the permittee to discontinue such procedures, subject to future reinitiation of such procedures upon a showing by the permitting authority of changed conditions, if the source of such toxicity cannot, after thorough investigation, be identified; and

Requiring the use of such NPDES permit terms, conditions or limitations only upon determination that such terms, conditions or limitations are technically feasible, accurately represent toxicity associated with wet weather conditions, and can materially assist in an identification evaluation or reduction evaluation of such toxicity.

WET testing should be used as a management tool to locate and reduce WET. The assessment of penalties for test failures or the potential for assessment has become a recognized disincentive for the use of WET tests, including accelerated testing to locate and reduce toxicity.

This bill would assure the use of these tests as tools to prevent pollution by respecting their technical limitations, eliminating penalties for test failures, and preserving the enforceability of procedures to locate and reduce whole effluent toxicity when detected.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation and I urge its consideration and enactment in this Congress.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Municipal Biological Monitoring Use Act".

SEC. 2. BIOLOGICAL MONITORING.

(a) BIOLOGICAL MONITORING CRITERIA.—Section 303(c)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the third sentence of subparagraph (B) the following: "Criteria for biological monitoring or whole effluent toxicity shall employ an aquatic species that is indigenous to the type of waters, a species that is representative of such species, or such other appropriate species as will indicate the toxicity of the effluent in the specific receiving waters. Such criteria shall take into account the natural biological variability of the species, and shall ensure that the accompanying test method accurately represents actual in-stream conditions, including conditions associated with dry and wet weather.";

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting the following: ";

except that for publicly owned treatment works, municipal separate storm sewer systems, and municipal combined sewer overflows (including control facilities) and other wet weather control facilities, nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the use of water quality standards or permit effluent limitations which result in the finding of a violation upon failure of whole effluent toxicity tests or biological monitoring tests.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) Where the permitting authority determines that the discharge from a publicly owned treatment works, a municipal separate storm sewer system, or municipal combined sewer overflows (including control facilities) or other wet weather control facilities causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numeric criterion for whole effluent toxicity, the permit may contain terms, conditions, or limitations requiring further analysis, identification evaluation, or reduction evaluation of such effluent toxicity. Such terms, conditions, or limitations meeting the requirements of this section may be utilized in conjunction with a municipal separate storm sewer system, or municipal combined sewer overflows (including control facilities) or other wet weather control facilities only upon a demonstration that such terms, conditions, or limitations are technically feasible accurately represent toxicity associated with wet weather conditions, and can materially assist in an identification evaluation or reduction evaluation of such toxicity.”

(b) INFORMATION ON WATER QUALITY CRITERIA.—Section 304(a)(8) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(a)(8)) is amended by inserting “, consistent with subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 303(c)(2),” after “publish”.

(c) USE OF BIOLOGICAL MONITORING OR WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING.—Section 402 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(q) USE OF BIOLOGICAL MONITORING OR WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Where the Administrator determines that it is necessary in accordance with subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 303(c)(2) to include biological monitoring, whole effluent toxicity testing, or assessment methods as a term, condition, or limitation in a permit issued to a publicly owned treatment works, a municipal separate storm sewer system, or a municipal combined sewer overflow (including a control facility) or other wet weather control facility) permit term, condition, or limitation shall be in accordance with such subparagraphs.

“(2) RESPONDING TO TEST FAILURES.—If a permit issued under this section contains terms, conditions, or limitations requiring biological monitoring or whole effluent toxicity testing designed to meet criteria for biological monitoring or whole effluent toxicity, the permit may establish procedures for further analysis, identification evaluation, or reduction evaluation of such toxicity. The permit shall allow the permittee to discontinue such procedures, subject to future reinitiation of such procedures upon a showing by the permitting authority of changed conditions, if the source of such toxicity cannot, after thorough investigation, be identified.

“(3) TEST FAILURE NOT A VIOLATION.—The failure of a biological monitoring test or a whole effluent toxicity test at a publicly owned treatment works, a municipal separate storm sewer system, or a municipal combined sewer overflow (including a control facility) or other wet weather control facility shall not result in a finding of a violation under this Act.”.

ON IMPEACHMENT

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, my constituents who ask me to vote for impeachment do so on the assumption that the President has been found guilty of perjury.

They ask me to apply the law to the President the same as I would apply for ordinary citizens.

I have analyzed my views in accordance with this direction.

I say with no doubt whatsoever, that the Articles of Impeachment or the record which accompanied it make no specific finding of facts as to exactly what statement was given under oath that forms the basis of the crime of perjury.

There are many suggestions and innuendoes and assumptions, but there is no specific listing of proof upon which the Judiciary Committee relied to make its recommendation to impeach and remove the President from office.

The Judiciary Committee takes the position that they are not required to provide the House with any degree of specificity. They interpret their report on impeachment as merely a referral of various and sundry allegations to the Senate and accordingly forfeited their duty to examine the facts independently and decide exactly what facts support the allegations of perjury. I believe that this view of our Constitutional duty is an abdication of our sworn responsibility.

If this House is prepared to remove the President from office it must do so on the basis of specific findings of criminal behavior. It cannot be on generalized allegations with a hope that the Senate will determine whether crimes have been committed.

I agree with my constituents who ask us to apply the same law to the President as would be applied to ordinary people.

Ordinary citizens would be given the specific basis underlying the charge of perjury.

The President has not been provided this information. He has been presumed guilty of perjury because he will not admit to it. How does this square with the rule of law?

I believe that it is the duty of the courts under which the President was required to provide sworn testimony to review the statements and to make a prompt determination as to which of the charges of perjury is sustainable.

What if the Courts refuse to charge the President of the crime of perjury as some commentators suggest? If he is driven out of office before the Court makes this finding, how will this House remedy this ultimate penalty?

To vote for these Articles of Impeachment is to vote to remove the President from office without any of us knowing what exactly he testified to under oath amounted to perjury. At the minimum this must be elaborated in the Articles of Impeachment so that the Public and the Senate may know what the specific charges are and so that the President may defend himself.

When I vote against these Articles of Impeachment, I will do so because I cannot allow this House to avoid its Constitutional duty to enumerate its allegations of perjury before recommending impeachment.

No President is above the law. He is at least entitled to the same protection that applies to each of us if we should be charged with criminal conduct.

People who are charged with crimes must be informed of the specific charges.

Without that, the call for the rule of law is an empty and hollow gesture.

IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT CLINTON

HON. JOHN F. TIERNEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall be voting against each of the articles of impeachment. I am convinced that impeachment is not in the best interest of the country and its citizens. President Clinton's conduct—inappropriate and wrong as it was—does not reach the threshold necessary to constitute the kind of high crimes and misdemeanors envisioned by the founding fathers and subsequent interpreters of the Constitution.

I have reached this decision after reviewing applicable law and precedence, after considering the views of academics, and after weighing the comments of constituents. A vote for impeachment ought to be a matter of conscience, but it should also not be unmindful of the strong opinion of the governed. Impeachment in this case would essentially undo the results of two popular elections.

As my colleague HOWARD BERMAN has stated, “That the President's conduct is not impeachable does not mean that society condones his conduct. Rather, it means that the popular vote of the people should not be abrogated for this conduct—when the people clearly do not wish for this conduct to cause the abrogation. * * * Conduct that may not be impeachable for the President * * * is not necessarily conduct that is acceptable in the larger society.”

Indeed the President is not blameless for the sorry state of affairs now before us. His actions were, as he admitted, indefensible, and his obfuscation of facts has been “maddening.” It would be entirely appropriate, I believe, for either or both bodies of Congress to strongly rebuke the President for his conduct and his lack of judgment.

It is regrettable that the leadership of the majority party, in the face of overwhelming public sentiment not to impeach—and in defiance of a fair number of its own party who have said that impeachment is not the appropriate course—has seemingly chosen to politicize this most serious matter. There is reason to believe that enormous pressure has been exerted on rank and file members of the majority party to support impeachment. The Republican leadership has compounded the situation by refusing to allow for a vote on the motion to censure the President—something that again its own members have said should be permitted. Leading members of the majority would have us believe they are acting out of conscience. Yet they would deny other members that same right. This sets the stage for bitter and needlessly divisive recriminations in the months ahead as the 106th Congress begins to confront the issues on our national agenda.

This country and its citizens will pay the price for such a course. While the President must bear responsibility for his role in allowing this scenario to develop, we cannot undo the past, and the Republican party must bear responsibility for prolonging a situation that most American rightfully want to be brought to a close.

The accusations against the President are serious. So too are the consequences of subjecting the nation to a Senate tribunal. To those who argue that the President should not be treated differently than others accused of similar misdeeds, let them be reminded that the President would still be subject to prosecution once out of office. It should be noted there is a large body of opinion that the statements in question made under oath by the President are not generally pursued criminally given the context in which they were made. However, the history of Ken Starr's relentless pursuit of William Clinton suggest that the President might stand little chance of receiving an objective analysis on the question of whether or not to prosecute.

The world may ask—how did it come to this? The answer may well rest in a combination of factors—blatant partisanship, unreasonably strong personal animosity toward the President, a righteousness by those who appear to have lost any capacity for forgiveness, and a total disregard for the larger issues at stake.

There are those who may truly believe that the facts do, in fact, require impeachment. However the process by which any such determination might have been made was deeply flawed and strained credulity. House Judiciary Committee Chairman HENRY HYDE said at the outset that successful impeachment would require bipartisanship. By that standard alone, the results are a failure. Unfortunately, the House Judiciary Committee chose to follow the lead of so-called Independent Counsel Ken Starr, and utterly failed to develop any facts of its own that would bear on the allegations. The Committee made a mockery of the responsibilities that come with consideration of impeachment and debased the Constitutional criteria by which impeachment is justified.

From the outset, I opposed the process pursued by the Committee. As members of the Committee noted, the majority proceeded from allegations to a conclusion, ignoring fact-finding or rational inquiry. In short, the process was unfair. By denying the House the opportunity to vote on censure, and by introducing raw partisanship into a vote of conscience, the majority has compounded that unfairness. Attempts to inflict the maximum amount of pain on the President by insisting on impeachment—the ultimate “scarlet letter” as Mr. McCOLLUM put it—risks putting this country through an experience it need not endure. In view of the strong reasons not to impeach, and the strong public sentiments against such action, the partisan march toward impeachment is truly regretful.

HINDU NATIONALISTS DESTROY
CHRISTIAN CHURCHES IN “SECULAR” INDIA

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed by recent reports that several Christian churches, prayer halls, and religious missions have recently been destroyed by Hindu extremists affiliated with the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP), a militant Hindu organization. The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), the party that leads the governing coalition, is also part of the VHP.

The violence forced many Christian congregations to cancel New Year's celebrations for fear of offending the Hindu militants, which could lead to further violence. Is this the secularism that India boasts about? Clearly, there is no religious freedom for these Christians in India.

Unfortunately, these are just the latest incidents of violence against Christians in India. Four nuns were raped last year by a Hindu gang. The VHP described the rapists as “patriotic youth” and called the nuns “antinational elements.” To be Christian in secular India is to be an antinational element! At least three priests were killed in 1997 and 1998, and in 1997 police opened fire on a Christian festival that was promoting the theme “Jesus is the Answer.”

Apparently, the Hindu Nationalists are afraid that the Dalits, or “Untouchables”, the aboriginal people of South Asia who are at the bottom of the caste structure, are switching to other religions, primarily Christianity, thus improving their status. This undermines the caste structure which is the foundation of the Hindu social structure.

The Indian government has killed more than 200,000 Christians since 1947 and the Christians of Nagaland, in the eastern part of India, are involved in one of 17 freedom movements within India's borders. But the Christians are not the only ones oppressed for their religion.

India has murdered more than 250,000 Sikhs since 1984 and over 60,000 Muslims in Kashmir since 1988, as well as many thousands of other people. The holiest shrine in the Sikh religion, the Golden Temple in Amritsar, is still under occupation by plainclothes police, some 14 years after India's brutal military attack on the Golden Temple. The previous Jathedar of the Akal Takht, Gurdev Singh Kaunke, was killed in police custody by being torn in half. The police disposed of his body. He had been tortured before the Indian government decided to kill him.

The Babri mosque, the most sacred Muslim shrine in the state of Uttar Pradesh, was destroyed by the Hindu militants who advocate building a Hindu temple on the site. Yet India proudly boasts that it is a religiously tolerant, secular democracy.

This kind of religious oppression does not deserve American support. We should take tough measures to ensure that India learns to respect basic human rights. All U.S. aid to India should be cut off and we should openly declare U.S. support for self-determination for all the peoples of the subcontinent. By these measures we can help bring religious freedom and basic human rights to Christians, Sikhs, Muslims, and everyone else in South Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce Press reports on the attacks on Christian religious institutions into the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, January 3, 1999]
HINDUS BLAMED FOR ATTACKS ON CHRISTIANS

NEW DELHI.—India's main opposition Congress party said a wave of attacks on Christians appeared to be a campaign by Hindu right-wing groups to whip up conflict.

Police detained 45 Hindus Friday in connection with torching a Catholic prayer hall by mobs Wednesday. Four nuns and two priests were injured in the 10th reported attack against Christians since Christmas.

No one has claimed responsibility for the attacks in the western state of Gujarat, but Congress and Christian activists blame Hindu right-wing activists, including the Vishwa Hindu Parishad—World Hindu Council—and its affiliate, Bajrang Dal. Christians make up 2.3 percent of the 960 million people in politically secular India. More than 80 percent of the population are Hindus.

[From the Washington Post, December 31, 1998]

INDIAN CHRISTIANS CANCEL NEW YEAR SERVICES

MULCHAND, INDIAN.—Christian congregations in western India are canceling New Year prayer services this year, fearful of provoking more violence from radical Hindus who already have destroyed a dozen churches. The violence has put the governing Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) in the awkward position of needing to protect India's Christian minority from groups affiliated with the Hindu nationalist party. Since Friday, mobs armed with axes, iron bars, hammers and stones have attacked 18 churches, prayer halls or Christian schools.

GENETIC INFORMATION NON-DISCRIMINATION IN HEALTH INSURANCE ACT OF 1999

HON. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce today H.R. 306, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance Act of 1999.

Over the past few years, genetic discoveries have proceeded at a pace undreamt of less than a decade ago. Genes have been identified that are linked to common disorders like colon cancer, heart disease, and breast cancer. Doctors and researchers are moving rapidly to develop gene therapies and specialized drugs that attack only cells carrying damaged DNA.

A tiny sample of blood, tissue, or hair can now reveal the most intimate secrets of an individual's present and future health. While this information holds tremendous promise for curing disease and alleviating human suffering, it also carries an equal potential for abuse.

As a result, I am reintroducing the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance Act. This vital legislation would prevent health insurers from denying, canceling, refusing to renew, or changing the terms, premiums, or conditions of coverage on the basis of genetic information. It would prohibit insurance companies from requesting or requiring that a person reveal genetic information. Finally, it would protect the privacy of genetic information by requiring that an insurer obtain

prior, written consent from an individual before revealing his or her genetic information to a third party.

Since it was first introduced in 1995, support for my legislation has grown steadily. At the end of the 105th Congress, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance Act had 210 bipartisan cosponsors in the House and 25 in the Senate. It had also gained the endorsement of over 125 health-related organizations, ranging from advocacy groups like the National Breast Cancer Coalition and the March of Dimes to health professional organizations like the American Medical Association and the American Nurses Association. Religious organizations, health information managers, and consumer protection groups joined the fight.

In May 1998, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee under Chairman JIM JEFFORDS held a groundbreaking hearing on genetic discrimination in health insurance. Unfortunately, efforts to move this legislation to the Senate floor became bogged down in the debate over managed care reform. Nevertheless, genetic nondiscrimination language was included in some versions of managed care reform legislation—an important step toward recognizing the urgent need to ban genetic discrimination in health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I am very hopeful that 1999 will be the year when Congress finally fulfills its duty to ensure that our nation's social policy keeps pace with scientific advances. Today, too many Americans are denying themselves access to information vital to their health—their genetic information—simply because they are afraid their insurers will learn this information and use it against them.

We must put an end to this unconscionable Hobson's choice. Congress should ban genetic discrimination in health insurance. I look forward to working with Members from both parties to protect all of our constituents against this practice. The American people deserve no less.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE 1999 CONGRESS-BUNDESTAG/BUNDESRAT STAFF EXCHANGE

HON. RALPH REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, since 1983, the U.S. Congress and the German legislature have conducted an annual exchange program for staff members from both countries. The program gives professional staff the opportunity to observe and learn about each other's political institutions and convey Members' views on issues of mutual concern.

A staff delegation from the United States Congress will be selected to visit Germany May 22 to June 5 of this year. During the 2-week exchange, the delegation will attend meetings with Bundestag members, Bundestag party staff members, and representatives of numerous political, business, academic, and media agencies. Cultural activities and a weekend visit in a Bundestag Member's district will complete the schedule.

A comparable delegation of German staff members will visit the United States for 3 weeks this summer. They will attend similar

meetings here in Washington and visit the districts of Congressional Members.

The Congress-Bundestag exchange is highly regarded in Germany and is one of several exchange programs sponsored by public and private institutions in the United States and Germany to foster better understanding of the politics and policies of both countries. The ongoing situation in the Persian Gulf, the expansion of NATO, the proposed expansion of the European Union, and the introduction of the Euro will make this year's exchange particularly relevant.

The U.S. delegation should consist of experienced and accomplished Hill staff members who can contribute to the success of the exchange on both sides of the Atlantic. The Bundestag sends senior staff professionals to the United States.

Applicants should have a demonstrable interest in events in Europe. Applicants need not be working in the field of foreign affairs, although such a background can be helpful. The composite U.S. delegation should exhibit a range of expertise in issues of mutual concern in Germany and the United States such as, but not limited to, trade, security, the environment, immigration, economic development, health care, and other social policy issues.

In addition, U.S. participants are expected to help plan and implement the program for the Bundestag staff members when they visit the United States. Participants are expected to assist in planning topical meetings in Washington, and are encouraged to host one or two Bundestag staffers in their Member's district in July, or to arrange for such a visit to another Member's district.

Participants will be selected by a committee composed of U.S. Information Agency personnel and past participants of the exchange.

Senators and Representatives who would like a member of their staff to apply for participation in this year's program should direct them to submit a resume and cover letter in which they state why they believe they are qualified and some assurances of their ability to participate during the time stated. Applications may be sent to Connie Veillette at 2309 Rayburn Building by noon on Friday, March 12.

STATEMENT BY ALBANIAN AMERICAN CIVIC LEAGUE REGARDING SITUATION IN KOSOVO

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the members of Congress to the following statement by the Albanian American Civil League regarding the current situation in Kosovo. It represents the views of a significant number of Albanian Americans, and I believe is of interest in view of the deteriorating situation in Kosovo:

STATEMENT BY THE ALBANIAN AMERICAN CIVIC LEAGUE

INDEPENDENCE FOR KOSOVO IS THE ONLY WAY TO STOP MILOSEVIC'S WAR

Recent events in Kosovo only confirm the Albanian American Civil League's prior assessment that the Milosevic-Holbrooke agreement is a death sentence for the Alba-

nian people of Kosovo. How many mistakes and tragedies must the Albanian people bear before the United States realizes that it is being exploited by Slobodan Milosevic as a convenient tool of Slavic expansionism, at the expense of the Albanian people?

The first major mistake occurred in 1990, when Secretary of State James Baker gave Slobodan Milosevic the green light to consolidate his power by stating that the goal of the United States was to keep Yugoslavia together at all costs. Milosevic responded by waging war first in Slovenia in 1990, then in Croatia in 1991, and finally in Bosnia in 1992. (His brutal military occupation of Kosovo in 1989 continues unabated to this day.) In 1995, Richard Holbrooke authored the Dayton Accords, in which a fault-ridden peace was declared in Bosnia after negotiations that excluded the third largest ethnic group in the former Yugoslavia—the Albanians. Then, in February 1998, U.S. Special Envoy to Kosovo Robert Gelbard mistakenly declared the Kosovo Liberation Army a "terrorist" group, giving Milosevic the signal he needed to openly wage a one-sided war against the Albanian people of Kosovo. This led to massacres of unarmed and defenseless civilians in Drenice and Dukagjin, leaving over 2,000 dead, 1,000 missing, and 300,000 displaced.

In September 1998, in response to the public outcries around the world about the brutality of the Serbian military campaign against a civilian population, the United States promoted the threat of air strikes against Serbia. But, true to form, Holbrooke crafted an agreement that enabled Milosevic to avert the use of force against him and at every step accepted more of his false promises. One must ask why our State Department is allowing a chauvinistic and dictatorial pan-Slavic Orthodox regime, with direct links to ultranationalists in Russia, to emerge in the Balkans?

The so-called cease-fire of recent weeks never really took place. The Serbs began to move their troops out of Kosovo in October, but then they moved right back. Albanians insist that the brutal and criminal Serbian paramilitary forces staged the killing of six Serbian civilians in Peja this month in order to justify the continuation of Milosevic's ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. (The Kosovo Liberation Army was quick to condemn the killings of the Serbian civilians.)

The events in Podujeva on December 24, in which the Serbian military attacked five villages, killed twelve Albanian civilians, and caused the flight of thousands of others leave no question about Milosevic's real intentions to continue the "ethnic cleansing" of the Albanian majority of Kosovo. The Western response to these events also leaves no question about our role in the Balkan conflict—that we never had any intention of stopping Milosevic from using illegal and inhuman methods to destroy the right of Albanians to freedom, democracy, and self-determination.

For the past three weeks, our policy makers and the press have once again attempted to create a false parity between the Serbian military and the Kosovo Liberation Army, and to cast blame on the KLA for breaking the so-called cease-fire. They have promoted Serbia's false statements to the press, including listing names of people supposedly arrested and imprisoned by the KLA but who, according to reliable Albanian sources, do not even exist. Meanwhile 2,000 Albanians are being held and brutally tortured in barbaric Serbian jails. And while this information goes unreported, unconfirmed reports of atrocities committed by the KLA against innocent Serbs living in Kosovo are publicized widely, even though the KLA has repeatedly stated its policy against killing civilians.

As the misrepresentation of the conflict continues apace, so do the "diplomatic" initiatives designed to sell out the Albanian

people of Kosovo. The French government for example, has been working behind the scenes to persuade Ibrahim Rugova, the leader of the Democratic League of Kosovo, to believe that he can find a solution to the Balkan conflict with Milosevic. Following a recent trip to France, Rugova made a public statement that Milosevic "was elected by the Serbian people in a legitimate way," and that he is the "only legitimate person" with whom he can negotiate. More astonishing still, Rugova stated that institutions in Kosovo that he controls "would do the utmost to persuade the UCK extremists to stop their provocations and attacks on Serbian security forces." Incredibly, this is tantamount to Rugova giving another green light to Milosevic to continue his reign of terror and murder against the Albanian people of Kosovo. Are we to assume that some forces inside LDK are being supported by the West to try to eliminate the KLA, and that they are willing to do so in order to retain their political control of Kosovo under any circumstances?

There has been great concern among Western diplomats that war has broken out again in Kosovo, well before the spring thaw. But, it should now be clear to all that as long as the Milosevic regime remains in power, the war will continue. To stop the war, NATO forces led by the United States must be mobilized to wage air strikes against Serbian military targets in Kosovo and Serbia. But, ultimately, the only way to peace and stability in the Balkans is to allow the Albanian people the right to declare their independence under international law, just as we allowed the Slovenes, Croatsians, Macedonians, and Bosnians after the demise of the former Yugoslavia.

THE PUERTO RICAN SOURCE TAX FAIRNESS ACT

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Puerto Rican Source Tax Fairness Act, a bill to clarify that retirement income from pension plans of the government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be exempt from nonresident taxation in the same manner as state pension plans. This may sound complicated, but it is not.

The 104th Congress passed important legislation banning the so-called "source tax." The source tax was a state tax placed on pension earnings of a nonresident for the portion of the pension that was earned while the worker was a resident of a state. If a person lives in New York and works for 25 years, builds a pension and then moves to Florida, New York had the opportunity to tax that pension income. That is no longer the case.

The issue at the time was one of fairness. This country was born under the cry "no taxation without representation." The source tax allowed a state to tax a person where he or she had no representation. Hence, the 104th Congress took action to remedy the situation.

Unfortunately, there is a glitch in the law. As written, the law prohibits source taxes on governmental retirement plans. However, the cross referenced section does not include the government of Puerto Rico in its definition. So, Puerto Rico may still tax the governmental pensions earned in Puerto Rico even though

the person may no longer live in Puerto Rico. This could not have been the intent of the law, as the other 50 states and the District of Columbia may not tax government pensions. It is simply a glitch that is easily remedied.

As we did the first time, Mr. Speaker, we are again discussing an issue of fairness. Why should former state employees around the country escape the source tax on their pensions and not the former employees of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico? The answer is that there is no reason for it. It is taxation without representation for former employees of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. A simple sense of fairness dictates that we need to make this change in the law to repeal the source tax in the way it was meant to be repealed. I urge my colleagues to support the Puerto Rican Source Tax Fairness Act.

SOUTH BRONX MENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL, INC. EIGHTH PATIENT RECOGNITION AND EMPOWERMENT DAY

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again pay tribute to the South Bronx Mental Health Council, Inc., which will celebrate its eight annual "patient Recognition and empowerment Day."

Created in 1968 as Lincoln Community Mental Health Center, the South Bronx Mental Health Council, Inc. is a community-based organization which provides treatment and mental health services to the local population and to area schools and senior centers. It is committed to helping empower its patients and their families through the rehabilitation of patients and their reintegration in their communities.

All of us, I am sure, have known someone who, whether we were aware of it or not, struggled with some form of mental illness. Tragically, a suicide or other crisis is too often our first—and only—indication of the individual's suffering.

While it is important, and appropriate, to recognize the care givers who provide these services, it is even more important that those individuals who have made special efforts to overcome their challenges also receive our attention and support.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting our friends at the South Bronx Mental Health Council, who on Friday, January 29, will celebrate the eighth annual Patient Recognition and Empowerment Day.

CREDIT OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS ACT

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to reintroduce the Credit Opportunity Amendments Act which will fundamentally reform the Community Reinvestment Act [CRA] of 1977, and clarify the enforcement of our fair lending laws.

The original purpose of CRA was to encourage banks to loan into the communities in which they maintained deposit taking facilities. In addition, the 95th Congress, which passed CRA, was concerned about redlining, the practice of denying loans in certain neighborhoods based on racial or ethnic characteristics. The enforcement mechanism chosen was to have CRA performance taken into account when regulators were deciding on applications by the banks.

When CRA passed in 1977, the Senate report stated that no new paperwork would be required under the new law. It was believed that examiners had all the information they needed on hand from call reports and their examination reports to enforce CRA. This is not the case. Instead of relying on existing information, regulators have created expansive new reporting requirements resulting in mounds of additional paperwork and many wasted hours that could have been used to serve the community.

CRA's enforcement mechanism has gone completely haywire. It has become what many refer to as regulatory extortion. By holding up applications on the basis of CRA protests, some community groups hope to get sizable grants or other contracts from banks. This happens all too often. Recently, the Clinton administration has linked the enforcement of CRA with other fair lending statutes. This has placed the Justice Department in the position of being an additional bank regulator. This new bank regulator caught the lending industry off guard by using the disparate impact test for proving discrimination. Disparate impact is a controversial theory for proving discrimination in employment law using only statistical data. Using this scenario, a lender can be found to have discriminated without some element of intent or without proving that any harm resulted from a lending practice.

This legislation remedies these problems while ensuring that lenders reinvest in the communities in which they serve. First, it replaces the current system of enforcement and graded written evaluations with a public disclosure requirement. This will dramatically reduce unnecessary paperwork and end the extortion-like nature of the current enforcement mechanism.

This approach allows bank customers to decide whether the bank is doing an adequate job in meeting its community obligations; not bureaucrats in Washington or organized community groups. If not, consumers can take their business elsewhere.

This will not end the congressional requirement that banks invest in their community. Nor will it stop organized groups from being involved. They will have the enforcement from the public disclosure on the bank's intentions and performance. They can raise any concerns with the bank or the regulators at any time. Consumers and the groups representing their interests can make their concerns known without having the extraordinary authority to hold up mergers and other obligations.

The second change in this bill makes the practice of redlining a violation of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and the Fair Housing Act. Redlining will be defined as failing to make a loan based on the characteristics of the neighborhood where the house or business is located. Currently no prohibition against redlining in fair housing or fair lending exists, however, courts have interpreted these statutes to

prohibit redlining. By placing a prohibition on redlining in statute, we will be sending a clear message that we are opposed to discrimination in lending in all forms, whether based on an individual's race, gender, age, sex, or makeup of neighborhood where the individual lives or works.

This will also clarify that the method chosen to enforce our antidiscrimination laws is clear and resides in the fair housing and lending laws. No longer will regulators be forced to confront laws to attempt to address problems that the laws are inadequate for the purpose.

Third, the Credit Opportunity Amendment Act adds two criteria to the current use of the disparate impact theory. First, it requires regulators show actual proof that the lender discriminated and that the discrimination caused harm to the victim. Second, this legislation requires the party bringing suit to prove the lender intended to discriminate when making its lending criteria.

Finally, by designating a lead regulator to enforce our fair lending and community reinvestment statutes, we will have more evenhanded enforcement of these laws. In turn, banks will be in a better position to know how to comply with them. Currently, confusion is the most prevailing reaction to the enforcement of CRA over the last 15 years and fair lending more recently.

The current bill makes substantial reforms to CRA which I strongly support. By enacting this legislation, we make a bold step to eliminate credit allocations in the guise of CRA and rationalize our regulation of the banking industry. At the same time, we make it absolutely clear that redlining is unacceptable and is against the law. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my legislation in the 106th Congress.

TRIBUTE TO RALPH AND ROSE
HITTMAN

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the First Couple of Boys Brotherhood Republic, Ralph and Rose Hittman, two outstanding individuals who have dedicated their lives to public service. They will be honored on January 9 by parents, family, friends, and professionals for their outstanding contributions to the community. I have known them personally for many years, and I am very familiar with their background, experience, character, and personality. They are two people of enormous commitment.

An active citizen and police captain at the Boys Brotherhood Republic (BBR) in the 1930s, Ralph Hittman grew up on East Sixth Street just west of the present-day BBR "City Hall" at Avenue D. While a BBR citizen, Ralph was introduced to Rose Bader, whose parents owned a candy store just a block away, at a Dance at the Christodora's House by Rose's cousin, who was also a BBR boy. They married in December 1939.

Mr. Speaker, during World War II, Mr. Hittman served as a noncommissioned officer in the Marine Corps, and both before and after the war he was associated with a West Seventeenth Street paper company, initially as sales manager then general manager.

Between 1954 and 1955 when the self-governing nature of the BBR had been all but lost and less than a hundred citizens frequented the "City Hall" building, then at 290 East Third Street, Ralph took on the responsibility of unpaid supervisor, working late afternoons and nights while still at the paper company. With the help and support of Rose (who took on administrative and bookkeeping duties during the daytime), the couple paid off some long overdue vendor bills, and began the task of steering the organization out of debt.

Rose was born on the Lower East Side, and she attended public School 131, Junior High School 188 and graduated from Washington Irving High School at age 15. She received many honors while in school and the one she is most proud of is the citywide arithmetic medal which she won at J.H.S. 188. However, for financial reasons, it was impossible for her to attend college. She went to work as a switchboard operator and bookkeeper to help support her family.

Ralph Hittman has had a lifelong affiliation with Boys Brotherhood Republic of New York, having participated in its programs as a boy. During his forty-three years as executive director, Mr. Hittman oversaw the relocation and reorganization of Camp Wabenaki, the planning and construction of a new BBR City Hall at 888 East Sixth Street, and the expansion of program services. Rose Hittman had a critical role in each of these accomplishments. Since 1956, the Hittmans have lived on-site with the children at Camp Wabenaki during the summer months.

Over the years, Ralph and Rose Hittman have guided and nurtured tens of thousands of youngsters on the Lower East Side. This is ultimately the highest testament to their unsurpassed efforts.

Ralph and Rose Hittman are the proud parents of three sons, Michael, Jeffrey, and Stephen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending and congratulating Ralph and Rose Hittman for their outstanding contributions to the community and in wishing them continued success.

COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT
IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to reintroduce the Community Reinvestment Improvement Act of 1999.

The original purpose of CRA was to encourage banks to loan into the communities in which they maintained deposit taking facilities. The enforcement mechanism chosen was to have CRA performance taken into account when regulators were deciding on applications by the banks. When CRA passed in 1977, the Senate report stated that no new paperwork would be required under the new law. It was believed that examiners had all the information they needed on hand from call reports and their examination reports to enforce CRA. This is not the case. Instead of relying on existing information, regulators have created expansive new reporting requirements resulting in mounds of additional paperwork and many

wasted hours that could have been used to serve the community.

This paperwork and regulatory burden can create even larger problems for smaller banks which cannot absorb the costs of compliance without passing them on to consumers. This bill is geared to reduce the cost of credit to consumers by allowing smaller banks with a track record of reinvesting in their communities to be released from some of the regulatory red tape.

If a bank with assets under \$500,000,000 is not in violation of section 701(a) of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and has not received a rating of "needs to improve" or "substantial noncompliance" in its most recent evaluation, the bank would undergo a modified CRA evaluation. The bank would need to maintain internal policies to help meet the needs of its local community consistent with the safe and sound operation of a bank and make a record of its reinvestment efforts available for public inspection. The appropriate regulator, when checking for CRA compliance, would then use existing business documents for its review.

The bill would exempt small town banks of less than \$100,000 from CRA evaluation altogether since, in order to survive, such banks have to meet the credit needs of their communities without government bureaucracy involvement.

Finally, the bill would specify that a bank shall not have an application to a regulator denied if such bank has received an "outstanding" or "satisfactory" rating within the past 24 months unless the bank's compliance has materially deteriorated since such evaluation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a prudent step in reducing unnecessary government bureaucracy. Furthermore, by reducing the cost of federal regulation, we can help lower the cost of credit to consumers. It is my hope that my colleagues will support this reform.

RETIREE VISA ACT OF 1999

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to create a 4-year non-immigrant visa to allow various people to spend some of their retirement years in the United States. This legislation is meant to make it easier for individuals who already enjoy the ability to spend time in the U.S. to have a 4-year non-immigrant visa to allow them to spend larger periods of time here.

Currently, Canadians may stay continuously in the United States for 6 months each year without a passport or visa. Visitors from countries participating in the Visa Waiver Pilot Program (VWPP) can stay in the U.S. continuously for a 90-day period without a visa. Since this visa is only intended for retirees, applicants would have to be at least 55 years of age to qualify.

The fact that these individuals can, in some ways, already spend some of their retirement in the U.S. reinforces the fact that this legislation is merely meant to reduce some of the procedural hurdles which currently deter foreign retirees from spending additional time here. For example, many German citizens use the Visa Waiver Pilot Program to come to

Florida for 90 days at a time. Many of these individuals would like to spend more than 90 days in the U.S. but are scrupulous about not overstaying their visit. These foreign retirees leave the U.S. within 90 days, spend some time in their country and then come back to the United States for another 90 days. Many of these individuals may end up spending a large amount of time in the U.S. using the VWPP but they can do so only by constantly going back and forth from their country to the United States. Of course, foreign citizens also use the B-2 visitors visa to spend time for pleasure in the U.S. Again, the use of the B-2 visa requires the holder to return to their home after a relatively short period of time before coming back to the U.S.

The 4-year visa period proposed in the legislation is intended to reduce the need for foreign retirees to frequently travel back and forth from the U.S. to their home country in order to comply with U.S. immigration requirements. At the same time, a 4-year period would ensure that retirees making use of this visa do go home periodically to renew their status by demonstrating that they meet the requirements outlined in this proposal, such as residence in a foreign country which the alien has no intention of abandoning. The visa would be renewable as long as the application was filed from the retiree's country of citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, there are clearly important practical and policy distinctions between long-term nonimmigrants and permanent residents holding green cards. This legislation does not aim to change that. For example, an important distinction between these nonimmigrant foreign retirees and permanent residents is that the amount of time they spend in the United States would not accrue for naturalization purposes. Also, a green card confers important benefits on permanent residents, such as the ability to engage in employment or receive government aid, which would not be available to a nonimmigrant under this legislation. This bill would not provide work authorization or eligibility for any Federal means-tested programs. Instead, these nonimmigrants would be required to own a residence in the United States, maintain health coverage, and receive income at least twice the Federal poverty level.

In its simplest terms, this visa would serve as a much needed mechanism in which foreign retirees would have the opportunity to comfortably reside in the United States. Let me give you an example of how this will work by using August and Gerda Welz as an example. August and Gerda Welz have spent more than \$380,000 in the United States since taking up a residence in Palm Coast, Florida three years ago. Native Germans, the Welz's saw Florida as an ideal place to spend their retirement years, with its pleasant climate and sound economy. They own a home, pay taxes and volunteer in the community. Couples, such as the Welz's, represent the growing number of foreign retirees who wish to stay for an extended period of time in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, by simplifying the process for this unique group of retirees, this legislation would provide new and exciting opportunities for foreign retirees—a practice that would benefit all parties involved. There is no reason to discourage such individuals from spending some of their retirement years in the U.S., contributing to the economy and enhancing our communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this proposal.

REFORMING PRESIDENTIAL
DEBATES

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Presidential Debate Reform Act. The situation surrounding the 1996 Presidential election has highlighted some flaws in our current method for selecting a President and Vice President of the United States of America. One critical flaw involves the way Presidential debates are scheduled.

My legislation would create the framework for deciding the participants and structure of Presidential debates. This framework would include a commission of three people nominated by the President. The President would nominate one person from a list submitted by the Republican National Committee, one person from a list submitted by the Democratic National Committee, and one person who is unaffiliated submitted jointly by the RNC and the DNC. These commissioners would then schedule several debates.

One such debate would be optional and include any Presidential candidate who is on the ballot in 50 states or polls at 5 percent in popular polls among likely voters. This could include major party candidates, although it would provide a forum for lesser known candidates to express their views.

The commission would then establish debates for Vice Presidential and Presidential candidates of the two major parties and anyone polling over 5 percent in polls taken after the optional debate. The penalty for a candidate choosing not to participate in the debates would be a reduction in the amount of Federal funds that candidate's party will receive to run the next convention. The reduction would be equal to the fraction of "mandatory" debates missed. I cannot imagine that a party would want to miss out on \$3 million, which is approximately the amount that would be lost by missing one debate, based on the cost of the 1996 conventions.

This has nothing to do with whether I think certain people should or should not participate in debates. However, I do believe that we need to have an established framework with defined ground rules to ensure fairness in the system.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good bill and I look forward to pursuing this as the 2000 election heats up. I urge my colleagues to review this legislation and support its passage.

F-1 STUDENT VISAS

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to give American high schools the ability to welcome foreign exchange students into their schools without requiring them to charge tuition. I am pleased to

be joined by my colleagues, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. PICKETT of Virginia.

It was brought to my attention that individual schools which participate in informal programs to allow foreign exchange students to attend school in the U.S. are required to charge these same students tuition. The F-1 visa is for students who seek to enter the U.S. temporarily and solely to pursue a course of study. Under existing law, even if the school and the local school district do not want to charge the student for accepting an invitation to study in the U.S., the student will not be able to receive an F-1 visa without paying the fee. In some cases, the school, which otherwise would welcome a foreign exchange student, may be deterred from allowing them to attend due to the administrative burden of administering the fee. In other cases, American schools entering into informal sister-school exchanges with a foreign school may find that they are forced to charge the foreign student tuition while the American student is attending their sister-school for free.

This tuition requirement does not apply to foreign students who come to the U.S. to study in a program designated by the Director of the United States Information Agency (USIA). These students receive a J visa and are not required to reimburse the school for the cost of their attendance. On the other hand, foreign exchange students in the U.S. under an F-1 visa are usually attending school under informal arrangements, with a teacher or parent having invited them to spend time in the U.S. as a gesture of American hospitality and goodwill. Some schools participate in informal sister-school exchanges where one of their students will go abroad and the school in turn will sponsor a foreign student here. Although these are informal, flexible, private arrangements between schools and students that are not designated by the USIA, they are no less valuable in developing goodwill and greater understanding among people of different nations. In many cases, it simply does not make sense to charge tuition to foreign exchange students simply because they have an F-1 visa rather than a J visa.

The legislation I am introducing today will give schools the ability to have the Attorney General waive the F-1 visa tuition fee requirement. Schools that certify that the waiver will promote the educational interest of the local educational agency and will not impose an undue financial burden on the agency will be able to allow foreign exchange students to attend without charging a fee. On the other hand, schools that do not want to waive the fee will still be able to collect it. This legislation will simply give schools added flexibility to sponsor foreign exchange students without limiting the right of schools to collect needed fees. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

STATE OCCUPANCY STANDARDS
AFFIRMATION ACT OF 1999

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, the State Occupancy Standards Affirmation Act of 1999, declaring

the rights of States in establishing occupancy standards for housing providers.

During the 105th Congress the House Committee on Banking and Financing Services passed a public housing bill. Within the debate of this bill at the committee level, occupancy standards were discussed, but a real standard with real definitions was left out of the final product. This bill would amend the Quality Housing and Word Responsibility Act and insert the standards and definition that should have been put in originally.

I believe that it is important to firmly establish the rights of the states in determining this standard, especially when considering that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) could require housing providers to house more people than is considered appropriate and reasonable.

Currently, many states have occupancy laws or guidelines in place, and there is a national consensus among housing providers that the maximum number of occupants most housing can accommodate is two people per bedroom. This legislation allows the inclusion of one infant to the already established two-people-per-bedroom limit. Beyond this level, the negative effects of overcrowding, including providers possibly decreasing the stock of affordable housing, could be triggered. It is important that reasonable limits be set for the number of occupants in a housing unit to provide safe living conditions, to protect from property damage, and to make sure that requisite services can be provided for all residents.

The bill I am introducing is a simple clarification of existing law and practice. It says that States, not HUD, will set occupancy standards and that a two-per-bedroom plus an infant standard is reasonable in the absence of a State law. American taxpayers have spent billions of dollars on HUD programs designed to reduce crowding. It is time to ensure that overcrowding will not be a possibility. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

A SECURE SOCIAL SECURITY CARD

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will make the Social Security card more tamper-resistant and less susceptible to fraudulent use. Eliminating Social Security document fraud is a vital first step in controlling our borders and stopping illegal immigration. It is simply unacceptable that the one document that is most commonly used to prove eligibility for employment—the Social Security card—is nothing more than a paper document that is easily counterfeited. As it stands, an illegal alien wanting a Social Security card can go to a street corner and purchase a fake for as little as \$30.

Improving the Social Security card is of the utmost importance for two fundamental reasons: (1) it reduces the incentive for illegal aliens to come to the U.S. by making it more difficult for them to get a job, and (2) it makes it easier for employers to comply with existing law by making employment authorization documents more reliable. It is that simple.

Mr. Speaker, the only way to control the crisis of illegal immigration is to eliminate the

lure of employment. The 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act created employer sanctions, making it illegal to knowingly hire an illegal alien. That law requires everyone seeking employment in the U.S. to produce evidence of eligibility to work. The most commonly used form of verification is the combination of a driver's license with the Social Security card. These reforms were well intentioned but a decade later, it is clear that fraudulent documents have weakened the impact.

One of the primary reasons that employer sanctions are not working today is the rampant fraud in the documents used to prove eligibility to work, including the Social Security card. As long as the Social Security card can be easily counterfeited, employer sanctions will not work. The fact that illegal aliens can easily counterfeit authorization documents undermines this important law and the lure of easy jobs continues to pull illegal aliens into this country.

My legislation would require a simple upgrading of the Social Security card. This would replace today's card with one that offers the best possible security against counterfeiting, forgery, alteration and fraudulent use. This proposal would require the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration to make such improvements to the Social Security account number card as are necessary to make it as secure against counterfeiting as the 100 dollar bill and as protected against fraudulent use as the United States passport. I chose these performance standards because of the many counterfeit-resistance features that are built into these two documents, including the type of paper, watermarks, background pattern of inks and security threads.

Mr. Speaker, with this legislation, the Commissioner of Social Security would be required to offer more than a bare assertion concerning the card's security. This legislation directs the Comptroller General to perform an annual audit regarding the progress and status of developing a secured social security account number card, the incidence of counterfeit production and fraudulent use of social security account number cards, and the steps being taken to detect and prevent such counterfeiting and fraud.

The legislation also provides that, beginning on January 1, 2008, any Social Security card that is used for employer sanctions purposes, i.e., to show that an individual is eligible to work in the U.S., must be one of the new, secured Social Security cards. By a date certain we need an improved Social Security card to be the only Social Security card acceptable for employer sanctions. Other documents, such as the passport, would still be acceptable. This would make the older, easy to counterfeit cards, worthless to illegal aliens.

Immigrants bring growth, creativity and opportunity to America. They are the cornerstone of much of our great nation's cultural heritage. Immigration should once again be seen as a noble experience that enriches America—both economically and culturally—rather than one demeaned by criminality and deceit. To accomplish this, we must make employer sanctions work and cut off the magnet of jobs. Adopting measures, such as a secure Social Security card, to reduce document fraud is the first pivotal step that must be taken.

If we do nothing and continue to allow the use of the Social Security card without making it tamper-resistant, fraud will remain rampant,

and the country will continue to be overrun by illegal aliens. This is a modest proposal to ensure that the SSA uses the latest inking and anti-counterfeiting mechanisms now used on paper issued in the form of the \$100 bill and the U.S. passport—both of which boast extremely low rates of fraud. These would be specific, clearly outlined performance standards. In 9 years or so, only such an upgraded card would qualify as a Social Security card for the purposes of confirming employment eligibility. These modest steps are the least we can do to stop the unrivaled wave of illegal immigration hitting our nation.

RELIEF FOR ROBERT ANTHONY BROLEY

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill for the relief of Robert Anthony Broley. After enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), Immigration Judges lost most discretion in granting suspension of deportation of certain criminal aliens. Any relief must be sought from Congress. The case of Robert Anthony Broley is, in my opinion, sufficiently compelling to have Congress grant him relief from pending deportation.

Robert is the son of Robert M. Broley and Barbara Broley. Mrs. Broley was born in Canada but is a U.S. citizen, having been naturalized in 1962. Mr. Broley is also a naturalized U.S. citizen. The son, Robert Anthony Broley, was born in Canada in 1966 and remains a Canadian citizen.

Robert Anthony Broley entered the United States with his parents at the age of 2 in November 1968. He lived with his parents in the United States until they accepted employment in Canada when he was nine. Robert Anthony Broley was admitted again in October, 1978 and, for the most part, he has remained here since. He has an American citizen son, Matthew.

Robert Anthony Broley had personal problems beginning with his senior year in high school. He stole checks from his parents in 1990. In 1992 he was convicted of Driving Under the Influence. He stole furniture from his family in 1993 in order to sell it for cash. His parents felt the need to turn him in to the authorities in order to help Robert in the long run. He served 5 months in prison and was released in October, 1993 and given probation, which he violated by returning to Canada.

His father finally convinced Robert Anthony Broley to return to the United States in order to accept the consequences of his actions. While attempting to enter the United States to turn himself in for violating his probation, he was apprehended and is currently serving a term for parole violation with a release date of March 20, 1999. Once released, he is deportable under Section 212(a) and 237(a) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (as amended by IIRIRA).

While serving time in prison, Robert was involved in a very serious accident that has left his face permanently disfigured. His family feels that their son has completely changed

and has suffered for his crimes and that his deportation will hurt Matthew, Robert's American citizen son.

In view of Robert Anthony Broley's situation, insofar that he was arrested because his family felt it would be for his own good, I feel great sympathy for his family's struggles. They

never intended for him to be deported. Therefore, I am introducing a private relief bill on behalf of Robert Anthony Broley. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.