EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE AIRLINE DISASTER RELIEF ACT

HON. DON SHERWOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Airline Disaster Relief Act, a measure which clarifies the legal rights of airline disaster victim's families. This bill is about fairness. It's about providing justice in our legal system to families who suffer the loss of a loved one in an aviation accident over the ocean. This same Act was passed overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives during the 105th Congress.

On July 17, 1996, 230 people lost their lives in the tragic crash of TWA Flight 800. Among the victims were 21 people from Montoursville, Pennsylvania, a small community in my district. The people of Montoursville were brutally impacted by the sudden loss of 16 high school students and five chaperones who were flying to France to enrich their educational experience. For the families of the victims aboard Flight 800, this tragedy has been made worse by the Supreme Court's application of an antiquated maritime law, known as the Death on the High Seas Act of 1920.

The Supreme Court decided in *Zicherman* v. *Korean Airlines,* that the Death on the High Seas Act applies to lawsuits that arise when an aircraft has crashed in the ocean more than a marine league from land. This interpretation would prevent the families of the TWA 800 victims from receiving the just compensation they are entitled to under state law. This decision treats families differently depending on whether their relative died in an aircraft that crashed into the ocean or one that crashed into land. If the plane crashes into the ocean, the Death on the High Seas Act applies and the family is entitled only to seek pecuniary damages before a U.S. District Court Judge with no jury. However, if a plane crashes into the land or within 3 miles of land, the applicable State tort law would apply. State tort laws generally allow compensation for loss of companionship, loss to society, pain and suffering in addition to lost income.

Today, however, when state tort law has progressed to a point where value is placed on human life, the application of this skewed statute is viewed as inequitable, unfair and inhumane. This is particularly true in the death of children since children are generally not economic providers for their families. Thus, family members would receive minimal compensation for the loss of a loved one who was not a wage earner or ''bread winner.'' Because of this arbitrary line, legislatively drawn in the ocean, the surviving family members in this case are being dealt a cruel blow. No parent should be told by our nation's legal system that longitude and latitude will determine the value of their child or determine their rights in a court of law. Many family members of TWA 800 victims feel that the application of the Death on the High Seas Act makes the life of their child or loved one appear worthless in the eyes of the law.

For this reason, I introduced this measure which will negate the application of the Death on the High Seas Act to air disaster cases. My bill would amend the Federal Aviation Act so that airline disasters at sea are treated the same as incidents on land. The gross injustice of the Death on the High Seas Act must be changed. Where a plane crashed should not dictate our rights in a court of law.

Both the Supreme Court and The White House Commission on Aviation Safety and Security recommend that Congress correct these inequities. Additionally, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that there will be no costs associated with the implementation of this Act. It is time to bring justice to the application of federal laws which regulate airline disaster claims. Passage of the Airline Disaster Relief Act will be an important step in achieving this objective. I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly approve this bill.

IN MEMORY OF FREDERICK A. JONES

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Frederick A. Jones, a gentleman who was an outstanding member of the Olmsted Falls community.

Over the years Mr. Jones worked in a variety of ways to make Olmsted Falls a better place. He umpired Summer League baseball games, led a Boy Scout group, and served as the presiding chairman of the city's Civil Service Commission.

After moving to Olmsted Falls in 1941 Mr. Jones worked as a volunteer fireman for 30 years, spending much of that time as a captain. During his tenure he helped connect the Fire and Police departments via a ham radio system.

Mr. Jones also served in the U.S. Army Infantry during World War II, participating in the Rhineland offensive. After his service in World War II Mr. Jones returned to Olmsted Falls and worked for Bell Telephone until 1981.

Mr. Jones was also a member of the committee that planned and oversaw the construction of a football field and track for Olmsted Falls High School. He and his wife, Betty, served as co-chairs of the Athletic Boosters Club for nine years. Mr. and Mrs. Jones also acted as the co-chairs of the Olmsted Falls local antique show at the Olmsted Community Church.

He will be greatly missed.

WHY I INTRODUCED THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, when I ran for the United States Congress, I campaigned on virtually one single issue—balancing the budget.

Whenever I speak on the matter, I think of my friend Delmar Burhenn. His family works hard to make ends meet on their Baca Country farm located in the extreme southeast corner of Colorado.

I savor every chance I get to speak with Delmar. He has opinions about everything—retirement, the reliability of farm equipment, saving for a vacation, and so on.

During my first term in Congress, we balanced the budget, reduced taxes and improved education. During the 106th Congress, we want to build on these achievements by preserving Social Security, giving families like Delmar's more tax relief, and permanently balancing the budget.

Of these, the most pressing issue is balancing the federal budget permanently. That's why I introduced H.J. Res. 1, the Balanced Budget Amendment Resolution of 1999, on the first day of the 106th Congress. Even while the Republican-led Congress exercises fiscal discipline in Washington, I believe the only way to protect families like Delmar's is by making it a requirement federal books remain balanced forever.

Some are unaware Congress balanced the federal budget last year. We did. In fact, we delivered the first balanced budget since 1969, a big step in the right direction. But that was simply a temporary victory that can be lost with the political winds. The Balanced Budget Amendment I propose guarantees the federal budget will be balanced each year to come.

Under my proposal, the only time the budget could be broken is by an affirmative vote of a three-fifths super majority in both the House and the Senate. This super majority would be too high a hurdle for frivolous, spur-of-the-moment impulse spending. Congress would only be able to spend more than income warrants during times of real need like national emergencies and war.

The Balanced Budget Amendment would also help us accomplish one of my top priorities for the 106th Congress, preserving and protecting Social Security for future generations. Right now the federal government ''borrows'' from the Social Security surplus in order to pay for other numerous federal programs such as education, Medicare, and transportation. Even by conservative estimates, without an end to this ''borrowing,'' we can count on Social Security running deficits by 2012, and headed toward bankruptcy in the early 2020's.

With a permanently balanced budget, the federal government will be forced to prioritize

money for these programs and others important to Coloradans. By reducing the amount we borrow to meet today's federal debt obligations, we pay less interest on the national debt each year.

Even with all of these incentives to pass the Balanced Budget Amendment, it won't be easy. There are still too many big spenders in Washington who are adept at creating new, expensive programs for every problem. Under the Balanced Budget Amendment, liberals won't be able to continue their free spending ways without considering the long-term consequences to Colorado families like Delmar's.

It's time to stop runaway government spending. Coloradans balance their checkbooks every day, knowing they can't spend money they don't have. I don't think there's any reason to expect less of the federal government.

By passing the Balanced Budget Amendment, Delmar will be assured bureaucrats in Washington will have to worry about making ends meet, just like he does.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. BETTY WELLS AND MR. ERNIE McCOLLUM UPON THEIR RETIREMENTS

HON. DAVID D. PHELPS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two of my constituents on the occasion of their retirement from the Board of Trustees of the Rend Lake Conservancy District. Rend Lake is a major southern Illinois reservoir whose construction was prompted by a severe regional drought in the 1950s. The Rend Lake Conservancy District operates a water treatment plant which serves 300,000 people in over 60 communities, as well as the Lake's enormously popular recreational facilities, which boast a golf course and resort, as well as hunting, fishing, camping, and boating.

Needless to say, the work of the Conservancy District is immensely important to the people of southern Illinois, and to the entire state, and it would not be possible without the leadership of a dedicated and capable Board of Trustees. Sadly, two esteemed members of this Board have recently announced their retirement and I am here today to express my deep appreciation for the service of Mrs. Betty Wells of Jefferson County and Mr. Ernie McCollum of Franklin County. These two remarkable people have contributed outstanding service to the people of southern Illinois through their excellent stewardship. I know their presence on the Board will be missed but their accomplishments will surely be long remembered. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will join me in wishing Mrs. Wells and Mr. McCollum the very best in whatever the future may hold for them.

EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, if our economy is so great, than why are American workers losing their jobs? If our economy is so great, than why are American workers going bankrupt in record numbers? If our economy is so great, who do many families need three jobs just to pay their bills? And Mr. Speaker, if our economy is so great, why are so many manufacturing plants going out of business?

On May 31, 1997, something happened in my congressional district that deeply affected 70 of my constituents and their families. The Camcar Textron Brainard Rivet plant in Girard, Ohio closed its doors and told its workers to go home. The workers at this plant, scared for their futures and the futures of their families, wanted to work with the parent company of Camcar, Textron to negotiate an employee buyout through an Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP). Unfortunately, Textron did not feel that selling the plant to the employees through an ESOP would be in the best interests of the company. I was particularly concerned over the fact that Textron has referred 50 former Brainard Rivet customers to another non-Textron company. These customers could have been the base for an employee-owned company.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to do all it can to encourage ESOPs. That is why today I am introducing legislation, the ''Employee Ownership Enhancement Act,'' to require that an employer closing a manufacturing plant to offer the employees an opportunity to purchase the business through an ESOP. This legislation would exempt companies that are planning to continue using the assets and/or capital from a closed plant at another location or the companies that close a plant but still are manufacturing the same product at another plant.

The current economy presents many challenges for both workers and employers. Congress needs to put in place reasonable laws to enable hard working Americans a chance to own and operate manufacturing plants if the owners don't want to anymore. My bill would apply to only a handful of plant closings a year, but would provide hope and opportunity to thousands of workers and their families. It is that simple.

I urge all my colleagues to support this very important piece of legislation.

IN HONOR OF THE EARNEST MACHINE PRODUCTS COMPANY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Earnest Machine Products Company as they celebrate their fiftieth year in business. Earnest Machine Products Company has proven itself as an outstanding family-owned business that adheres to simple principles of exceptional customer service, customer loyalty, and close employee relations.

In 1947 Paul and Victor Zehnder started the Zehnder Engineering and Machine Company in Cleveland. The company manufactured and sold various industrial supplies until 1948, when Paul began selling surplus track shoe bolts. The bolts were in high demand at the time, and they enabled Paul to begin a long career of distributing nuts and bolts. In 1951 the company name was officially changed to the Earnest Machine Products Company. By 1967 the company's sales had tripled and Earnest Machine Products Company kept introducing new industrial products, such as enamel paints and roller bearings. Eventually, business expanded to include distributors in all 50 states.

Quality products and hard work are important components to the success of Earnest Machine Products Company, but strong customer service and loyal employees are the backbone of the company's history of success. From the very beginning Zehnder promoted outstanding customer service by accepting collect calls before toll free numbers were introduced. The employees are treated like family. That sentiment, and steady growth over 50 years has enabled Earnest to establish and maintain a base of loyal employees. In fact, over 70 percent of the work force has been with the company for 15 years or more.

In 1998 Earnest received ISO 9002 certification, which recognizes that the company is a quality supplier of industrial fasteners by American and European Quality Assurance agencies. Earnest has also maintained an accredited lab to test and insure the quality of their product. Today, Earnest Machine Products Company distributes over 30,000 different fastener types and sizes.

The Earnest Machine Products Company has proven that adherence to employees, customer service, and quality can produce a successful business.

TRIBUTE TO AMOS W. ALLARD

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay humble tribute to the life and legacy of Amos W. Allard, who died Monday, February 1, 1999 in Ft. Collins, Colorado. Mr. Allard was born on a ranch near Walden, Colorado on May 14, 1920 to Arthur Allard and Pearl Wade Allard. He is the Great Grandson of James O. Pinkham, the first permanent settler in North Park.

Amos Allard attended schools in Denver, Walden and Fort Collins. He graduated from Fort Collins High School in 1937. Later he attended Colorado A.&M., now know as Colorado State University, and the University of Missouri, where he received his Bachelor of Sciences degree.

On July 18, 1941, he married Jean Stewart. After he served his country in the United States Navy during World War II, Amos and Jean moved to ranch in the Walden area where they ranched for more than 20 years. The couple have two sons: WAYNE ALLARD, currently serving as a United States Senator and wife Joan, and Kermit Allard, a Fort Collins C.P.A. and wife Judy.

Amos Allard demonstrated a history of service and commitment both to his family and to the community. While ranching in the Walden area, Amos was actively involved in the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, the North Park Stockgrowers Association, and the IOOF Lodge where he served as Grand Master for the State of Colorado.

After the family moved to Loveland, Colorado, Mr. Allard became a real estate broker

and proceeded to develop a 297 acre farm into housing units know as Lock-Lon. Mr. Allard served as President of the Loveland Chamber of Commerce, President of the Loveland Board of Realtors and served for many years on the County Extension Advisory Committee. He also served as Chairman of the 4th Congressional District in Colorado.

He was preceded in death by his parents and his brother, Martin. Amos Allard is survived by his wife, Jean and their two sons, WAYNE and Kermit; a brother, George: five grandchildren: Christi (Steve) Johnson, Karen (Colin) Campbell, Cheryl (Eric) Smith, Jana & Sam; four great grandsons and numberous nieces and nephews.

Amos Allard will be sorely missed and warmly remembered. May we be thankful for his eternal peace and happiness. Amos was always there for me with sound advice or a kind word. I'll always remember his keen insight and wisdom. I found Mr. Allard to be a man of honesty, integrity and humility who touched many souls and raised many spirits. A devoted husband, father and a great American, he set a fine example for us all. To those Mr. Allard left behind, Washington Irving deemed, ''The love which survives the tomb is one of the noblest attributes of the soul.''

TRIBUTE TO EDWIN J. TANGNEY, JR. UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. DAVID D. PHELPS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep thanks and appreciation for the service of my constituent, Edwin J. Tangney, Jr., on the occasion of his retirement. For 37 years, Mr. Tangney served the people of Macon County, Illinois, with diligence and professionalism, beginning with eight years as Harristown Township Auditor and four years as Macon County's first Code Enforcement Officer. In 1976, Edwin began serving as Macon County Recorder of Deeds, and was re-elected as Recorder of Deeds, and then as County Recorder, on five subsequent occasions. Under his leadership, the Macon County Recorder's Office has become one of the most efficient, accessible and accurate official records offices in the entire state of Illinois. Edwin has consistently ensured that his Office was both technologically up to date and, even more importantly, friendly and courteous to the public it serves.

Edwin Tangney retires leaving the Office of the Macon County Recorder well positioned to enter the new millennium, and I know the citizens of Macon County share my profound appreciation for his many years of dedication and leadership. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will join me in wishing Edwin the very best as he enters his well-deserved retirement from public service. He will indeed be missed, and his accomplishments will be remembered far into the future.

TRIBUTE TO A COMMUNITY LEADER: LEO SMITH

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated volunteer and advocate, Leo Smith.

Mr. Smith, a tireless defender of social justice, died Wednesday, January 13th at the age of 80 after a lifetime of standing up for what he believed in.

Remembered by many as conscientous, Mr. Smith belonged to many church and public service groups including several that looked out for the rights of seniors. Working with a Southern Maryland group that aimed to improve housing conditions and eliminate open-air drug markets, he was often a mentor and a leader.

Mr. Smith was a founding member of the local chapter of the AARP (American Association of Retired Persons) and was the La Plata Richard R. Clark Senior Center's representative in 1994. It was in that year that the AARP, Sheriff's office, State Police and La Plata police signed an agreement to form TRIAD to both reduce crime and help seniors become more aware of protecting themselves.

Occasionally described as controversial because he went all out for what he believed, Mr. Smith was described by one of his coworkers as ''a selfless community servant''. The seniors of Charles County and the citizens of Southern Maryland will sorely miss his enthusiastic spirit and informed voice.

Leo Smith was born in Washington, DC and served in WWII in the U.S. Navy. He worked for 30 years for the U.S. Government in Greenbelt at NASA. He is survived by his wife Mary, five sons and six daughters.

IN MEMORY OF JACK AND RUTH CORDES

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mr. Jack Cordes, 75 and his wife Mrs. Ruth Cordes, 72 of Cleveland. After 53 years of marriage the couple died a day apart.

Mr. and Mrs. Cordes grew up together and were inseparable. Jack Cordes served in the U.S. Navy during World War II. Following the war both Jack and Ruth Cordes worked, Jack as a plumber and Ruth as a counter clerk for a bakery. Together, the couple lived through both joy and sorrow.

Jack Cordes battled several types of cancer before falling ill with lung cancer on November 18th. During this struggle Ruth never left his side, providing comfort and support. She stayed with him even though she was in great pain. She suffered a heart attack from watching as her beloved husband grew ill. Ruth suffered a second heart attack on Sunday the 22nd and died later that afternoon. Jack died just a day later.

Their lives were so interconnected; their true love was so interdependent; their commitment to each other was so evident. By living their lives as a true partnership, Jack and Ruth's passing reflects the true meaning of ''till death do us part.''

Ladies and gentlemen, the Cordes' lives and deaths are testaments to the strength of love. Please join me in remembering this extraordinary couple.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 13107 IMPLEMENTING HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the RECORD the following thoughts of John and Carol Loeffler, on President Clinton's Executive Order (EO) 13107.

Date: 12/15/98

Assertion: Last weeks, President Clinton signed an Executive Order setting up a new bureaucracy to implement international human rights treaties. This is yet another end run around Senate approval of controversial UN treaties.

Factoids: The Executive Order 13107, entitled ''Implementation of Human Rights Treaties,'' at first glance appears to be an administrative tool to carry out the implementation of international treaties within the U.S. governmental agencies. However, there are some phrases within the order that should raise a red flag to anyone who is concerned that our national sovereignty and constitutional rights could be eroded by various UN treaties.

For example, the introductory paragraph specifically cites the implementation of three treaties which have already been ratified by the Senate; that is, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. There are provisions in these treaties that have been argued to undermine our own Bill or Rights, but this is only the tip of the iceberg.

The order goes even further by including ''other relevant treaties concerned with the protection and promotion of human rights to which the United States is now or may become a party in the future.'' This sweeping statement seems to indicate that the administration intends to enforce human rights treaties that have not yet been ratified by the Senate.

If so, there are a number of controversial UN treaties that have not been ratified because they also could potentially nullify rights granted to us under the Constitution. Treaties such as the UN Covenant on the Rights of the Child, which officaily designates the state as the guardian of children's best interest, insuring that the state knows better than parents what materials are appropriate and what associations are beneficial. It is also responsible for protecting the child when parental beliefs conflict with the rights of the child. Politically incorrect beliefs such as spanking or religious indoctrination could be grounds for placing children into foster care.

Another controversial treaty is the Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. This treaty has been criticized in part because it forces countries which sign it to allow abortion rights to women, whether or not there is national legislation prohibiting abortion.

It doesn't take much imagination to project what agencies like the Department of Education or the Department of Health and Human Services could do with directives such as these.

The agency Clinton has set up with the issue of this Executive Order has been directed to monitor agencies, coordinate responses to human rights complaints, review proposed legislation for violations, and monitor the actions of states, commonwealths, and territories of the United States, as well as Native American tribes. It would appear that no local governments will escape the scrutiny of this new political bureaucracy.

INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION SERVICES PROVIDER REGISTRATION ACT

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I have re-introduced legislation to provide a resource to people seeking reputable agencies and facilitators that process intercountry adoptions. The bill, entitled the ''Intercountry Adoption Services Provider Registration Act,'' requires people licensed to process intercountry adoptions or involved with intercountry adoptions to register with the U.S. State Department's Office of Children's Issues. The agencies are required to disclose all addresses, employees and sources. If any agency fails to comply, it may suffer financial penalties or a loss of its operating license.

When I became a member of this body, I vowed to give a voice to those with no voice and to protect people from being victimized. Accordingly, when a constituent from my 17th district told me about her horrible experience with an intercountry adoption, I was compelled to take action.

My constituent and her husband had tried for many years to have a second child. When circumstances beyond their control would not let them have another child, they decided to adopt a foreign-born child. They researched the international adoption process and adoption agencies. They contacted the State Department and national adoption networks to gather information before proceeding with their adoption. Finally, they settled on what they thought to be a reputable agency from New Mexico. The adoption process was underway. The New Mexico intercountry adoption facilitator asked for and received prepayment, followed by several installments to cover costs. The couple understood that an intercountry adoption was an expensive process, but knew that the cost would not matter when they had a child in their arms.

After a few months, a photograph of a three-year-old Russian girl was sent to the couple. They were told she was eligible for adoption. In order to prevent the child from being adopted by someone else, the couple was told to send additional monies to secure the adoption. The facilitator explained that the final adoption would take six to eight months to process. The couple gladly sent the money. What they weren't told was that Russia had placed a moratorium on all foreign adoptions. The moratorium took effect even before they were sent the photo of the child. The child was never placed in their home and they lost more than $12,000 to a foreign adoption con artist. When the adoption facilitator was confronted with the moratorium information, he changed the name of his organization and moved to another state. After several months of searching for the agency, the couple is suing for a refund. The case is pending in a New Mexico court.

While completing research for this bill, I discovered many other couples who have similar horror stories of intercountry adoptions. Fraud, deceit and lots of money were involved in each of the tales. The House of Representatives must provide some consumer protection for persons who wish to adopt a foreign-child.

The Hague Intercountry Adoption Convention, a convention convened to protect children and co-operation in respect to intercountry adoptions, has yet to be signed by the United States. Among other matters, this treaty addresses the fraudulent and unscrupulous practices of a minority of agencies that participate in selling children, bribing parents and government officials, deceiving adoptive parents and failing to ensure that each and every adoption is in the best interests of the children concerned. However, the Hague Convention gives no specific legal protection to any person or provide a resource regarding the adoption process. Each individual country must protect its citizens. The Intercountry Adoption Services Provider Registration Act will provide a much needed source of information and protection for prospective adoptive parents.

THE REINTRODUCTION OF A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO ABOLISH THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

HON. RAY LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to reintroduce, along with Congressman WISE from West Virginia, a constitutional amendment that seeks to end the arcane and obsolete institution known as the Electoral College.

It is no accident that this bill is being introduced today, the day that the electoral ballots are opened and counted in the presence of the House and Senate. I hope that the timing of this bill's introduction will only underscore the fact that the time has come to put an end to this archaic practice that we must endure every four years.

Only the President and the Vice President of the United States are currently elected indirectly by the Electoral College—and not by the voting citizens of this country. All other elected officials, from the local officeholder up to United States Senator, are elected directly by the people.

Our bill will replace the complicated electoral college system with the simple method of using the popular vote to decide the winner of a presidential election. By switching to a direct voting system, we can avoid the result of electing a President who failed to win the popular vote. This outcome has, in fact, occurred three times in our history and resulted in the elections of John Quincy Adams (1824), Rutherford B. Hayes (1876), and Benjamin Harrison (1888).

In addition to the problem of electing a President who failed to receive the popular vote, the Electoral College system also allows for the peculiar possibility of having Congress decide the outcome should a presidential ticket fail to receive a majority of the Electoral College votes. Should this happen, the 12th Amendment requires the House of Representatives to elect a President and the Senate to elect a Vice President. Such an occurrence would clearly not be in the best interest of the people, for they would be denied the ability to directly elect those who serve in our highest offices.

This bill will put to rest the Electoral College and its potential for creating contrary and singular election results. And, it is introduced not without historical precedent. In 1969, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a bill calling for the abolition of the Electoral College and putting a system of direct election in its place. Despite passing the House by a vote of 338–70, the bill got bogged down in the Senate where a filibuster blocked its progress.

So, it is in the spirit of this previous action that we introduce legislation to end the Electoral College. I am hopeful that our fellow members on both sides of the aisle will stand with us by cosponsoring this important piece of legislation.

IN MEMORY OF PADDY CLANCY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a music legend, Paddy Clancy of The Clancy Brothers and Tommy Makem. The Clancy Brothers were one of the first Irish musical groups to achieve international notoriety. The Clancy Brothers and Tommy Makem created numerous hit songs in the 1960's.

Paddy Clancy was born in Carrick-on-Suir in Tiperrary county to a family of nine, all of whom were musically inclined. In the 1950's he and his brother Tommy emigrated to New York to pursue acting careers. It seemed the brothers were destined however, to make their mark not as thespians but as musicians. Later, their brother Liam was to join Paddy and Tom, with Tommy Makem they created The Clancy Brothers and Tommy Makem. The Clancy Brothers were known for their incredible harmonies and their energetic concerts. These talents were quickly recognized, and they built a loyal fan base, playing folk clubs in Greenwich Village.

In 1961 they gained national notoriety following an incredible 16-minute set on The Ed Sullivan Show. Their music defied definition. It was both beautiful and raucous at once. They blended American folk music with traditional Irish forms. Paddy was equally capable of singing an Irish drinking song or an elegant ballad. Paddy and the Clancies also performed with Bob Dylan and Barbara Streisand. The Clancies were able to expose Americans to the glorious music of Ireland and still incorporate American folk into their music.

Ladies and gentlemen, the contributions made by Paddy Clancy to music were incredible. I ask you to join me today in remembering this fine musician.

FRANCIS FRANCOIS, A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the retirement of Francis B. Francois; Executive Director of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

Mr. Francois will retire in February after 19 years with AASHTO. In addition, during his tenure he also served on the Executive Committee of the Transportation Research Board.

Francis Francois was born and raised on an Iowa farm and earned an engineering degree at Iowa State University and then went on to earn a law degree at the George Washington University. A registered patent attorney, Mr. Francois resides in Bowie, MD with his wife Eileen where they have raised five children.

Known as a skilled parliamentarian, Mr. Francois served 18 years as an elected official in Prince George's County including nine as a County Councilman. While serving the County, Mr. Francois was a member of many boards and associations including the National Association of Counties and the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Area Transit Authority. Having the vision for a regional approach to solving problems, he earned the reputation of being ''Mr. Goodwrench'' and ''Mr. Fixit.''

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Francois is a person dedicated to solving problems, serving people and setting plans in motion. In 1973, Mr. Francois was named ''Washingtonian of the Year'' by the Washingtonian magazine. He is also well published on such topics as the important role of counties in state government, urban water resources and the responsibility of regional decisionmaking.

Mr. Francois will be missed by AASHTO as well as the people of Prince George's County. Mr. Francois has the vision of an all-purpose reformer. I know my colleagues will join with me in congratulating Francis Francois and his family on his retirement and wishing them all the best as Mr. Francois enters what we all hope will be his most exciting adventures to date.

EDUCATION STANDARDS

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the November elections and impeachment trial have overshadowed a little-known victory for Colorado schools. Congress succeeded in blocking the president's efforts to consolidate national education standards and testing for local schools under the authority of the federal government.

Many parents and educators have been concerned about federalizing education measurements, content, and curriculum since the inception of Goals 2000 in 1994. While the need for standards and accountability is clear, concerns arise when one considers who will set the standards.

Under Goals 2000 legislation, unelected Washington bureaucrats set the standards. Although we hope the government will come up with reasonable and fair education benchmarks, in reality, there are big differences between what Washington experts prescribe and what parents want their kids to be taught.

This dilemma is no better illustrated than in the case of the National History Standards already developed under Goals 2000. Initial standards for American history did not mention some of the most prominent figures of American history including Paul Revere, the Wright Brothers, or George Washington's presidency. They did, however, encourage the study of Mansa Musa, a West African king in the 14th Century.

Not surprisingly, the standards were unduly critical of capitalism and our European founders. Even members of the Clinton administration and the press found the standards objectionable. The standards have subsequently been revised.

Placing government in charge of standards is certain to include not only content requirements—the who, what, where, why, and how of history, science, math and so on—but also subjective standards such as ''students must demonstrate high order thinking or appreciate diversity.'' Suppose students are held to a standard which defies lessons their parents have taught them? What if teachers are forced to teach what they know to be false or counterproductive? Will government curricula replace that which locally elected school boards have chosen?

If adopted, national education priorities will reflect not the community nor parental values, but those of Washington. Given the atmosphere of political and pervasive corruption in Washington, can we afford such influence in our classrooms?

Clearly, standards of behavior and content must be established and enforced at the state and local level by those who are directly elected and accountable to parents and the community. Federal cooption must give way to increased parental authority. Parents must insist lessons and reading materials state facts and relate values they know to be true. They should vote for school board members who hold their convictions and parents should attend board meetings to stay connected to the process.

The authority of parents to direct their children's education remains threatened however, at least until zeal for federalization is extinguished. The 105th Congress voted to keep education standards in hands of parents and the community last year. Congress must continue to stand up for the freedom of local teachers to teach, and the liberty of our children to learn.

SYRACUSE SERVED BY INTRODUCTION OF ''NEW NEWSPAPER'' 100 YEARS AGO

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, one century ago, on January 1, 1899, Central New Yorkers were treated to a new newspaper, The Post-Standard. That paper, one of a half-dozen at the time, remains today. Now it is one of two papers, and the only morning newspaper. I want to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the management and staff at this important milestone.

In particular, I would like to congratulate the top management, Mr. Stephen Rogers and Mr. Stephen A. Rogers, the President and Publisher respectively, for their well-known civic leadership and faithful adherence to the best of principles of journalism in the United States.

With the stewardship of a newspaper comes an important and historic responsibility. In the attached editorial, it is mentioned that a newspaper must be profitable to survive. But the newspaper must be sensitive to its special status in our nation's history. It is protected mightily by the First Amendment, and its right to print news and opinion without fear of retribution from any governmental quarter is unique in the world.

Though we in this body are often at odds with newspapers, we know their value and we know they represent a fundamental tenet of freedom. I have included the attached editorial, which appeared January 1 this year, commemorating the centennial recognition of The Post-Standard.

''CENTENNIAL POST: Your morning paper is 100 today, still pursuing much the same mission. 'A legitimate primary aim of the newspaper is to make money.'

Thus read the editorial that appeared in the inaugural edition of The Post-Standard 100 years ago today. The principle remains true today. As the editorial noted, quoting an editor-senator from Rhode Island: 'A paper that cannot support itself cannot be any service . . . to spend money upon it is like wasting fuel in an attempt to kindle a store.''

The Post-Standard boasts a tradition that extends back more than a century—to The Post, which traces its origins to 1894, and The Standard, dating to 1829, decades before the founding of the City of Syracuse. The consolidation of the two newspapers was described as a victory over 'factionalism' in Onondaga County and the ascendancy of 'a Republican newspaper, dedicated to the public weal along Republican lines, and representing a united Republicanism.'

That partisan bias reflects an earlier era in newspaper publishing when journals were closely allied with parties and candidates. Most newspapers, including The Post-Standard, have long since declared their independence from rigid party orthodoxy, endorsing candidates based on their qualifications, performance and prospects rather than political affiliation. Of course, The Post-Standard continues to represent a region long known as a bastion of Republican fervor.

Although the mission of The Post-Standard through the years has included some hard truth-telling, its editorial page since the beginning has attempted to build and strengthen the community. 'The Post-Standard deems the blessings of life and of work too precious to be frittered away in perpetual contention and fault-finding,' wrote the editor in 1899. 'To prove itself a cheery presence, seeking to say good of men and things always when it can, and consenting to say ill only when it must, shall be this newspaper's consistent aim.'

Hewing to that aim is no easier today than in 1899. There never seems to be a shortage of rascals, ludicrous schemes and conspiracies afoot, no less in the Age of McKinley than the Age of Bill and Monica.

Yet there is something uplifting and inspiring in the long-ago editoralist's aspiration for his paper to 'preach the gospel of

right living and bright living without being suspected of preaching.' He concludes: 'If it can help to lift men or in any degree make better or cheerier or more wholesome the community with which its lot is cast, it will be glad and grateful for its opportunity.'

We remain grateful for that opportunity today.''

TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDER KOULAKOVSKY

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Alexander Koulakovsky and his company ''Nafta Sib'' which has undertaken an exciting new project in Russia. In September of 1998 at the beginning of the new school year, a traditional Christian School opened in Moscow. This school, which was built in one year, was funded by the company ''Nafta Sib,'' which also engages in several charities and projects aimed at restoring old churches, and preserving icons and religious artifacts. Mr. Koulakovsky is currently in the process of putting together a Board of Trustees for the Christian School which will provide financial support and assist in maintaining high standards of education.

This new Christian School is the first since the communist revolution in 1917. Prior to the opening in September, the school would provide occasional lessons in a rented apartment. Two hundred and sixty students are now enrolled in the school, and the erection of the new building will provide the opportunity for one hundred and twenty more students to enroll in this outstanding educational program.

The school has received all of the educational licenses required, and is permitted to conduct lessons in accordance with the state school programs. For the past two years, many graduates were accepted by the most prominent Russian universities. The students are also receiving religious instructions as part of their curriculum. The school has an in-house church which is named after martyr St. Pytor, the archbishop of the Russian Orthodox Church and close advisor to the Russian Patriarch in the 1930s and was killed during the Stalin regime. Regular religious services are conducted for the students. This church is also the first one to be named after a martyr of this century and be recognized by the Russian Orthodox Church.

I traveled to Russia last September, and visited this school on its opening day. I was impressed with the school's curriculum, and with the quality of the students who attended it. As a former school teacher and the father of five, I know that education is the key to the future. For Russia's democracy to succeed, they must look to tomorrow and educate a new generation of Russians in the tenets of freedom. I applaud Alexander Koulakovsky for schooling Russia's leaders of tomorrow and for taking steps to bring quality education and religious freedom to the children of Moscow.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT, DR. ED ELLIOTT

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to pay tribute to Dr. Ed Elliott, who is retiring from his post as President of Central Missouri State University (CMSU), Warrensburg, MO, after serving there for nearly fourteen years.

During Dr. Elliott's tenure at CMSU, the University has seen tremendous growth in enrollment due to Ed's insightful university policies. There has been an expansion of the school's international and distance learning programs, increased admissions standards, a new general studies program, an emphasis in strategic planning and collegial governance, and an integration of a new teaching-learning-assessment model known as Continuous Process Improvement. In addition, numerous building renovations and new construction projects, including the James C. Kirkpatrick Library that will be dedicated in March, have added to student interest in CMSU.

Under Ed's leadership, the University has received dramatically increased state and alumni funding. He has also set academic priorities to develop all curriculum around a strong, liberal arts core, verifying quality through assessment and program-specific accreditation. In addition, he integrated technology into the curriculum and emphasized teacher education. Recently, Central has been named the state's lead institution in professional technology.

Dr. Elliott became Central Missouri State's 12th president on July 1, 1985, after serving for three years as president of Wayne State College in Wayne, NE. He came to Wayne State in 1971 as director of graduate studies and had also served as a dean and vice president before being named president there.

A native of Grain Valley, MO, Ed is a 1960 graduate of William Jewell College and started his teaching career in Harrisonville that same year. He earned his master's degree from Columbia University in 1964, and his doctor of education degree from the University of Northern Colorado in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ed Elliott has had an outstanding career in education, and he will surely be missed by everyone at Central Missouri State University. I wish him and his wife, Sandra, all the best in the days ahead. I am certain that the Members of the House will join me in playing tribute to this fine Missourian.

IN HONOR OF FATHER BENJAMIN H. SKYLES

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Father Benjamin H. Skyles for his outstanding contributions to the community and citizens of Pasadena, Texas.

Father Skyles has served the community of Pasadena through his ministry as Rector of St. Peter's Episcopal Church for 34 years. His social conscience is second to none. Throughout those 34 years, Father Skyles has been a tremendous asset to the Pasadena community. He has worked to protect the environment, care for and educate children and the elderly, train workers, and give a helping hand to hose who are ill or living in poverty. He is also a dedicated husband and father.

His ministry has enhanced the lives of thousands of Pasadena citizens from birth to old-age. St. Peter's Day School has nurtured and educated children for over 30 years. Its After School Program has been a safe-haven for latchkey children for over 25 years. For the elderly, St. Peter's offers low-cost housing. Additionally, St. Peter's has programs to confront social ills, such as alcholism and hunger. St. Peter's also offers English as a second language program, Scouting Programs, and year round GED classes.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Father Skyles began his crusade to protect the environment. He became the first vice-president of the Channel Area Subsidiary Chapter for Help Eliminate Pollution. As Chairman of the Preservation of the Armand Bayou in 1972, he led the way in a complicated battle to save a beautiful natural resource so that it could be enjoyed by future generations. He chaired the Southeast Harris Country Clinic Task Force in 1976 and 1977, which established the Strawberry Clinic and vital health services to the area.

In 1984, Father Skyles learned to speak and read Spanish to reach out to the Hispanic Community. Today, Father Skyles leads four services, including one in Spanish, each Sunday.

Father Skyles founded the North Pasadena Community Outreach Organization. In association with the Episcopal Health Charities and support from St. Peter's parishioners, the Community Outreach Center will house after school programs, a free community clinic, and a state of the art computer clubhouse. The Center, opened in January 1999, is a $1 million investment in the well-being of Pasadena and is among the first church-school-community collaborations in this area.

Father Skyles was recognized as Pasadena's Citizen of the Year in 1973, awarded the Religious Service Award for the Greater Houston area, and appointed as Dean of the East Harris County Convocation of the Episcopal Diocese of Texas in 1993. He has also been a member of the National Conference of Christians and Jews since 1982.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Father Benjamin Skyles for his service to the Pasadena community. He is truly a man of social action. His deeds and contributions will not be forgotten.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO STOP FRANKING ABUSE

HON. RAY LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced H.R. 642, a bill that ends the most pervasive abuse of the frank—sending out unsolicited, self-promotional mass mailings. Today, I am reintroducing this bill. My bill specifically targets franking abuse by cracking down on the use of mass mailings.

Title 39 of the U.S. Code defines the types of mailings that are frankable. Included in this definition are the ''usual and customary'' congressional newsletter, press release or questionnaire. The legislation I am reintroducing would simply strike mailings of this type from the code, thereby disallowing future use of the frank for these purposes.

Other franking reform proposals have centered around dangerous numbers games that leave open the possibility of abuse. Rather than try to settle on some arbitrary formula, my legislation will get to the heart of the problem. Reducing the definition of ''mass'' from 500 to 100, or debating whether the franking allowance should be reduced by 50% or 33% misses the mark. The problem that needs to be addressed is the use of the frank as a campaign tool whose real ''informational'' purpose is to make constituents aware of how deserving we are of reelection.

I urge all members who are interested in real campaign finance reform to carefully consider cosponsoring this bill.

COMMEMORATING THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF SRI LANKA'S INDEPENDENCE FEBRUARY 4, 1999

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my warmest congratulations to the Honorable Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga (President of Sri Lanka), her government, and the people of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, on the occasion of the 51st anniversary of Sri Lanka's independence.

Sri Lanka is a free, independent, and sovereign nation. This unique country has an extensive and rich history, dating back to its flourishing civilization of the 2nd century B.C. Throughout the years, Sri Lanka has developed its economy based on its agriculture, cultivation of semi-precious stones, and manufacturing industries.

Although Sri Lanka experienced invasions and rule by the Portuguese, Dutch, and British, Sri Lanka regained independence through a peaceful and constitutional process in 1948. After 51 years of independence, Sri Lanka has emerged as a key South Asian country committed to democracy, free market economics, and sound social and development policy.

Bi-lateral relations between the U.S. and Sri Lanka have always been strong. To date, Sri Lanka exports nearly $1.5 billion worth of goods to the U.S. and the U.S. exports nearly $370 million worth of goods to Sri Lanka. Trade and investment between the U.S. and Sri Lanka continue to grow, with some of the largest business links with Sri Lanka including companies such as Coca-Cola, Motorola, IBM and Hilton, to name a few.

The formation and development of the Congressional Caucus on Sri Lanka and Sri Lankan-Americans will lead to increased constructive and educated dialogue between the U.S. and Sri Lanka. This will ensure progress between the two countries and the opportunity for Congress to gain greater knowledge and education about Sri Lanka.

As Sri Lanka celebrates 51 years of freedom, this is a wonderful opportunity for us to pay tribute to all of her national heroes and freedom fighters who fought for independence. I am also happy to extend my congratulations to the approximately 100,000 Sri Lankans in the U.S., whose communities have made economic and social impacts throughout various cities across the U.S.

Sri Lanka's rich history of over 2500 years, and its tremendous progress as a nation in 51 years alone, proves Sri Lanka's strength and tremendous potential for the 21st century and years to come. Again. I join in commemoration of Sri Lanka's 51st year of independence and I look forward to working with the Congressional Caucus on Sri Lanka and Sri Lankan Americans, the Sri Lankan community in the U.S., and the government of Sri Lanka.

CONGRATULATIONS TO GOVERNOR MEL CARNAHAN OF MISSOURI

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Governor Mel Carnahan of Missouri is one of five public leaders nationwide to receive an Americans for the Arts' Government Leadership in the Arts award.

Governor Carnahan received the 1999 Americans for the Arts and The United States Conference of Mayors Award for State Arts Leadership. Governor Carnahan was recognized for his outstanding leadership in forging overwhelming bipartisan support of the arts, resulting in unprecedented cultural policy within the state of Missouri. He spearheaded and signed into law a provision designating 100 percent of an existing tax on non-resident athletes and entertainers to build a $100 million state Cultural Trust over the next ten years. A portion of this designated revenue stream will also provide annual state budget increases for the arts. A number of other exemplary initiatives also characterize Governor Carnahan's leadership in the arts. Since taking office in 1993, Governor Carnahan steadily increased the annual appropriations for the arts in the state, ranking Missouri seventh nationally in per capita state funding for the arts. He established the Missouri Fine arts Academy at Springfield, MO, providing 200 high school students each year the opportunity to participate in a three-week residence program to sharpen their artistic talents. His efforts also led to the statewide public school adoption of arts education as a part of their core curriculum.

Nominated by the Missouri Arts Council and Missouri Citizens for the Arts, Governor Carnahan was honored at the Mayor's Arts Gala at Washington, D.C., on January 28, 1999. The event was held in conjunction with the Conference of Mayor's Annual Meeting and the Urban Arts Foundation meeting, a gathering of more than 700 mayors and arts leaders from across the nation.

Governor Carnahan shares this honor with many key national figures including, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, of Massachusetts; Representative MICHAEL CASTLE, of Delaware, Mayor Joseph Riley, of Charleston, S.C.; and Jane Alexander, former NEA Chairperson.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in congratulating Governor Carnahan, and join the Americans for the Arts in commending his good work.

IN HONOR OF MR. FRANK AGUIRRE

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, it is with the utmost pleasure and privilege that I rise today to recognize a wonderful American, Mr. Frank Aguirre, for his inspiration as a dedicated father, a hard-working professional, and a model citizen of our great nation. Frank Aguirre is a fitting example of someone living ''the American dream.''

Born and raised in Sonora, Mexico, Frank came to the United States in 1949 on a student visa. His interest was Engineering, and he attended Los Angeles Trade-Technical College. Later, at East Los Angeles College and California State University, Los Angeles, his major changed to Accounting.

Recognizing the value of hard work and the opportunities it opens in the United States, Frank became a naturalized citizen in 1956. While at East Los Angeles College, he met Rosie Padilla, and they wed in March 1957. They have four children: Victor, Cindy, Becky and Haydee and six grandsons: Alex, Ryan, Austin, Victor, Kellen and Brett.

After attending East Los Angeles College, Frank started as a stock boy in a wall paper hanging company. He worked hard, and his industry was noticed. Frank soon earned a promotion to the accounting department. Anxious to provide for his new family, Frank went on to work as an accountant at Global Van and Storage and opened an income tax business at home.

His dreams were big, and he worked diligently to offer his growing family more than he had ever had growing up. He accepted positions at Pacific Van and Storage, again at Global Van Lines and finally plunged into the moving business himself. Owning his own business had been his goal, but his Sun Moving & Storage company struggled through adversity for a year and a half before closing its doors. Several years later, he was joined by two partners and formed Merit United Moving and Storage. This business brought Frank prosperity, not to mention, high blood pressure.

Perhaps what is most notable about Frank is his love for his family. He worked hard, yet he always had time for his children. They have fond memories of impromptu Saturday mountain day trips, miniature golf games, road trips to Mexico and lots of family get-togethers. Frank is the most fortunate of men—he is deeply loved and respected by his family and peers.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 6, 1999, family and friends—and I am privileged to count myself among them—will gather at a special dinner to pay tribute and celebrate Frank Aguirre's accomplishments as a father, businessman, and model American citizen. It is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me today in saluting this exceptional human being.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

HON. BARBARA CUBIN

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to ensure that the name of Devils Tower National Monument remain unchanged. I introduced this bill during the 104th Congress, the 105th Congress, and rise now to introduce the same bill at the beginning of the 106th Congress. Since the time that this bill was first introduced, I have received numerous positive comments and support from constituents from around the Devils Tower area. In fact, my office has received a petition with an estimated 2,000 names from not only those in and around the Monument, but from all over the country of those concerned with changing the name of this beloved landmark.

For more than 100 years the name ''Devils Tower'' has applied to the geologic formation in my state and has since appeared as such on maps in Wyoming and nationwide. The name was given to the Monument by a scientific team, directed by General George Custer and escorted by Col. Richard Dodge in 1875, and is universally recognized as an important landmark that distinguishes the northeastern part of Wyoming. The Monument has brought a vital tourist industry to that portion of the state due to its unique character and structure.

According to a recent memo, released by the United States Board on Geographic Names, the National Park Service has advised the board that several Native American groups intend to submit a proposal, if one has not already been submitted, to change the name of the Monument. On September 4–6, 1996, former Superintendent of Devils Tower, Deborah Liggett, gave a presentation at the Western States Geographic Names Conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, giving the Native American perspective.

The legislation that I am introducing today on behalf of the state of Wyoming will ensure that the name of the geological formation, historically known as Devils Tower, remain unchanged.

It is my belief and the belief of hundreds of people from around the region that a name change will only bring economic hardship to the tourist industry in the area. I cannot and will not stand idly by and allow that to happen. I commend this bill to my colleagues and ask for their support.

REMEMBER PAOLI!

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the students of the outstanding schools in my Congressional District—Sugartown Elementary School, KD Markley Elementary School, Charlestown Elementary School, and East Goshen Elementary School. The fine students of these schools have contacted me to inform me of an issue which is important to them, to their schools, to their community and to our nation—they are fighting to save the Paoli Battlefield.

The Paoli Battlefield, which is located in my Congressional District, remains one of the only historic sites from the Revolutionary War left untouched since 1777. This land was the site of the ''Paoli Massacre'' in which British troops led by Major General Grey attacked the American Army of Pennsylvania Regiments on the wooded hillside and two fields between what is now Sugartown Road and Warren Avenue. The ensuing battle resulted in at least 52 American deaths and 7 British fatalities. The British night-time bayonet charge was aided by the fact that Americans were silhouetted against the light of their campfires. Some American troops panicked and fled and general disorder spread throughout the American line. British dragoons, arriving on the field, shattered the American column and pursued retreating Americans as far as Sugartown Road. Only the more disciplined American soldiers escaped the original onslaught unscathed, but a following British assault completed the rout.

The Paoli Massacre was part of the Revolutionary War's Philadelphia Campaign, a chapter of the war that witnessed the occupation of Philadelphia and the famed American encampment at Valley Forge in the winter of 1777–78. The first two American attempts to stop the British invasion that Fall were the Battle of Brandywine, September 11, 1777, and the unsuccessful Battle of the Clouds, September 16, 1777. The Paoli Massacre was part of the third effort to contain British General William Howe's advance on Philadelphia.

In an effort to save the Paoli Battlefield, I will be introducing the P.A.T.R.I.O.T. Act—Preserve America's Treasures of the Revolution for Independence for Our Tomorrow. Passage of this legislation will forever insure that the sacrifice made by our nation's first veterans will be remembered. This legislation will also protect the Brandywine Battlefield. The Battle at Brandywine was the most significant battle of the Philadelphia campaign. My bill further memorializes this campaign by authorizing the Superintendent of Valley Forge National Historical Park to enter into an agreement with the Valley Forge Historical Society to build a museum which would house the world's largest collection of Revolutionary War artifacts and memorabilia, including the tent in which General Washington slept at Valley Forge.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize the outstanding young patriots of my district who have made their voices heard in the fight to preserve this piece of our nation's history. The students of these schools sent me almost five hundred letters, pictures, and banners with their plea for this body to ''Remember Paoli!''—this small piece of land that is so important to their communities. As a former school teacher and a father of five, I am heartened by their dedication and commitment to this cause. The future of America lies with our youth, and with youngsters like these, I am confident that America's future will be bright.

I would like to congratulate these young patriots of my district, and thank them for taking part in this campaign to preserve the history of the Revolutionary War. I would also like to thank their teachers and parents who also sent me letters, and taught these students that their involvement could make a difference. I would like to include the letters of Melissa Clark, who is in the first grade at KDMarkely; Bonnie Hughes-Sobbi, mother of a fourth grader at KDMarkely; Bess McCadden, who is in the fourth grade at Charlestown Elementary; and Catherine Wahl, who is in the fourth grade at the Sugartown School, for the record so that my colleagues can also appreciate them.

JANUARY 6, 1998.

DEAR SIR, I am writing to you to ask you to save the Paoli Battlefield. We need to remember the men who fought to make our country free. Please do not build houses on the Paoli Battlefield.

Sincerely,

MELISSA CLARK.

JANUARY 5, 1999.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WELDON: It has come to my attention, through my daughter's fourth grade class, that a part of our local history is being threatened by ''progress''. The site to which I refer is the Paoli Battlefield, located in Malvern, PA.

Our children are being taught the importance of this site in their local history lessons and are also being taught to respect sites such as this for their intrinsic and irreplaceable value. We should be willing to support our lessons to our children by protecting the Paoli Battlefield from development.

Thank you for your efforts in support of protecting this site, hopefully with permanent registry as an historic landmark. I will be happy to lend any assistance, as I am able, to further this cause.

Very truly yours,

BONNIE HUGHES-SABBI.

DECEMBER 22, 1998.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WELDON: People know that it is wrong to build something on historical land. Valley Forge Park is part of our history, so we should also save the site of the Paoli Massacre Battlefield. My classmates and I have been studying it, and I think that building things on historical land is destructive. If General Anthony Wayne were here, he would do all he could to stop people from building something on the ground of our past.

Don't let people build on the site of the Paoli Massacre Battlefield! Please save it!

Sincerely,

BESS MCCADDEN.

DECEMBER 11, 1998.

DEAR MR. WELDON: I think that you should stop this craziness because it should remain a burial ground. Paoli isn't very popular except for the Paoli Battlefield. That puts us in the battlefield book. It is a historical sight [sic]. It's disrespectful to know down a memorial battlefield. One of my ancestors was buried at that battlefield there so I care very deeply about this battlefield.

CATHERINE WAHL.

DEVOTED EMPLOYEES SAVINGS LIVES

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on Christmas Day, the New York Times ran a wonderful article that tells a story about the careful and thoughtful work of a cadre of employees at the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) who test toys to ensure they do not injure or kill children. One CPSC employee, Bob Hundemer, who works in CPSC's engineering laboratory, calls his toy testing work a ''labor of love.'' The article goes on to describe

some of the testing methods used to determine if certain toys are risks to children. The article quotes Robert Garrett, acting director of the lab: "I walk out of here every day thinking we're made the world a better place," adding, "I am not sure every government agency can say that."

As the new Chairman of the VA–HUD Independent Agency Appropriations Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the CPSC, I am delighted to read about Federal employees who are so devoted to the mission of their agency.

I commend this article to my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, December 25, 1998]

IN PARADISE OF TOYS, THE GAME PLAN IS TO SAVE LIVES

WASHINGTON, Dec. 24.—In the Washington suburb of Gaithersburg, Md., far from the intrigue of the capital and even farther from the North Pole, employees of the Consumer Product Safety Commission test toys of every description for dangers and defects.

Bob Hundemer, an engineering technician, has tested toys at the agency for two decades. He has cultivated a scrupulous and unforgiving eye for potential hazards and quickly detects whether a toy is up to standard—whether it is safe as well as inviting beneath the Christmas tree.

''This is a killer,'' Mr. Hundemer said, pointing to a fluorescent yellow rattle with an unusually thin stem and tiny ball at the tip. ''The end could get jammed in a baby's mouth so easily and cause choking.''

Mr. Hundemer's office is a 5-year-old's paradise. A bookcase overflowing with brightly colored tops, dolls, toy cars, and jacks-in-the-box covers the back wall. A sign reading ''Caution: Adults at Play'' adorns his door.

Robert Garrett, the acting director of the engineering laboratory, said: ''After years in the private sector, I realized that I could get a job with the Government doing about the same thing. I thought I'd died and gone to heaven.''

At the annual Toy Fair in February, giant manufacturers like Mattel and Hasbro, as well as small toy companies from around the country, gather in New York City to display their wares. Representatives from the commission attend the show and examine all the new toys. They discuss potential problems with the manufacturers and then work with them to insure that potential hazards are eliminated.

''The big retailers don't want to recall their products,'' said Kathleen P. Begala, the commission's director of public affairs. ''With mailings and bad press, it's a very expensive process for them, and so there is an incentive to cooperate with us.''

Mindful that injuries kill more children than any illnesses, the agency, which has requested just over $57 million for its 2000 budget, performs four tests on toys it reviews.

One, the template test, examines small parts of a toy that could catch in a child's throat and affect breathing. Mr. Hundemer uses a truncated cylinder that represents an average child's mouth and throat. Any piece of a toy that fits into the cylinder is considered dangerous.

The sharp-edge test uses a special tape to indicate whether any side of an object could cut the skin.

The force test determines how easily parts of the stuffed animals, like eyes and noses, can be removed from the toy. Mr. Hundemer users an instrument that resembles pliers to grasp the eye of a stuffed toy, for example, and applies 15 pounds of pressure, about the strength of a 2-year-old. He tries to rip off the part for about 20 seconds.

In the impact test, a toy is dropped four and a half feet to test durability. ''We use something pretty cheap,'' Mr. Hundemer said. ''It's called gravity.'' If pieces of the toy break off, and the shards of plastic fail the template test, the toy is considered not safe.

The commission officially approves toys that survive the tests.

Like veterans telling war stories, Ms. Begala and Mr. Hundemer recalled some of the most troublesome toys. They remembered the Cabbage Patch doll accused of ''eating'' a child's hair, the Chinese slap bracelets made with cloth and sharp metal that could cut a child and Woody, the cowboy with plastic spurs that had sharp edges and a small plastic badge.

Mr. Hundemer added that this year's hot toy, the Furby, was safe.

''People shopping for toys need to be sure that toys do not contain parts smaller than their child's fist,'' Mr. Hundemer said.

Mr. Garrett mused happily on his career.

''I walk out of here every day thinking we've made the world a better place,'' he said.

Then, pausing, he added, ''I am not sure every government agency can say that.''

CONGRESSIONAL COMMISSION ON SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of the "Servicemembers and Veterans Transition Services Improvement Act of 1999." This measure contains the improvements in benefits and services for America's service members and veterans recommended by the Congressional Commission on Servicemembers and Veterans Transition Assistance.

By way of background, the Commission was established by Public Law 94–275 and was directed to review the programs and benefits designed to facilitate the transition from military service to civilian life for those who have served in uniform. The Commission was encouraged to be thorough in its analysis of existing programs and to be bold in its recommendations for program changes and improvements. Without question, the Commission has met those challenges and transmitted to Congress a meticulous examination of transition programs in place today and an impressive list of recommendations to improve and enhance those existing programs and benefits.

Many of the Commission's proposals, particularly those related to veterans' education and training, can serve as a blueprint for the 106th Congress. Of particular interest to me is the recommendation to significantly increase and expand educational opportunities under the Montgomery GI Bill. I agree with the Commission's statement that education ". . . is the most valuable benefit our Nation can offer the men and women whose military service preserves our liberty." I know from first hand experience the benefits of these educational benefits and I look forward to discussing this and the Commission's other initiatives in depth during upcoming hearings.

I want to commend Tony Principi, chairman of the Transition Commission, and all of the Commissioners for their excellent service, dedication, and hard work on behalf of America's servicemembers and veterans.

There will be those who will say the recommendations made by the Transition Commission are too costly. If we value a strong defense and believe our Armed Forces and society in general will reap real benefits from the service of our best and brightest in our military, we cannot afford not to improve the transition benefits we offer to those who serve our nation in uniform.

CONGRESSMAN PETE STARK PROFILED IN U.U. WORLD

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following remarks for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The magazine U.U. World, which is published by the Unitarian Universalist Church, recently published a profile of Congressman PETE STARK, my long-time Ways and Means colleague. The article highlights some of Congressman STARK's concerns about the effects of welfare reform. I believe many of us share those concerns. I commend this article to my colleagues' attention.

[From the U.U. World, Jan./Feb. 1999]

A STARK ASSESSMENT: U.S. REP. PETE STARK SPEAKS OUT ON HEALTH CARE AND WELFARE REFORM

(By David Reich)

When President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, more commonly known as the welfare reform bill, U.S. Rep. Fortney Pete Stark didn't make a secret of his displeasure. ''The president sold out children to get reelected. He's no better than the Republicans,'' fumed Stark, a longtime Unitarian Universalist whose voting record in Congress regularly wins him 100 percent ratings from groups like the AFL–CIO and Americans for Democratic Action.

One of the Congress's resident experts on health and welfare policy, the northern California Democrat has earned a reputation for outspokenness, often showing a talent for colorful invective, not to say name-calling. First elected to the House as an anti-Vietnam War ''bomb-thrower'' (his term) in 1972, Stark has called Clinton healthcare guru Ira Magaziner ''a latter-day Rasputin'' and House Speaker Newt Gingrich ''a messianic megalomaniac.'' When the American Medical Association lobbied Congress to raise Medicare payments to physicians, Stark, who chaired the Health Subcommittee of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, called them ''greedy troglodytes,'' unleashing a $600,000 AMA donation to Stark's next Republican opponent.

''I've gotten in a lot of trouble speaking my mind,'' the congressman admits with a rueful smile. For all his outspokenness on politics, Stark appears to have a droll sense of himself, and he tends to talk softly, his voice often trailing off at the ends of phrases or sentences.

Back in the 1960s, as a 30-something banker and nominal member of the Berkeley, California, Unitarian Universalist congregation, Stark upped his commitment to the U.U. movement after his minister asked him to give financial advice to Berkeley's Starr King School for the Ministry. ''I think I was

sandbagged,'' he theorizes. After a day of poring over Starr King's books (''The place was going broke,'' he says), he was invited by their board chair to serve as the seminary's treasurer. ''I said, 'Okay,'" Stark recalls. ''He said, 'Then you have to join the board,' 'I said, I don't know, I guess I could.'"

The UUing of Pete Stark culminated at his first board meeting, when the long-serving board chair announced his resignation, and Stark, to his astonishment, found himself elected to take the old chair's place. ''There I was,'' he reminisces, his long, slim body curled up in a wing chair in a corner of his Capitol Hill office. ''And I presided over a change in leadership and then spent a lot of time raising a lot of money for it and actually in the process had a lot of fun and met a lot of terrific people.''

The World spoke with Stark in early October, as rumors of the possible impeachment of a president swirled around the capital. But aside from a few pro forma remarks about the presidential woes (''His behavior is despicable, but nothing in it rises to the level of impeachment''), our conversation mainly stuck to healthcare and welfare the areas where Stark has made his mark in government.

World: You have strong feelings about the welfare reform bill. Do the specifics of the bill imply a particular theory of poverty?

PS: They imply that if you're poor, it's your fault, and if I'm not poor, it's because I belong to the right religion or have the right genes. That the poor are poor by choice, and we ought not to have to worry about them. It's akin to how people felt about lepers early in this century.

World: Does the welfare reform law also imply any thinking about women and their role in the world?

PS: Ronald Reagan for years defined welfare cheat as a black woman in a white ermine cape driving a white El Dorado convertible and commonly seen in food checkout lines using food stamps to buy caviar and filet mignon and champagne and then getting in her car and driving on to the next supermarket to load up again. And I want to tell you she was sighted by no less than 150 of my constituents in various supermarkets back in my district. They were all nuts. They were hallucinating. But they believed this garbage.

And then you've got the myth that, as one of my Republican neighbors put it, ''these welfare woman are nothing but breeders''—a different class of humanity.

World: You raised the idea of belonging to ''the right religion.'' Do these views of poor people, and poor women in particular, come out of people's religious training?

PS: No, my sense of what makes a reactionary is that it's a person younger than me, a 40- or 50-year-old man who comes to realize he isn't going to become vice president of his firm. His kids aren't going to get into Stanford or Harvard or make the crew team. His wife is not very attractive-looking. His sex life is gone, and he's run to flab and alcohol.

World: So it's disappointment.

PS: Yes. And when the expectations you've been brought up with are not within your grasp, you look around for a scapegoat. ''It's these big-spending congressmen'' or ''It's these women who have children just to get my tax dollar. The reason I'm not rich is that I pay so much in taxes, the reason my children don't respect me is that the moral fabric has been torn apart by schools that fail to teach religion.''

And then there's a group that I've learned to call the modern-day Pharisees, people from the right wing of the Republican party who have decided the laws of the temple are the laws of the land.

World: Then religion figures into it, after all.

PS: Oh, yeah, but to me that's a religion of convenience. In my book those are people with little intellect who listen to the Bible on the radio when they're driving the tractor or whatever. But I do credit them with being seven-day-a-week activists, unlike so many other Christians.

World: Going back to the welfare reform bill itself, how does it comport with the values implied by the UU Principles, especially the principle about equity and compassion in social relations?

PS: If you assume we have some obligation to help those who can't help themselves, if that's a role of society, then supporters of the welfare reform bill trample on those values. ''I'm not sure that's the government's job,'' they would say. ''It's the church's job, or it's your job. Just don't take my money. I give my cleaning lady food scraps for her family and my castaway clothes to dress her children. I put money in the poor box. What more do you want?''

The bill we reported out, the president's bill, was motivated by the belief that paying money to people on public assistance was, one-squandering public funds and, two preventing us from lowering the taxes on the overtaxed rich. I used to try and hammer at some of my colleagues, and occasionally, when I could show them they were harming children, they would relent a little, or at least they would blush.

World: Did you shame anyone into changing his or her vote or making some concessions on the language of the bill?

PS: We got a few concessions but not many. Allowing a young woman to complete high school before she had to look for a job because she'd be more productive with a high school education—you could maybe shame them into technicalities like that. But beyond that they were convinced that if you just got off the dole and went to work, you would grow into—a Republican, I suppose.

World: It's been pointed out often that many people who supported the bill believe, as a matter of religious conviction, that women should be at home raising kids, yet the bill doesn't apply this standard to poor women. Can the bill's supporters resolve that apparent contradiction?

PS: Yes. I hate to lay out for you what you're obviously missing. The bill's supporters would say that if a woman had been married and the family has stayed together as God intended, with a father around to bring home the bacon, then the mother could stay home and do the household chores and raise the children. They miss the fact that they haven't divided the economic pie in such a manner that the father can make enough money to support mother and child.

Now, I do think young children benefit grandly, beyond belief, by having a mother in full-time attendance for at least the first four years of life. But given the reality that a single mother has to work, you have to move to the idea of reasonable care for that mother's child. And by reasonable care I do not mean a day care worker on minimum wage who's had four hours of instruction and doesn't know enough to wash his or her hands after changing diapers and before feeding the kid. Or who's been hired without a criminal check to screen out pediphiles. Because it's that bad.

World: Did the welfare system as it existed before the 1996 bill need reform?

PS: Sure. The Stark theory—which I used to peddle a thousand years ago, when I chaired the House Public Assistance Committee—is that people have to be allowed to fail and try again and again—and again. We can't let people starve, but they've got to learn to budget money and not spend it all on frivolous things. So I'd have cashed out many of the benefits. For instance, instead of giving you food stamps worth 50 bucks, why don't I give you the 50 bucks? The theory behind food stamps was that you'd be so irresponsible you'd buy caviar and wine and beer and cigarettes and not have any money left for tuna fish and rice. And that kind of voucher doesn't give you the chance to learn.

We did a study, good Lord, in the 1960s in Contra Costa County, California. Our church was involved, along with the United Crusade charity, and some federal money went into it, too. We identified in the community some people who had never held a regular job—other women who had done day work or men who were nominally, say, real estate brokers but hadn't sold a house in years. And in this study we took maybe 20 of them and made them community organizers—without much to do but with a office and a job title. All this was to study what happened to those people when they had regular hours and a regular paycheck, having come from a neighborhood where people didn't necessarily leave for the office every morning at 7:30.

And we found that these people suddenly became leaders, that people in the neighborhood came to them for advice. They even talked about going into politics, just because of the fact that they fit into the structure and what that did for their self-image and their neighbors image of them.

Another part of that program: in the poorest parts of our community people were given loans to start new stores—wig shops and fingernail parlors and liquor stores and sub shops and soul food places and barbecue pits. The stores had little economic value but lots of social value. They were places where children of the families who owned them went after school, and people didn't sleep or piss in the doorways or leave their bottles there because the street with these shops became a community that had some cohesion—though when the funds were cut back, it reverted to boarded-up shops.

World: Are you suggesting that this kind of program night work for current welfare recipients?

PS: Absolutely. I don't believe for a minute that 99 percent of people, given the opportunity, wouldn't work. They see you and me and whoever—the cop on the beat, the school teacher, the factory worker, the sales clerk—going to work. People want to be part of that. It's just like kids won't stay home from school for very long. That's where the other kids are, that's where they talk about their social lives. That's where the athletics are. And so it is with adults: they want to be part of the fun, of the action.

Inefficient as some people's labor may be, as a last resort, bring them to work in the government. It would be so much more efficient than having to pay caseworkers and making sure they're spending their welfare checks the right way. Give them a living wage, damn it. They'll learn. And given time, their efficiency as economic engines will improve.

World: Do you have a clear sense of how the changes in the system are affecting welfare clients so far?

PS: No, and I'm having a major fight with our own administration over it. Olivia Golden, who until recently headed up the family, youth, and children office in the Health and Human Services Department, sat there blithely and told me, ''Welfare reform is working!'' I said, ''Olivia, what do you mean it's working?'' ''Well, people all over the country have told me—'' ''How many?'' ''Maybe 12.'' I said, ''Are you kidding? You've talked to maybe 12 people?''

They won't give us the statistics. They say, ''The states don't want to give them to

us.'' All we know—the only figures we have—is how many people are being ticked off the rolls. What's happened to the people who leave the rolls? What's happened to the kids? The number of children in poverty is starting to go up—substantially, even when their family has gotten off welfare and is working.

World: One of the arguments in favor of the welfare bill involved ''devolution.'' Do you accept the general proposition that states can provide welfare better than the federal government?

PS: Well, the states were always doing it, under federal guidelines. Now we've taken away the guidelines and given the states money with some broad limitations.

I have no problem with local communities running public assistance programs. They're much closer to the people and much more concerned, and somebody from Brooklyn doesn't know squat about what's needed in Monroe County, Wyoming, where an Indian reservation may be the sole source of your poverty population. But I want some standards—minimum standards for day care, minimum standards for job training. I'm talking about support standards, not punishment standards.

World: And the current bill has only punishment standards?

PS: Basically. It's a threat, it's a time limit, it's a plank to walk.

World: What about the idea that welfare reform would save the government money? How much money has been saved?

PS: I can get the budget figures for you, but I suspect we haven't saved one cent. I mean, do homeless people cost us? What is the cost in increased crime? We're building jails like they're going out of style. Does the welfare bill have anything to do with that? I don't know, but I wouldn't make the case that they're unrelated.

So if you take the societal costs—are we saving? And it's such a minuscule part of the budget anyway. It's like foreign aid. I could get standing applause in my district by saying, ''I don't like foreign aid.'' And if I ask people what we're spending on it, they say, ''Billions, billions!'' We spend diddly on foreign aid. The same is true for welfare. Any one of the Defense Department's bomber programs far exceeds the total cost of welfare.

World: Is there any hope of improving the country's welfare system in the short or medium term, given that the 1996 bill did have bipartisan support?

PS: It had precious little bipartisan support, but it had the president. No, I don't think we're apt to make changes. And what's fascinating is that with the turn in global events our economy may have peaked out. We may be heading down. And while this welfare reform may have worked in a booming economy, when the economy turns down, those grants to the states won't begin to cover what we'll need.

World: If Congress isn't likely to do anything, what can people in religious communities do to make sure the system is humane?

PS: They can get active at the state and local level. Various states may do better things or have better programs or more humane programs. And the lower the level of jurisdiction, the easier it is to make the change, whether it's in local schools or local social service delivery programs.

The other thing is to take the lead in going to court. It's the courts that have saved us time after time—in education, women's rights, abortion rights. We need to look for those occasions where a welfare agency does something illegal—and there will be some—and take up the cause of children whose civil rights are being violated.

World: Let's shift over to healthcare. In the 1992 presidential campaign, the idea of a universal healthcare plan was seen as very popular with the voters. Why did the Clinton health plan fail?

PS: I'd like to blame it on Ira Magaziner and all the monkey business that went on at the White House—the secret meetings and this hundred-person panel that ignored the legislative process. Their proposal became discredited before it ever got to Congress. We paid no attention to it. My subcommittee wrote our own bill, which accomplished what the president said he wanted. It provided universal coverage, it was budget-neutral, and it was paid for on a progressive basis.

World: And it did that by expanding Medicare?

PS: Basically it required every employer to pay, in effect, an increase in the minimum wage, to provide either a payment of so much an hour or add insurance. And if they couldn't buy private insurance at a price equivalent to the minimum wage increase, they could buy into Medicare—at no cost to the government on a budget-neutral basis. But the bill allowed private insurance to continue, with the government as insurer of last resort.

We got it out of committee by a vote or two, but then on the House floor, we couldn't get any Republican votes. They unified against it, so we never had the votes to bring it up.

The Harry and Louise ads beat us badly. People were convinced that government regulation was bad, per se. It was just the beginning of the free market in medical care, which we're seeing the culmination of now in the for-profit HMOs and the Medicare choice plans that are collapsing like houses of cards all over the country. But back in 1993 the idea was ''Let the free market decide HMOs will be created. They'll make a profit, they'll give people what they want. People will vote with their feet and the free market will apply its wonderful choice.''

World: Did that bill's defeat doom universal healthcare for a long time to come?

PS: It certainly doomed it for this decade, and things are only getting worse. We now have a couple of million more people uninsured. We're up to about 43.5 million uninsured, and we were talking about 41 million back in 1993. And people on employer-paid health plans are either paying higher copays or getting more and more restricted benefits. Plus early retirement benefits are disappearing, so that if people retire before 65, they often can't get affordable insurance. It will have to get just a little worse before we'll have a popular rebellion. We're seeing in the managed care bill of rights issue where people are today. To me, that the most potent force out there in the public.

World: In both areas we've been discussing assistance to the poor and health insurance, the US government is taking less responsibility than virtually all the other industrial democracies.

PS: Why take just democracies? Even in the fascist countries, everybody's got healthcare. We are the only nation extant that doesn't offer healthcare to everybody.

Take our neighbor Canada. There is no more conservative government on this continent, north or south. I've heard the wealthiest right-wing Canadian government minister say, ''I went to private prep schools, but it never would it occur to us Canadians to jump the queue, go to the head of the line in healthcare. We believe healthcare is universal. Now, we fight about spending levels, we fight about the bureaucracy, and we fight about how we're working the payment system.'' But they don't question it.

World: In the US we do question it—the right to healthcare, that is, Why?

PS: It's connected with this idea of independence. Where do we get the militas from, and those yahoos who run around in soldier suits and shoot paint guns at each other?

World: The frontier ethos?

PS: Maybe, maybe. And the American Medical Association is not exactly exempt from blame. The physicians are the most antigovernment group of all. They're the highest paid profession in America by far, and so they are protecting their economic interests. Though the government now looks a little better to them than the insurance industry because they have more control over government than over the insurance companies.

Look, the country was barely ready for Medicare when that went through. It just made it through Congress by a few votes. There are some of us who would have liked to see it include nursing home or long-term convalescent care. That can only be done through social insurance, but people won't admit it. They say, ''There's got to be a better way.'' It's a mantra. On healthcare: ''There's got to be a better way.'' Education: ''There's got to be a better way.''

They've yet to say it for defense though. I'm waiting for them to privatize the Defense Department and turn it over to Pinkerton. Although in a way they have. There's a bunch of retired generals right outside the Beltway making millions of dollars of government money training the armed forces in Bosnia. I was there and what a bunch of crackpots! They've got these former drill sergeants over there, including people out to try to start wars on our ticket.

World: A few more short questions. Have the culture and atmosphere of the House changed in the years since you arrived here?

PS: Yes, though I spent 22 years in the majority and now four in the minority, so I may just be remembering good old days that weren't so good. Back when I was trying to end the Vietnam War, I was in just as much of a minority as I am now, and I didn't have a subcommittee chair to give me any power or leverage.

On the other hand, look at the country now. Look at tv talk shows—they argue and shout and scream, and then they call it journalism. Maybe we're just following in their footsteps.

World: Is it is spiritual challenge for you to have to work with, or at least alongside, people with whom you disagree, sometimes violently?

PS: Yes, and I don't do a very good job. My wife says, ''When you retire, why don't you become an ambassador?'' And I say, ''Diplomacy doesn't run deep in these genes.'' But it's tough if you internalize your politics and believe in them.

Still, I like legislating—to make it all work to take all the pieces that are pushing on you, to make the legislation fit, to accommodate and accomplish a goal. It really makes the job kind of fascinating. I once reformed the part of the income tax bill that applies to life insurance, and that's one of the most arcane and complex parts of the tax bill. It was fun—bringing people together and getting something like that. And actually, writing that health bill was fun.

But not now. We don't have any committee hearings or meetings anymore. It's all done in back rooms. Under the Democratic leadership we used to go into the back room, but there were a lot of us in the room. Now they write bills in the speaker's office and avoid the committee system. I mean, it's done deals. We're not doing any legislating, or not very much.

World: Do you think about quitting?

PS: No, I don't think about quitting. I'd consider doing something else, but I don't know what that is. Secretary of health and human services? Sure, but don't hold your breath until I'm offered the job. Even in the

minority, being in the Congress is fascinating, and as long as my health and facilities hold out. . . . I mean, I'm not much interested in shuffleboard or model airplanes.

IN TRIBUTE TO BILL SEREGI

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad responsibility to advise our colleagues of the recent passing of an outstanding American, a remarkable individual, and a tremendous philanthropist.

Bill Seregi was born in Budapest, Hungary in 1903. Although as a youth he aspired to a career in engineering, he found this avenue closed to him by the blatant anti-Semitism which permeated that part of Europe at that time. Instead, Bill went into the jewelry trade at a young age, and soon was considered a master of that trade in his home nation.

In 1928, he married the lovely Lily and thus began a marriage which lasted seventy years. The union between Bill and Lily is an inspiration to all of us.

By 1939, Bill and Lily were considered leading citizens of Budapest. That year, World War II struck Europe like a dreaded thunderstorm, and no life was left untouched. As devout Jews, Bill and Lily found themselves targeted by the oncoming Nazi hordes. Bill was sentenced to a concentration camp. Torn from his family, Bill was forced to toil at slave labor in the Nazi labor camps. It was only his hope of reuniting with his family which kept Bill alive during the horrible years of the Holocaust.

After the defeat of Nazi Germany, Bill was reunited with Lily and they brought together the survivors of their family. Bill and Lily spent the post-war years trying to rebuild their shattered lives. But the respite was short-lived. Hungary was soon taken over by Soviet dictators and, in many ways, life was no better than under Nazi domination. In 1951, Bill and Lily emigrated to the United States to start a new life, for themselves and their family.

Once he had emigrated to the U.S., Bill found the peace and freedom which he so vainly sought all of his life. No freedom did he cherish more than his right to worship according to his own beliefs and the beliefs of his faith. Bill learned very soon after arriving in America about Bnai Zion, the brotherhood organization of people desiring a homeland for Jews in Palestine. Bill soon threw most of his energies into the many philanthropic works of Bnai Zion. He became President of one of the local chapters of Bnai Zion, the Theodore Herzl Lodge.

Bill Seregi devoted a great part of his life to the B'nai Zion Foundation, as well as to various fund raising efforts for the State of Israel. Bill earned a name for himself throughout the greater New York region, and became highly respected as a superb spokesperson. He was active in the America Israel Friendship League, which cemented a good relationship between our nations. Bill also established a ''Gift of Giving Scholarship'' award presented to students of New York City high schools.

In presenting the scholarship to the worthy students, Bill Seregi summed up his philosophy of life to them:

''a. Help those in need
b. Fight against intolerance
c. Study more than you want to
d. Be grateful to those who teach you; and
e. Knowledge is your fortune.''

A few years ago, Bill Seregi was the recipient of the Dr. Harris J. Levine Award, the highest honor possible from the Bnai Zion organization. At that time, Norman G. Levine, the son of the philanthropist for whom the award was named, stated: ''There could not possibly be any better candidate or anyone more dedicated to the same principles as my father than Bill.''

Bill left us on Dec. 16th, 1998, at his golden age of 95. He leaves behind his widow Lily, to whom he had been married for more than 70 years. He also leaves his children, Ann and Larry, his grandchildren Ellie and Lewis, and many loving nieces and nephews and their families.

By fleeing the tyranny of Communism in 1951, Bill Seregi demonstrated that it is never too late for any individual to seek freedom, liberty and justice for themselves and their families. By continuing his career as a master of the art of jewelry as well as his advocation of Zionist and philanthropic causes, Bill underscores the old adage that if you want something done, ask a busy person. No one will ever fully know the suffering Bill and Lily experienced under both Nazism and Communism, and no one will ever know how many lives they touched and how many people were positively impacted by their decision to help others rather than curse their own misfortune.

Mr. Speaker, our condolences are extended to the many loved ones Bill leaves behind, and the countless individuals who were inspired by this outstanding human being.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. JAMES CALVIN PIGG

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, It is my distinct privilege to rise today to honor one of Texas' finest agricultural journalists, Mr. James Calvin Pigg, editor of the Southwest Farm Press magazine in Dallas, Texas. Calvin has served as editor since the magazine's founding in 1974, faithfully reporting agricultural news for Southwest Farm Press for 25 years. A native Texan, Calvin has practiced his craft on radio, television, and print coverage of agriculture in the Southwest since 1955. After more than 40 years on the Texas and Oklahoma agricultural scene, his hands-on reporting style keeps stories fresh and interesting Reporting the dynamic and ever-changing events within the agriculture industry is an important duty since farmers and ranchers across the Southwest depend on this information.

In addition to his Farm Press duties, he has served as a member of the Dean's Advisory Committee for Texas Tech University's College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources and has received the college's prestigious Gerald W. Thomas Outstanding Agriculturists Award in 1985. His unsurpassed dedication and genuine concern for the South Plains agricultural industry is legendary. He also was honored for his distinguished service to Texas agriculture by the Professional Agricultural Workers of Texas in 1980. Calvin was the president of the Dallas Agricultural Club in 1989, and his active involvement in various professional and honor societies proves he truly is a friend of agriculturists.

It is with great honor that I recognize Mr. James Calvin Pigg on his commitment to the agricultural industry and his tireless dedication and service to Southwest Farm Press.

LEGISLATION TO BENEFIT THE AGRICULTURE COMMUNITY NATIONWIDE

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced several pieces of legislation that I believe should be considered during the 106th Congress. These bills represent a broad array of policy initiatives that will benefit the agriculture community nationwide.

AGRICULTURAL WATER CONSERVATION ACT

Over the past few years I have read countless articles on the need to conserve water and the role federal government has with this mission. While discussing water conservation methods with farmers in my district, I found cost was their overriding concern. The outlays required to implement water conservation systems, (i.e., drip irrigation, sprinkler systems, ditch lining) are a tremendous burden on the agriculture industry. While I firmly believe most agriculture interests are genuinely concerned about conserving water, cost has crippled the ability to implement conservation methods on farms.

The Agricultural Water Conservation Act is not a mandate for expensive water conservation systems, it is a tool and an option for farmers. Specifically, it will allow farmers to receive up to a 30% tax credit for the cost of developing and implementing water conservation plans on their farm land with a cap of $500 per acre. The tax credit could be used primarily for the cost of materials and equipment. This legislation would not require them to change their irrigation practices. However, it would allow those farmers who want to move toward a more conservation approach of irrigation but cannot afford to do it during these tough economic times.

CANNED PEACH RESOLUTION

For almost two decades, the European Union (EU) has been heavily subsidizing its canned fruit industry to the detriment of California cling peach producers and processors. Despite a Section 301 investigation, a favorable GATT ruling against the EU, and a subsequent US/EU agreement intended to contain the problem, the EU canned fruit regime has in fact grown considerably more disruptive over time. In recent years, EU canned fruit subsidies have greatly increased (now totaling between $160–$213 million annually), as has injury to the California industry in every one of its markets.

The resolution I introduced today details the problem, identifies it to be of priority concern, and calls for corrective action. I hope by introducing this resolution we can highlight this dispute as a trade priority, underscore that relief

is long-overdue and convey a message to the EU that its canned fruit subsidy excesses must be discounted.

LAND FOR YOUNG FARMERS AND RANCHERS

We are well aware of the migration away from rural areas in part due to the difficulty young people encounter to stay in farming. I believe providing young farmers the opportunity to discover, first-hand, the changing technologies agriculture presents and to keep them interested in agriculture is a vital role for Congress. This legislation will help advance young people's interest in farming much like the USDA's Beginning Farmer Program.

Specifically, this bill will allow education institutions and non-profit organizations that are involved in teaching farming to young people the ability to acquire land held by USDA. Currently this ability is available, however, these specific groups are put at the bottom of the list of people who are eligible to bid for the land. Under current law, these groups are bidding against interested parties such as real estate investors, land speculators, and business groups, all of which could easily increase the price of the land making it financially impossible for organizations interested in keeping the land in farming. My legislation will provide these nonprofits and educational institutions the same purchasing rights to USDA land as beginning farmers. Under the bill, these groups must be involved in teaching young people farming practices they can use to start their own farming practice. Given the current age of our farm and ranch population, I believe the ability for young people to start a farming or ranching operations remains a top priority of the agriculture community. This bill will continue to advance that priority.

INTRODUCTION OF THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PRESERVATION ACT OF 1999

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the United States Federal Government Preservation Act. On the first day of the 106th Congress, I introduced H.R. 62 and H.R. 63. Both of these bills concern Executive Order 13107, which President Bill Clinton signed on December 10, 1998. Today I am introducing a redrafted version of this legislation. The two bills I am reintroducing today take the necessary steps to nullify the provisions of Executive Order 13107 and prevents the Federal Government from spending any money to implement this Executive Order.

Executive Order 13107 directs the Federal Government to take numerous steps to require our nation to comply with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhumane and Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), and the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD). In my legislation, I discussed the fact that these treaties were never given the advice and consent of the Senate. In clarification, these treaties did in fact pass the Senate by voice vote.

Our Constitution provides in Article II, section 2, clause 2, that ''He [the President] shall have the Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.'' Because these treaties were accepted by voice vote, we cannot be certain where each individual Senator stands on the particular treaties involved. I believe these concerns warrant a debate, and an individual vote in the Senate. Committing the American people to United Nations treaties is an endeavor that should be carefully scrutinized.

President Clinton claims this Executive Order was written to promote this Administration's human rights record. In actuality, it acts as a vehicle to commit the United States to a definition of human rights that is vastly different from the one contained in our Constitution. The United Nations defines human rights in The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which addresses the freedom of thought, conscience, religion, opinion, and expression. Article 29 of this document states that ''These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.''

The founding documents of the United States make it clear that basic human rights are inalienable, meaning they descend from the ultimate Sovereign, the Creator, God. Therefore, no human authority, no government, no criminal, no individual can abrogate or abridge those rights. The United Nations has frequently shown only contempt for biblical values, American sovereignty, and the U.S. Constitution. If the government can bestow upon a people certain rights, it can just as easily take those rights away. On December 10, 1998, with the signing of this Executive Order, President Clinton accepted on behalf of all Americans a definition of human rights that descends from government authority. Due to this action, every American has lost some of their basic freedoms.

Executive Orders are supposed to be a presidential tool for running the Federal Government. President Clinton, however, has used Executive Orders to bypass the legislative branch, and make policy affecting other branches of government, states, and individuals. For example, Executive Order 13107 requires the Federal government to establish the Interagency Working Group on Human Rights Treaties to provide guidance, oversight, and coordination concerning adherence to and implementation of U.S. human rights obligations and related matters. This not only expands the President's regulatory authority, but also bypasses Congress's legislative powers and the Senate's treaty power. If President Clinton believes this is an important objective of his Administration he should send legislation to Capitol Hill and allow Congress the ability to debate and vote on this proposal. It is clear this Executive Order contains alarming provisions that diminish basic rights provided for in our Constitution.

This is a clear example of the President abusing the power entrusted to him by the American people. As Paul Begala, an aid to Clinton, has stated ''The President has a very strong sense of powers of the presidency, and is willing to use all of them.'' I believe Congress should recognize its power and vote on the United States Federal Government Preservation Act of 1999 in order to stop the implementation of Executive Order 13107. Executive Orders have long been recognized as a presidential prerogative. However, they are not a blank check to rewrite the Constitution or to assume powers that belong to the states, or other branches of government. This Congress needs to take immediate steps to ensure Executive Orders are used for their intended purpose, and not to take rights away from American citizens.

TRIBUTE TO GORDON GRAVES

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the life of Gordon Graves, who died on September 16, 1998 at the age of 80. Gordon Graves was a great man and true hero in his efforts to save the Kankakee River.

Gordon Graves was born along the banks of the Kankakee River and thus knew and understood the river. He had been known to describe himself as a ''river rat'' and was a lifelong hunter, fisherman, and conservationist who spent most of his life protecting the Kankakee River. Gordon was one of the first voices of concern for the Kankakee River. According to Gordon, people took whatever they could get from the river, and the next day, they took it again. The problem is that they took more than the river had to give.

At the age of 45, Gordon Graves retired early to work full time to protect the Kankakee River. He is one of the founding fathers of the Northern Illinois Angler's Association, and of the Alliance to Restore the Kankakee River. Throughout his life, Gordon Graves served on many Illinois State Conservation Advisory Boards and Commissions. The highest honor Gordon Graves received was the Pride of America Award, presented to him by President Ronald Reagan.

Gordon Graves is survived by his wife, Marion Graves. As one newspaper article pointed out, Gordon Graves has passed on a legacy of spirit, of vision and of organization that will see his work continue.

Gordon Graves' commitment and impact on his community is not only deserving of congressional recognition, but should serve as a model for others to follow.

At a time when our nation's leaders are asking the people of this country to make serving their community a core value of citizenship, honoring Gordon Graves is very appropriate.

I urge this body to identify and recognize others in their congressional districts whose actions have so greatly benefited and enlightened America's communities.

HELPING PARENTS TEACH THEIR KIDS: THE CHILDREN'S EDUCATION TAX CREDIT

HON. JAMES E. ROGAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, as the father of two beautiful twin daughters, Dana and Claire, I am firmly committed to providing our nation's children an education which will prepare them for the future. Congress must empower parents to do more for their children so that our nation's next generation can truly thrive.

That's why I am introducing the Children's Education Tax Credit Act today. This bill provides a $1,000 tax credit per child for education expenses. The tax credit will be given to families who devote their hard-earned money to purchase textbooks, supplies, educational computer software, tuition, and other resources their children need to excel in school.

Today, an average American family spends about $720 per year on each child's learning. Sadly, too many Americans are forced to choose between spending a little extra on their kid's learning or paying the rent. With the Children's Education Tax Credit, parents can better afford to make the best education choices for their children. It is vital that we reward investment in a child's education and encourage families to control more of their own money.

By letting parents decide how best their education dollars can be spent, we begin deferring to local communities and families the crucial decisions on how to educate a child. For the sake of our children, I urge that Members join me in fighting for sound education for our nation's children by supporting the Children's Education Tax Credit Act.

RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE UNILATERAL DECLARATION OF A PALESTINIAN STATE

HON. MATT SALMON

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, the Resolution I have introduced today expresses bipartisan, bicameral congressional opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and urges the President to do the same and promise that such a declaration would not be recognized by the United States. Before I discuss the merits of the bill, I would like to thank Majority Whip DELAY, as well as Representatives SAXTON and ENGEL for all of their work in crafting the resolution. I would also like to thank Senators BROWNBACK and WYDEN for introducing the companion resolution in the other chamber.

The United States owes Chairman Arafat no favors. At least eleven American citizens have been killed in Israel by Palestinian terrorists since the signing of the Oslo Accords in 1993. Of the 15 Palestinians identified by Israel as participants in these attacks, most are free men, and four are reportedly serving in the PA police force. The Palestinian Authority harbors more terrorists who have murdered Americans than Libya.

The introduction of the resolution could not be more timely. Today, President Clinton is expected to meet with Chairman Arafat at the congressional prayer breakfast. His conversation with Chairman Arafat should make at least one point clear: The United States will NEVER recognize a unilaterally declared Palestinian state—whether the state is declared in this manner on May 4, 1999—the date the Oslo accords expire—January 1, 2000, or any date thereafter. It has been reported that Chairman Arafat may use the issue of statehood at the meeting to leverage the United States to place pressure on Israel to withdraw from additional land. President Clinton must not succumb to these tactics.

As our resolution states, at the heart of the Oslo process lies the basic, irrevocable commitment made by Palestinian Chairman Yasser Arafat that, in his words, ''all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations.'' Resolving the political status of the territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority while ensuring Israel's security is one of the central issues of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Therefore, a declaration of statehood outside the framework of negotiations would constitute a fundamental violation of the accords.

In mid-July, Chairman Arafat stated that ''there is a transition period of five years and after five years we have the right to declare an independent Palestinian state.'' On September 24th, Chairman Arafat's cabinet threatened to unilaterally declare a Palestinian state that would encompass a portion of Jerusalem. The cabinet announced that ''At the end of the interim period, [the Palestinian Authority] shall declare the establishment of a Palestinian state on all Palestinian land occupied since 1967, with Jerusalem as the eternal capital of the Palestinian state.''

Jerusalem is the undivided, eternal capital of Israel, and U.S. law—the Jerusalem Embassy Act—recognizes that this should be U.S. policy. Palestinian threats to declare a state on land they do not have any territorial control over—particularly Jerusalem—at the very least amounts to a renunciation of the Oslo process, and could legitimately be interpreted by Israel as an act of war. The Administration has not effectively dampened the dangerous proclamations issued by the Palestinian Authority on statehood, and as May 4th rapidly approaches, if U.S. policy remains murky, hostilities could occur.

The most recent statements by Palestinian leaders have been confusing and somewhat contradictory. A number of reports indicate that plans for a unilateral declaration of statehood may be delayed—at least until after Israel holds elections on May 17th. However, some of the comments suggest that the Palestinians are still intent on declaring a state on May 4th. On January 24th, a senior Palestinian official told the Voice of Palestine that May 4th ''is a day [which has] international legitimacy'' and that ''the Palestinian leadership can not postpone this date for even an hour in announcing an independent Palestinian state.'' The day before, another senior official said that May 4th is ''a historic and vital day,'' suggesting that the Palestinians will indeed declare a state on this day.

The Clinton Administration has done little to discourage Palestinian aspirations of having a unilaterally declared state recognized by the United States. On several occasions over the past year, the Clinton administration has refused to express U.S. opposition to the unilateral declaration of an independent Palestinian state, and has left it as an open question as to whether the United States will recognize a unilaterally declared Palestinian state. As a case in point, during President Clinton's visit to Gaza, in December, Chairman Arafat reaffirmed his intention of establishing a Palestinian state with its capital in Jerusalem. Unfortunately, the President might have only encouraged this course when he said: ''[T]he Palestinian people and their elected representatives now have a chance to determine their own destiny on their own land.''

Recently, however, the President has issued more appropriate comments on the issue of statehood. In an interview for a London-based Saudi newspaper in mid-January, President Clinton said that: ''[We] oppose the declaration of a state or any other unilateral action by any party outside the negotiation process in a manner that could pre-empt the negotiations.'' He also said that, ''We are making maximum efforts to strengthen negotiations on the final status (of the Palestinian territories) and believe that those who think they can adopt unilateral measures during the transitory period are opening up a path to catastrophe.''

President Clinton's latest remarks on this issue are welcome but do not go far enough. A careful reading of his comments suggests that the United States may oppose a unilaterally declared Palestinian state, but has left open the possibility of recognition. It is critical for the President privately to inform Chairman Arafat and publicly tell the world that a unilateral declaration of statehood is a grievous violation of Oslo and will be firmly opposed, and never recognized by the United States.

I am encouraged that Congress is working in a bipartisan basis to head off this destabilizing threat to peace in the Middle East. It is essential that the United States speak loudly and clearly in advance of May 4th, to prevent a terrible miscalculation by Chairman Arafat.

PROTECTING ISRAEL

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. DeLAY. Mr. Speaker, I worked with Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SALMON and now over 60 cosponsors to introduce a resolution calling on the President to clarify American policy with respect to a unilateral declaration of an independent Palestinian state. I did this because I feel the Administration's policy regarding Israel and the Middle East process has been confusing and misleading not only for the American people, but for the international community at large, and especially for the parties to the peace process itself.

The United States has never endorsed the creation of a Palestinian state. After the signing of the Oslo accords, the U.S. made it clear that all questions of sovereignty and statehood were a matter for negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. However, First Lady Hillary Clinton's public statement last May that ''it will be in the long-term interests of the Middle East for Palestine to be a state . . . and seen on the same footing as any other state'' put U.S. policy on this issue in severe and grave doubt.

The First Lady's remarks came almost exactly one year before the scheduled expiration date in May, 1999 for completing the final status talks between Israel and the Palestinians under the Oslo agreement. Any unilateral declaration of statehood will constitute a fundamental violation of the Oslo accords because they were agreed to only after Chairman Arafat made an irrevocable commitment that, in his words, ''all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations.'' Since resolving the political status of the Palestinian people while protecting the security of Israel is one of the central issues of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, any effort to act unilaterally on the issue will

have the effect of destabilizing the current security situation not only in Israel but in the entire region.

So it is of great concern that despite official denials by the United States State Department and numerous other officials in the administration, the First Lady's remarks were interpreted by many around the world, including Palestinian Authority President Yasser Arafat, as ''a very important and clear signal'' regarding the Administration's position on the issue of Palestinian statehood. Arafat subsequently threatened to unilaterally declare an independent Palestinian state in May of 1999—which is now just three months away.

Last July, subsequent to the First Lady's remarks, the United Nations voted to elevate the Palestinian observer mission at the UN to the status of a full observer mission, a status just short of that accorded an independent state. Then last fall, while speaking before the United Nations, Yasser Arafat called on world leaders to support an independent Palestinian state—though the U.S. State Department scrambled mightily to prevent him from also repeating his threat to declare such a state unilaterally.

Mr. Speaker, what has been missing from this debate over the last year has been a public—and unequivocal—statement from President Clinton himself that the United States will never recognize the unilateral declaration of an independent Palestinian state. No amount of denials, statements, or clarifications by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and other functionaries down at the State Department can dispel the confusion and uncertainty about U.S. policy occasioned by the First Lady's remarks. Rightly or wrongly, the perception of many around the world and even in this country is that only President Clinton has the clout to override the influence of the First Lady within his Administration on this point.

For the President to pretend otherwise is to hide his head, and America's, in the sand. The need for the President to personally act to clarify the U.S. position was brought home when Yasser Arafat stated last July that ''[t]here is a transition period of five years and after five years we have the right to declare an independent Palestine state. We are asking for an accurate implementation, an honest implementation of what has been signed in the White House under the supervision of President Clinton.''

Even after the conclusion of the Wye River agreement and the call for new elections in Israel, Chairman Arafat, his cabinet, the Palestinian legislature, and other officials continue to threaten to unilaterally proclaim the establishment of a Palestinian state when the Oslo accords expire on May 4, 1999. On January 24th, senior Palestinian official Saeb Erekat told the Voice of Palestine that May 4th ''is a day [which has] international legitimacy'' and that ''the Palestinian leadership can not postpone this date for even an hour in announcing an independent Palestinian state.'' The day before the Palestinian Minister of Planning and International Cooperation, Nabil Shaath, said that May 4th is ''a historic and vital day'' suggesting that the Palestinians will indeed declare a state on this day.

We must remember that Yasser Arafat and the Palestinians demand the whole West Bank and has declared ''that there can be no permanent peace as long as the problem of Jerusalem remains unresolved.'' The Palestinian Cabinet, on Thursday, September 24, stated that ''at the end of the interim period, it (the Palestinian government) shall declare the establishment of a Palestinian state on all Palestinian land occupied since 1967, with Jerusalem as the eternal capital of the Palestinian state.''

It is way past time for the President to declare that the United States will never recognize a unilateral declaration of an independent Palestinian state, and that Israel, and Israel alone, can determine its security needs. This was made clear back in June, less than a month after the First Lady's remarks, when Palestinian National Council Speaker Salim al-Za'nun announced that, ''If following our declaration of state, Israel renews it occupation of East Jerusalem, the West Bank, and the Gaza strip, the Palestinian people will struggle and resist the occupier with all means possible, including armed struggle.'' If the President fails to speak and the Palestinians do declare an independent state, what security there is currently prevailing in Israel and the region could dissipate overnight.

This is a common sense resolution that clarifies United States policy toward Israel. We all hope that Israel and the Palestinian people can work out an arrangement that benefits both communities and the region as a whole. But we should never forget in the quest for peace that Israel is a proven friend and ally of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to expedite its consideration.

A TRIBUTE TO CYNTHIA S. HARRINGTON

HON. PETER HOEKSTRA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, too often, our staff employees get little or no recognition for the work they do to keep this body functioning. They are the unsung heroes of this institution. Today, I would like to say a few words of thanks to one of those heroes.

A native of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and a graduate of Pennsylvania State University, Cynthia S. Harrington has worked for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives since 1973. Cindy began her tenure as Office Manager and Administrative Secretary to Congressman Ronald A. Sarasin of Connecticut, then moved to the office of Congressman Robert Davis of Michigan in 1979. She worked as Congressman Davis' Executive Assistant until 1993, when I had the fortune of hiring her as my Executive Assistant when I joined Congress.

For the last six years, Cindy has been one of the constants in my office—booking my flights, scheduling my meetings in Washington, paying the bills and generally making sure I was where I needed to be at any given point in time.

After 25 years of service to this institution and the American people, Cindy is leaving us and moving to the private sector. She will be working part-time for the CATO Travel Agency and will be spending more time being a mom to her 7-year-old daughter, Jessica, and spending more time at home with her husband, Lee, and Jessica. I expect she will continue to be active in her church and at her daughter's school as a classroom volunteer and on grounds projects, as well as with her daughter's Brownie troop selling cookies.

So, in closing, I just want to say, ''Thank you, Cindy.'' Thank you for helping a newcomer in 1993 become an effective Congressman today. Thank you for helping me get home to my family every weekend. Thank you for making sure we all got paid. Thank you for serving the American people for a quarter-century.

You will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY GOVERNALE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Anthony Governale, a former mayor of San Bruno, California and a dedicated community leader of San Mateo County who passed away on December 29, 1998.

Born in Brooklyn in 1929, Anthony Governale became interested in politics at a young age, helping his uncle run for a Brooklyn ward seat. He moved to San Francisco in 1950 where he met his wife who was performing in community theater—his other passion that was equal only to politics.

Mr. Governale was very active in politics, assisting numerous state, local and federal campaigns as well as serving as President of the San Mateo County Democratic Council. He was elected to public office in 1971 when he won election to the San Bruno City Council. He served as Mayor from 1974–75 and remained on the Council until 1978.

Mr. Governale was also active in a broad range of civic groups including serving as Executive Director of the Daly City-Colma Chamber of Commerce, board member of the San Mateo County Fair, and as President of the San Bruno Chamber of Commerce Governing Board up until his death.

Mr. Governale also served on the governing board of Shelter Network of San Mateo County and was the first Chairman of the San Mateo County Health Center Foundation Board. The Foundation's resources directly improve the lives of patients at San Mateo County General Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, Anthony Governale was a very kind and selfless man dedicated to his family, his community and his country. All who knew him sought his wisdom and advice on issues and life in general. He lives on through his three children and two grandchildren, through his devoted wife Helen, and through all of us who were blessed to be part of his life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to a wonderful man who lived a life of purpose and to extend our deepest sympathy to Helen Governale and the entire Governale family.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MILLS E. GODWIN, JR.

HON. TOM BLILEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1999, Virginia buried a man in the loamy soil of Southeast Virginia. This was no ordinary man—his name was Mills E. Godwin, Jr. He will be remembered as one of the greatest political figures of the 20th Century in Virginia.

Mills was born on November 19, 1914 in Chuckatuck, Virginia. Mills' lifelong interest in politics began at the age of 11. He later earned a bachelor's degree from William and Mary in 1934 and a law degree from the University of Virginia in 1938. While attending law school, Mills met Katherine Beale. They were married October 26, 1940. This beautiful marriage lasted for fifty-eight years until Mills passed away on January 30, 1999.

At the outbreak of World War II, he worked for the Federal Bureau of Investigation with distinction. He began his political career in 1947 by winning election to the Virginia House of Delegates. In 1951, Mills won election to the state Senate where he served for ten years until his election as Lieutenant Governor in 1961. In 1965, Mills became the Democratic nominee for Governor and was elected to the first of his two terms as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

During his first term of office, Mills created the community college system in Virginia while using state bonds to sponsor huge increases in funds for public education. Under Mills Godwin's leadership, policies were enacted improving educational opportunities for students from kindergarten to graduate school while improving teacher's pay.

Today, national leaders spend a lot of time touting their education programs. Yet, Mills was leading the way thirty years ago. Mills Godwin's vision for education in the 1960's still holds true as a model for the 1990's. Governor Godwin laid the cornerstone for today's educational system and our leaders should emulate his policies while remembering that a Virginian showed the way to improving education thirty years ago.

He left office because he was term-limited after one term but he would run again for Governor in 1973 as a Republican. He won the election and became the only two-term Governor of Virginia this century. During his second term, Mills established the Department of Corrections, reinstated the death penalty for violent offenders while increasing spending on our state's education and health systems and its sprawling infrastructure needs.

Mills is long remembered for revising the state Constitution and his lengthy term of service to the people of Virginia. However, I will remember him for his help to me when I was mayor of Richmond in the seventies and his leadership in and out of office. He unfailingly reached across party-lines to accomplish the greater good for all Virginians. After all, he remarked, there was ''no higher honor'' than to be Governor of Virginia.

In Virginia, we have many statesmen and Mills is one for the 20th Century. When it was the right thing to do, he acted with strong leadership because he was not permanently bound to a rigid devotion to history. He knew it was imperative we learn from our past mistakes—and this was his attitude for success.

He now joins his daughter Becky in heaven but he left a huge impact on our lives. May God Bless Mills, his wife Katherine, his sister, Leah Keith, and his family and friends.

THE CHARITABLE INTEGRITY RESTORATION ACT

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Charitable Integrity Restoration Act. This legislation addresses most of the sophisticated and shameful tax schemes that I have seen. Recently, The Wall Street Journal has run a series of articles on the so-called charitable split-dollar insurance plans where wealthy individuals are taking improper tax deductions in an effort to avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

The legislation would prohibit the use of charitable split-dollar insurance plans where wealthy individuals give a substantial ''gift'' to the charity and subsequently take a tax deduction for that contribution. The charity, in turn, invests a portion of that money in a life insurance policy for the heirs of the donor or in an annuity contract in the name of the donor. The charity retains the right to a small portion of the policy's proceeds. In other words, the donors get the benefit of purchasing a life insurance or annuity policy using the charitable contribution deduction—something all other taxpayers would pay for directly out of their own pocket.

I would like to point out there is no provision in the Tax Code that gives investors even the remote impression that charitable split-dollar investment policies are legal. Instead, this is a mythical creation of those who are trying to find ways for their clients to avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

This scheme also violates the principle of charitable giving. Charitable contributions are tax deductible because they are supposed to benefit an organization dedicated to a worthy cause. Under this abuse, the charities simply become a conduit for a tax avoidance scheme.

The Charitable Integrity Restoration Act would end the abuse of charitable split-dollar investment policies. The donors face the prospect of having their investment returned to them and losing their tax deduction for the so-called charitable contribution.

Furthermore, any charitable organization engaging in split-dollar insurance plans would lose their tax-exempt status. Anticipating such action, the National Committee on Planned Giving, a professional association based in Indianapolis, has called the scheme ''a high-risk venture'' exposing participating charities to considerable financial risk, which ''may endanger the tax-exempt status of charities that participate.''

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the House will pass the Charitable Integrity Restoration Act and put an end to this abusive tax practice and restore charitable contributions to their original intent—helping people in need