EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF THE CITIZENS' TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1995

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, most Americans seem to agree that a tax cut is desirable, since they have become anxious while watching the Nation's economy plunge deeper into global interdependence. But Congress must be responsible enough to rein in the deficit simultaneously so that Americans do not end up paying higher taxes in the future. My proposal, the Citizens' Tax Relief Act of 1995, would successfully accomplish this delicate balancing act.

The 1990 Budget Enforcement Act—1990 act—requires that any cuts in taxes must be paid for with equal cuts in mandatory spending—entitlement programs such as Medicare and Social Security—or with increases in other taxes, not with cuts in discretionary spending. This pay-as-you-go rule has been invaluable in beginning to get a handle on the Nation's deficit.

Unfortunately, Democrats and Republicans alike appear ready to cast aside this proven tool of fiscal responsibility. Members on both sides of the aisle are toying with the idea of lowering the 5-year budget caps on discretionary spending, thereby forcing the appropriations committees to spend less. But according to the Congressional Budget Office [CBO], lowering the caps in a budget-reconciliation bill to pay for a tax cut is purely speculative. It is no different than what Republicans have been accusing Democrats of for years—spending first while promising to pay later.

Another option being considered is amending the 1990 act to break down the walls between mandatory and discretionary spending. Since this move would buy Members of Congress time in making difficult choices about cuts in entitlement programs, the result would likely be a deficit which continues to balloon.

For the reasons I have outlined, Congress must not take the easy way out. Instead, we must at least match proposed tax cuts with entitlement cuts or increases in other, more targeted taxes. The Citizens' Tax Relief Act of 1995 would do just that.

This bill would lower the first income tax bracket from 15 to 12.5 percent, giving every American a tax cut. To pay for it, a huge tax loophole would be eliminated—the favorable tax treatment of inherited property. To be equitable, the bill also would exempt from taxes the first $250,000 of capital gains on the sale of inherited homes—which is currently available only to individuals over the age of 55 and only for the first $125,000—and provide lower capital gains tax rates on the inherited property of heirs who pay the tax in the first 4 years after enactment of the bill.

Currently, when a person dies and leaves property to a family member, the amount by which that property increased in value during the person's lifetime is never taxed. Such a policy is fundamentally unfair considering that if the same person sells the property before dying, the individual is taxed on the gain. My bill would reverse that policy.

A study conducted by two Cornell University professors showed that more than 10 trillion dollars' worth of property will be inherited over the next 45 years. That means that there will be several trillion dollars of capital gains that should be taxed. If Congress takes advantage of this opportunity, we would have more than enough money to pay for my proposed tax cut, so that the bill actually would increase the revenues of the Federal Government. With the money left over, we could invest in job creation programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill in order to achieve the three goals of increasing Americans' disposable income, creating jobs for everyone who is willing and able to work, and getting the Nation's fiscal house in order.

TRIBUTE TO FLOYD R. SCOTT

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 6, 1995, Mr. Floyd R. Scott, Jr., of Tinton Falls, NJ, died at the age of 67. I rise today to join with the many friends, colleagues and fellow-community activists who knew Mr. Scott to pay tribute to this fine man.

A registered architect in the States of New Jersey and New York, Mr. Scott was past president of the New Jersey State Board of Architects and a past State chairman of the Committee on Preservation of Historic Buildings in New Jersey. To date, he is the first and only African-American appointee to the New Jersey State Board of Architects.

Mr. Speaker, the list of Floyd Scott's accomplishments is a long and impressive one. Born in Asbury Park, NJ, he attended local schools while growing up in Monmouth County. Mr. Scott was an Air Force World War II veteran, serving as a member of the Tuskegee Airmen, the famous 332nd fighter group, the first all-black pilot group. He earned his bachelor's degree in architecture at Howard University. He is listed in both the Who's Who in the East and the American Encyclopedia. Mr. Scott was a former president of the Neptune Township Board of Education, a member of the Rider College Board of Trustees, and a member of the Brookdale Community College Trustee Selection Committee. He was a past president of the Monmouth Boys Club, the Monmouth Council of Boy Scouts, the Monmouth County Men's Club and the Second Baptist Church of Asbury Park. He is a recipient of the NAACP's Distinguished Service Award.

Mr. Scott is survived by his wife, Ruby Scott, a son, Rudolph, his brother, Ed Royal Scott, and three grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Scott has served his community, his State and his country in an exemplary manner. In extending my deepest sympathy to his beloved wife, the rest of his family and his many friends, I hope we can all gain strength and inspiration from the fine example he set for hard work and distinguished achievement in his profession, love and devotion to his family, and dedication to making his community a better place.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENT LOAN EVALUATION AND STABILIZATION ACT

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I join today with Representative BILL GOODLING, chairman of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, and other members of the committee and with our Democratic colleagues in the introduction of the Student Loan Evaluation and Stabilization Act. This legislation is urgently needed in order to ensure the stability of the Federal student loan program that provide access to higher education opportunities for our Nation's students.

In 1992, when Congress reauthorized the Higher Education Act, extensive consideration was given to the concept of a Government direct lending program. After long and thoughtful deliberation, the House-Senate Conference Committee which was dominated by Democratic Members from both bodies of Congress, agreed to try a direct lending program over a period of several years on a pilot basis consisting of approximately 4 percent of new student loan volume.

One year later, during the budget reconciliation process, the complete phase-out of the Federal Family Education Loan Program was initiated by the administration in favor of a direct Government lending program. The pilot agreed upon during the 1992 reauthorization which allowed for a thorough evaluation of the program was no longer important. A swift move to a direct Government lending program was adopted in order to achieve budget savings. The administration continues to promote its direct lending program on the basis of the $4.3 billion in savings even though the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that approximately one-half of those savings disappear when long term administrative costs are included in the cost determination.

The administration also continues to promote the concept of public/private partnerships while moving forward with plans to eliminate a public/private partnership that has been successful ever since passage of the Higher Education Act in 1965. Over the years, Congress has taken steps to strengthen this partnership by requiring improved service to students while reducing both student and program costs. Before Members of Congress are able

to determine which loan program meets the needs of students, institutions, and taxpayers, we need a thorough evaluation of both programs and the bill we are introducing today allows for such an evaluation.

The bill allows for a much larger pilot than was contemplated under the 1992 amendments to the Higher Education Act, but we believe that a pilot consisting of 40 percent of new loan volume will permit Congress to carefully oversee and evaluate its implementation. At the same time, we will be maintaining a stable Federal Family Education Loan Program for those institutions not wishing to participate in a Government direct lending program. When both programs are fully operational, Congress will be able to fairly evaluate the programs for efficiency and cost effectiveness prior to making decisions to totally replace one program with the other.

Specifically, this bill provides for the continued implementation of the direct loan program at those institutions selected for participation in order to achieve 40 percent of new loan volume. It calls for increased congressional oversight with respect to the expenditure of funds on the part of the Department of Education and a revision to budget scoring rules that will correct the existing bias in favor of direct lending programs described by Rudolph Penner, former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, in his testimony before the Budget Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate on January 10, 1995. We have attempted to ease the application process for all students participating in the student aid programs to ensure that all students are treated in the same manner. Most importantly, we have provided stability to the student loan programs which are vital to the continued access to higher education for the students of this country.

In my new role as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training and Life-Long Learning, I look forward to working with Chairman GOODLING and all the members of the subcommittee and full committee as we work to reform and improve the education and workplace policy programs under our jurisdiction.

CLINTON WRONG ON EIGHTIES

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, it has become fashionable in some quarters, including the White House, to dismiss the 1980's as a time of greed and venality, in which the rich exploited the poor and the Federal Government's deficits went wild due to the economic policies of the Reagan administration.

In today's edition of my hometown paper, the Contra Costa Times we read a lucid, compelling refutation of the President's misguided perspective. As the editorial in the Times notes, the eighties were a time of unprecedented economic growth. New jobs, rising wages and lower inflation followed the Reagan program. Yes, deficits grew—because a Congress without fiscal discipline spent without restraint.

I am including this outstanding editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it is a needed corrective to the relentless stream of misinformation we hear all too often about the Reagan era. I hope that many of my colleagues will take the time to read it.

CLINTON WRONG ON 1980'S—PRESIDENT SHOULD FOCUS ON PROBLEMS OF 1990'S

President Bill Clinton made a major mistake when he claimed that Republicans had disavowed Reaganomics and that Congress made a mistake in 1981 ''to adopt a bidding war in the tax cuts that gave us what became known as ''trickle-down economics' and quadrupled the national debt.''

Republican leaders were quick to point out that they never attacked Reagan's policies and that Clinton was dead wrong about the cause of the deficit.

The president's remarks are hardly a way to begin a bipartisan effort to control federal spending and bring about needed reforms in government programs.

Equally disturbing is the view Clinton and many others in positions of power have of the 1980s.

Reagan's tax policies, which received wide bipartisan support at the time, can hardly be blamed for mounting deficits. Even though tax rates were reduced, government revenues grew dramatically, nearly doubling in the 1980s.

As a percentage of gross domestic product, tax revenues remained nearly constant. What grew during the 1980s was government spending.

Clinton also was wrong in saying that under Reagan the poor got poorer while the rich got richer. That's only half true. Wealthy people indeed gained economically in the 1980s, but so did the poor and middle classes.

According to the Department of Commerce, even the poorest one-fifth of Americans gained income in inflation-adjusted dollars in the 1980s, as did every other major income grouping.

More than 19 million jobs were created in the 1980s, unemployment dropped by one-fourth, inflation dropped by two-thirds, and the country enjoyed a prolonged economic expansion. That's a record Republicans are not about to back away from.

It's time for Clinton to stop campaigning against the 1980s and work together with the GOP to correct the problems of the 1990s.

END CHILDHOOD HUNGER—NOT NUTRITION PROGRAMS

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we all agree that welfare needs to be reformed—but we should not throw the baby out with the bath water. The Personal Responsibility Act contains a proposal to block grant current Federal nutrition programs such as WIC, Food Stamps, and the School Breakfast and Lunch Programs. It would remove their entitlement status. It would reduce their funding levels. This would be a terrible mistake.

Block granting these programs would in all likelihood increase hunger amongst our Nation's children. States will now have to bear the burden of administering the programs with less funding. States will be forced to make extremely difficult choices like reducing funding for WIC or eliminating the School Breakfast Programs because they are short of funds.

I believe it is part of the Federal Government's job to set priorities for our Nation and for me, our children are the priority. We can't, in good conscience, be unmoved when children go to bed hungry at night. We can't just send the issue of childhood hunger to the States and hope the problem goes away.

These food assistance programs serve as an important safety net for children. The Food Stamp Program alone serves 10 percent of the population in America—half of which are children. We know that for every dollar spent on WIC, we save $5 in health care costs later on down the road. We know that every child who participates in the School Breakfast Program is better able to learn in school and thus is more prepared to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

It is time to end childhood hunger, not successful nutrition programs that feed hungry children.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENT LOAN EVALUATION AND STABILIZATION ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with several of my distinguished colleagues in the introduction of the Student Loan Evaluation and Stabilization Act—legislation that will allow a systematic review and evaluation of the current student loan programs. Specifically, this legislation will allow for the careful evaluation and comparison of the Federal Family Education Loan Program and the Federal Direct Student Loan Program to a true pilot status and allowing both programs to operate with continued stability for several years. Once this is accomplished, an independent evaluation can be made about whether the direct loan program serves students and institutions effectively, and whether the Federal Government can manage—and pay for—the multibillion-dollar student loan program which is so important to assuring access to higher education for millions of Americans.

Through the reconciliation process, the 103d Congress made policy considerations and decisions affecting the student loan programs without the benefit of a true evaluation of the long-term cost and effect. The impetus for the move to establish a direct Government lending program was projected budgetary savings of $4.3 billion over 5 years. When pressed, however, the Congressional Budget Office revealed that when the administrative costs associated with a direct determination, almost one-half of the savings disappear. Rudolph Penner, former Director of the Congressional Budget Office in testimony before the Budget Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate on January 10, 1995, identified this particular aspect of scoring a direct Government lending program as one of the arbitrary measures currently found in the Credit Reform Act which creates a strong bias in favor of using direct loans instead of guarantees.

While the Clinton administration was talking about promoting new public/private sector partnerships, they moved forward with their

proposal to dismantle one of the most successful of such partnerships. Participation of the private sector in the student loan program was summarily dismissed as being unnecessary and too costly. Notwithstanding the poor administrative record of the Government in the direct lending business, the belief that direct Government lending would lead to major improvements and lower costs in the student loan program was the overriding theme.

However, with the advent of the new Congress, we have determined that a careful comparison of programs for efficiency and cost effectiveness needs to be undertaken before decisions to totally replace one program with another can be made with any degree of confidence. We believe this to be particularly true when dealing with a loan program projected to be in the magnitude of $30 billion by 1998.

The legislation we are introducing today is designed to stabilize the current student loan programs, limit the loan volume in the Direct Loan Program to those institutions which have elected to participate in the first 2 years, continue the improvements which have already been initiated, and increase and enhance the congressional oversight of these particular programs. We pledge that the Congress will thoroughly evaluate the quality, effectiveness, efficiency and costs associated with these programs so that Members of this body are able to make informed decisions about what works for students, institutions and American taxpayers.

Specifically, this bill will allow for: First, the continued implementation of the Federal Direct Student Loan Program; second, the continued stability of the Federal Family Education Loan Program; third, reduced expenditures on the part of the Department of Education; fourth, improved Congressional oversight of expenditures; fifth, ease in the application process for all students; and sixth, a revision to the Congressional Budget Act which will provide truth in budget scoring when determining costs associated with a guaranteed loan program and a direct Government lending program. I believe these are all important steps that this Congress needs to take in order to compare and evaluate programs while continuing to support our country's students in the pursuit of their education goals.

I want to express my pleasure at having the opportunity to work with BUCK MCKEON, the new chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training and Life-Long Learning, as he and the other subcommittee members tackle the important issues facing the 104th Congress in the areas of education and workplace policy.

I also want to express my gratitude to BART GORDON and my other Democratic colleagues who have helped to create this bipartisan effort and who share my concerns about integrity and accountability in the student aid programs. This bipartisan group has steadfastly voiced concerns with respect to this untested, expansive direct Government lending program and its long-term implications.

PRAISE FOR BILL STOUFFER

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, few of us in this body would achieve much success if not for the help of the local officials in the towns and cities of our districts which we represent. These local officials are often the catalysts behind legislation which reaches both the State and Federal levels. Unfortunately, the selfless work of these men and women who serve the public at the local level all too often goes unrecognized. Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to such a local official from my congressional district, who has dedicated his life to serving the community in which he lives. The man I am speaking of is Mr. Bill Stouffer of Altoona, PA.

Bill Stouffer has devoted the majority of his life toward serving and helping the people around him. He graduated from Altoona High School in 1940 and immediately answered the call of his country as a U.S. Marine Corps combat soldier. He has been noted as one of the first Americans to enter Nagasaki after the bomb was dropped. After the war, Bill worked for the city of Altoona as an electrical foreman for 18 years, earning a reputation amongst his peers as a man of integrity and character. This reputation enabled him to seek and win election to the Altoona City Council. He served as a city councilman from 1964–71 and in doing so distinguished himself as a community leader with a vision for a better tomorrow.

In 1972, Bill Stouffer was elected mayor of the city of Altoona. During his tenure as the city's mayor the area reaped the benefits of his leadership. Examples of this benefit can be seen in projects such as the construction of the 10th Avenue Expressway, the 11th Street tower, the water treatment plant, and the expansion of the Penn State Altoona campus. these projects and others like them helped to both create jobs and improve the quality of life for the people of Altoona.

In 1980, Bill Stouffer moved on to serve as a Blair County commissioner. As commissioner I asked him to chair a local committee to help bring the FAA Flight Service Center to the Altoona-Blair County Airport. It came as no surprise to me when Bill went after this task without hesitation, organizing and mobilizing a group of individuals to help make our case to the FAA. Although the Altoona area faced fierce competition from other cities including Pittsburgh, we were able to obtain the flight service center. This accomplishment would not have been possible if not for Bill's tireless work and undying commitment to the project.

Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend and colleague, Bill Stouffer, announced that he would not seek reelection to another term as county commissioner. While I am sad to see him go, I know that Bill's work within the community is far from finished. Bill will move on to become more deeply involved in his already extensive work with his church and other civic activities such as the Salvation Army, the Altoona Kiwanis, and a women's prison ministry which he himself established. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute Bill Stouffer for his more than 30 years of service to the community which he loves, and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

NEBRASKA CORNHUSKERS ARE FOOTBALL'S NATIONAL CHAMPIONS IN EVERY WAY

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the Nebraska Cornhuskers' thrilling victory in the Orange Bowl on New Year's Day was an exhilarating success for the entire State. This Member joins all Nebraskans in extending hearty congratulations to Coach Tom Osborne and the Nebraska Cornhuskers on being named college football's national champions.

As important as this victory was for Nebraska, this Member believes it also sends an important message to all Americans. Everyone would do well to study the lessons offered by Coach Tom Osborne and the Huskers throughout the 1994 season. The Huskers' perfect season, the exciting Orange Bowl win, and the resulting national championship tell a compelling story about the importance of perseverance, hard work, and commitment to a goal.

The entire Cornhusker team was intensely motivated from the beginning of the year to complete its unfinished business. This incentive enabled the Big Red to rise above numerous obstacles along the way. Many so-called football experts counted the Huskers out when their star quarterback was unable to play and his backup suffered an injury as well. What wasn't taken into consideration was the absolute dedication of the entire team to turn it up a notch to get the job done. This same determination shone brightly when the team was trailing the University of Miami on their home field, in the Orange Bowl, during the fourth quarter. The Huskers pulled together as a team and found a way to completely stymie the Miami team and win.

The Huskers are clearly a reflection of their outstanding coach, Dr. Tom Osborne. During his 22 years as head coach, Osborne has earned national respect and praise for his coaching expertise, integrity, high academic motivation, and genuine concern for his players. He has set exemplary standards for excellence and character both on and off the field. Nebraska and NCAA football are certainly fortunate to have such an exceptional coach and role model.

Nebraskans have always considered Coach Osborne and the Huskers to be champions. It is certainly gratifying to see that the overwhelming majority of the country agrees. In conclusion, this Member commends to his colleagues the following article from the January 3, 1995, edition of the Lincoln Journal congratulating the Nebraska Cornhuskers on their outstanding success. Go Big Red.

[From the Lincoln Journal, Jan. 3, 1995]

HUSKERS: N CREDIBLE!

In the world of sports, as in the rest of the world, the good guys don't always win. In the 22 years since they won their last national title, a succession of very good Nebraska Cornhusker football teams has learned that, no matter how much they train and try, the other guys are sometimes better.

But not this time. The pollsters have spoken—thunderously. The good guys are the best there is.

This city and this state spent Monday basking in the glow of an undefeated season and an Orange Bowl victory. Tuesday, although a day back at work, is a day to bask in the glow of a national title.

Wednesday Nebraskans can remind themselves that football and all sports are only small parts of what the billboards at the borders advertise as The Good Life. They can get on seriously with 1995.

But not before one more warm embrace with some brand new and sparkling memories—of a coach who demonstrates, even in winning it all, his faithfulness to priorities that go beyond winning, of a team that leaves taunting to opponents foolish enough to waste their energy on it, and of a Big Red army that kept the faith.

In all those bars and bowling alleys and coffee shops across Nebraska, on all those charts where a dozen victories were joyfully recorded, victory No. 13 is now writ large: Nebraska 24, Miami 17.

The 1994 football season ended as it began. It was N credible!

TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN J. CAPESTRO

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last year, the people of Middlesex County, NJ, lost one of their greatest and most popular public servants with the passing of Mr. Stephen J. Capestro. The death of Mr. Capestro has, for me, meant the loss not only of a top political leader, but of a good friend.

In December 1992. Mr. Capestro retired from elected public office after having served 24 years as a Middlessex County Freeholder. For 13 of these years, he served as the board's director. During those years of distinguished service, Steve Capestro's was a name and a face synonymous with dedication and good government. Shortly after his retirement, on May 27, 1993, Steve was honored with a testimonial dinner in Edison, NJ, which was attended by a wide array of State, county, and local political leaders from both parties, as well as many other community leaders. It was a most fitting tribute to a man who had made such a profound impact on his community, but it is sad that this proved to be one of the last occasions for many of Steve's friends and well-wishers to see him.

A native of Brooklyn, NY, Steve's family relocated to New Jersey where ''Cap,'' as he was known to his classmates, graduated from Toms River High School. Steve was a four-sport athlete, and was active in many other organizations. He attended Franklin and Marshall University in Pennsylvania on a football scholarship, was active in student organizations and maintained honor roll grades. He went on to New Jersey's Rutgers University, where he was on the varsity football team for 3 years and earned the nickname the ''Golden Toe'' for his extra point kicking. He also held down various jobs throughout his college years. In fact, it was while working at the Raritan Arsenal that he met Miss Vivian Testa, whom he would go on to marry. But first, after graduating from Rutgers, Steve went into the Army and served as a paratrooper with the Office of Strategic Services during World War II. He received a medical discharge in 1945.

An active member of his church and community, Steve, along with other parishioners of Holy Rosary Church started one of the first Little Leagues in New Jersey. After years as a self-employed businessman, he was appointed director of health and welfare, parks and recreation of Edison Township. He became a Middlesex County Freeholder in 1968, serving as director of the board from 1979 until his retirement in 1992. From 1978 through 1984, Steve worked for the New Jersey Highway Authority, and was heavily involved in the senior citizen programs, ethnic festivals and other activities at the Garden State Arts Center.

Steve's commitment to his church and his community was well-known. The list of his civic memberships, accomplishments, and awards is a long one, so it's no coincidence that the list of people who volunteered to help organize his testimonial dinner was also quite long. Perhaps the best indicator of the type of official and the type of man that Steve was comes through in his own assessment of his life and career: ''Life has been a lot of fun for Steve Capestro. Working with people is the greatest thrill of all. Working with the public is and always has been a pleasure and an honor.''

For those who knew him personally, and for those who only knew of him through his work, this statement was pure Steve Capestro. Indeed, the public and private sides of Steve were the same person—straight-forward, down to earth, someone who genuinely enjoyed working with people. For his friends, colleagues and the many others who benefited from his years of exemplary pubic service, Steve Capestro will truly be missed. I extend my deepest sympathies to Vivian and hope that the many tributes to Steve will be at least some comfort to her.

Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues, in this House, I would say that the life and the public career of Steve Capestro represents everything that we should strive to be.

IN TRIBUTE TO ED MADIGAN

HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my former colleague in the House, my dear colleague from the State of Illinois and, moreover, my good friend, Ed Madigan.

I had the honor of serving with Ed Madigan in Congress from 1985 to 1991. Ed was one of the Members of the Illinois delegation, and of the entire Congress, that I most respected and from whom I frequently sought counsel and advice.

For those of my colleagues who did not have the honor of serving with Ed in Congress, he served 10 terms in the House from Illinois' 15th Congressional District. For 8 years he was the ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, and served on that committee for a total of 18 years. There was no greater authority in Congress on farm issues than Ed Madigan, and I often sought Ed's views on farm issues when they came before the House.

But Ed was not only a leader on agriculture issues. While in the House, he served as chairman of the Republican Research Committee, and was a senior member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Of course, in 1991, President Bush named Ed the Nation's 24th Secretary of Agriculture. As Secretary, Ed was designated by President Bush to serve as the lead negotiator on the agriculture portion of the trade negotiations under the GATT.

However, Ed Madigan is best remembered by me as simply a very good friend. Although when I first came to Congress, Ed was an eminently successful Member. He was never too busy to give me a listening ear. His success in politics never went to his head. With Ed, what you saw was what you got. There were no pretensions. He was a friend who could put one at ease precisely because he was interested in other people's concerns. I do not believe I ever heard anyone in Congress, or, for that matter, anyone in my presence ever say anything derogatory about Ed Madigan. I know I shall miss him. He leaves a rich legacy for all of us who were privileged to have known him.

BAN ON SATURDAY NIGHT SPECIALS

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, the opening day of the 104th Congress, I reintroduced my bill, H.R. 250, to ban the manufacture and sale of Saturday Night Specials. I did so because I know these guns are used to commit crimes, from armed robbery to murder, every day. As crime in this country has grown so has the prevalence of Saturday Night Specials. I believe that taking these dangerous weapons off of our streets is a key to reducing violent crime and saving the lives of our Nation's citizens.

We have all heard the cliche ''Guns don't kill people; people kill people.'' However, on the streets of our cities and in the schools of our neighborhoods guns kill people, some types of guns kill more often than others. Although we have successfully banned semi-automatic assault type weapons, we have failed to ban Saturday Night Specials, a type of handgun that dominates ATF's list of guns used most often in crime. One model, the Raven P–25, has topped that list since 1991.

Saturday Night Specials are cheap, easily concealed handguns. Many sell for between $70 and $115 while the average handgun costs approximately $400. Often they are made with deficient materials and do not possess any safety features. The guns my legislation addresses have already been banned from import by ATF because of their inherently dangerous characteristics. Five of the ten guns traced most often to crime by ATF in 1994 would be banned under the import criteria. Additionally, of all crimes committed with guns appearing on ATF's top ten list, the percentage committed with Saturday Night Specials increased from 58 percent in 1991 to 73 percent in 1994. ''Made in America'' usually means quality and pride, but not in the production of Saturday Night Specials.

Just recently, Intratec, famous for the TEC–9 semi-automatic, introduced the CAT–9 semi-automatic pistol. This new weapon weighs just 18 ounces and measures 5.74 inches overall, perfect for any criminal. Not only is it relatively cheap and very small, it has the capability to shoot seven rounds of 9 mm ammunition in a short amount of time. Guns and Ammo found that it is ''designed for relative ease of concealment and close range shooting.'' I know of no sporting or defensive purposes that demand such features. This gun, too, would be banned under the import criteria but instead is in full production today.

Crime with guns is increasing. Saturday Night Specials, because of their design, are clearly the favorite weapon of criminals. H.R. 250 uses the same criteria ATF established for imports and does not apply to all handguns. Therefore, it is both easily implemented and easily enforced.

The basic fact is that passage of such legislation is critical to the survival of too many people for us to ignore.

HONORING THE WARSAW HIGH SCHOOL MARCHING PERCUSSION ENSEMBLE

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, today I honor a dedicated and committed group of young people from my home district. This talented group of 24 young men and women make up the Warsaw, Indiana High School Marching Percussion Ensemble. Marching with the Tiger Pride Marching Band, the ensemble has earned distinction repeatedly over the years, and continues to strive for, and achieve, the highest standard of quality.

Having garnered numerous honors and titles in their young careers, the ensemble recently capped their success by winning the 1994 Grand National Indoor Percussion Championship at the Bands of America Competition in Indianapolis. Making their achievement all the more impressive is that this is the third consecutive year that the Warsaw ensemble has won the national championship. This is something in which they can and should take tremendous pride. This is also something in which our community can take great pride.

In addition to spending numerous hours in rehearsal, these 24 young people carry full class loads, study hard, belong to clubs, attend church with their families, and enjoy time with their friends. They have worked hard and deserve our recognition, support, and commendation.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity to applaud Band Director Marty Becker and Percussion Director Mickey Ratliff who have given so much of their time, energy, insight and enthusiasm to the young people of the Warsaw community. Clearly, they have used their position as teachers to the great benefit of their students, and I and the community they serve are grateful.

NATIONAL APPRECIATION DAY FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1995, America will celebrate National Appreciation Day for Catholic Schools. It is certainly appropriate that we acknowledge the institutions that are preparing our young people for fulfilling lives of service, dedication, and achievement.

Over the years, this Nation's Catholic schools have educated thousands of students. They have given each child a high academic, value-added education that inspired him or her to grow and become a person of integrity and service. All students, regardless of race, creed, color, or gender are given the opportunity to learn, succeed and become contributors to the community.

This year's theme is Catholic Schools: Schools You Can Believe In. I am especially proud that a Catholic school in my district, Saint Athanasius in Bensonhurst truly embodies this idea. I would like to take this opportunity to commend them for the exceptional job they have done educating the young people in our community. Saint Athanasius School serves as an example in our community of how to prepare students to believe in themselves.

I know my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join with me in wishing Saint Athanasius and this Nation's Catholic schools many more years of success. It is clear that the men and women educators of these schools understand the value in investing in this country's most precious resource, our children.

THE ''MUST-CARRY'' REPEAL

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to repeal the must-carry provision of the Cable Act of 1992 in order to restore consumer choice.

The must-carry provision is a so-called consumer provision of cable regulation. However, it is the consumers who are hurt most by it. Cable television consumers are denied the ability to view many stations simply because the hands of the cable operators are tied by the must-carry rule.

Must-carry states that one-third of each cable operator's channel capacity must be reserved for local commercial broadcast stations. Local is defined as the area of dominant influence, or the closet metropolitan area. In many suburban areas, there is more than one major city nearby. In such cases, all stations from the closest city, regardless of appeal, must be carried, often at the expense of more popular stations from another city.

This legislation is a straightforward repeal of the must-carry rule. It will allow cable operators to listen to the wishes of consumers. The American people are sick and tired of Government telling them what to do. Repealing the must-carry rule is a step in the right direction.

DUTY DRAWBACK DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 1995

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we mark the 1-year anniversary of the devastating Northridge earthquake, some businesses in the Los Angeles area are still struggling to pick up the pieces and get back on their feet.

Despite the commendable efforts of FEMA Director James Lee Witt, former SBA Administrator Erskine Bowles, and HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros, a number of earthquake-damaged companies are at serious risk of falling through the cracks. Some of these face unique and unanticipated circumstances, and have thus been unable to qualify for the standard Federal disaster assistance programs.

To help one small subset of these needy businesses, I am once again introducing legislation that would provide an 18-month extension of the duty drawback filing period for businesses that sustain damage in a Presidentially declared disaster. Under current law, the Commissioner of Customs has no discretion to provide such an extension even if, through no fault of their own, businesses lose their records in a fire, flood, hurricane, tornado, earthquake, or other disaster.

This legislation would have an almost negligible budgetary impact, yet would be of crucial importance to the small number of businesses unable to file drawbacks when disaster strikes. The Customs Service, the Treasury Department, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative have all signaled their support for this legislation, and I hope it will be enacted by the Congress in a timely fashion.

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SPECIAL RULE FOR EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING DRAWBACK CLAIMS.

Section 313(r) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(r)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) Notwithstanding the limitation set forth in paragraph (1), the Customs Service may extend the time for filing a drawback claim for a period not to exceed 18 months, if—

''(i) the claimant establishes to the satisfaction of the Customs Service that the claimant was unable to file the drawback claim because of an event declared by the President to be a major disaster on or after January 1, 1994, and

''(ii) the claimant files a request for such extension with the Customs Service within 1 year from the last day of the 3-year period referred to in paragraph (1).

''(B) If an extension is granted with respect to a request filed under this paragraph, the periods of time for retaining records set forth in subsection (t) of this section and section 508(c)(3) shall be extended for an additional 18 months.

''(C) For purposes of this paragraph the term 'major disaster' has the meaning given such term in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)).''.

COMMENDING R. JAMES WOOLSEY

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the Members' attention the following resolution which was recently passed in the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

TO COMMEND R. JAMES WOOLSEY FOR EXCEPTIONALLY DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas, R. James Woolsey has served the people of the United States of America in government and as a private citizen for over twenty-five years.

Whereas, R. James Woolsey began his public service with the United States Army in 1968 where he served as an advisor to the U.S. delegation to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and on the National Security Council Staff.

Whereas, R. James Woolsey went on the serve with distinction as a General Counsel to the U.S. Senate Committee on Armed Services, as Under Secretary of the Navy, as Delegate at Large to the U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, and as Ambassador and U.S. Representative to the Negotiation on Convention Armed Forces in Europe, and as a member of several Presidential commissions.

Whereas, R. James Woolsey has served with distinction since February 5, 1993 as the Director of Central Intelligence.

Whereas, R. James Woolsey has worked diligently to lead the intelligence community to meet the demanding requirements of U.S. national security in an uncertain and unpredictable world.

Whereas, under the direction of R. James Woolsey, the intelligence community has provided excellent support to this nation in providing critical insights into the world hot spots—in Iraq, Somalia, Haiti, the former Soviet Union, and elsewhere; and followed and, when possible foiled, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorist acts, and other activities inimical to U.S. national interests.

Whereas, R. James Woolsey has continued and further promoted the consideration and redirection of intelligence roles and missions while simultaneously coping with a dramatic reduction in fiscal resources and of personnel at over twice the rate directed by the President for the government at large.

Whereas, R. James Woolsey led the Central Intelligence Agency in the critically sensitive final stages of identifying and apprehending a traitor who had, in previous years, compromised some of its most valuable capabilities.

Whereas, R. James Woolsey judiciously and carefully began a complete revamping of personnel security practices and counterintelligence roles in the intelligence community to limit the possibility of a recurrence of such traitorous activity.

Whereas, R. James Woolsey used his tenure as Director of Central Intelligence to lay the groundwork for intelligence policies designed to support national security needs for the coming century.

Whereas, R. James Woolsey brought to his duties a commitment to improve effective Congressional oversight and to demystify and explain the mission of intelligence to the people of the United States.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that, on the occasion of his departure as Director of Central Intelligence, the Committee expresses its deep appreciation to R. James Woolsey for his distinguished service to the people to R. James Woolsey for this distinguished service to the people of the United States and, particularly, for his leadership of the intelligence community and the Central Intelligence Agency.

TRIBUTE TO SAN DIEGO CHARGERS

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the new champions of the American Football Conference, the San Diego Chargers. It is no secret that America's finest city now has America's finest football team and we are eagerly anticipating a Chargers' victory over the San Francisco 49ers in the Super Bowl.

To quote from the Associated Press, "What happens when the cork pops on 35 years of football frustration? Come to San Diego to find out. The San Diego Chargers are in the Super Bowl, and that has never happened before." On Sunday, when the triumphant Chargers returned from Pittsburgh, there were 70,000 screaming fans on hand to welcome them home.

For far too long, people have written off the Chargers. The Steelers made that mistake on Sunday. Before the AFC Championship, Pittsburgh was busy rehearsing for a Super Bowl video and their fans were booking trips to Florida. After the Chargers beat the Steelers 17–13, they aren't writing off the Chargers anymore in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Speaker, I want to salute Chargers president Alex Spanos, who has defied the skeptics and produced a world-class team through perseverance, hard work, a little luck and a little stealth.

I want to salute Chargers general manager Bobby Beathard, who has brought to San Diego his proven record of creating winners with his keen eye for talent, and a true commitment to teamwork.

To coach Bobby Ross and his team of coaches who are proven motivators. Their leadership has given this team the focus to never give up and the skills to overcome the obstacles in their way, against even the longest odds.

And finally to the players of the San Diego team, a team who national "experts" picked to finish last. They have proven that commitment, focus, teamwork and heart can win and that America's finest city has America's finest team, the San Diego Chargers.

RETIREMENT OF BRIG. GEN. EDWARD RAMIREZ DUENAS

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to commend a journalist, a military commander, and a fellow legislator. Brig. Gen. Edward R. Duenas is a native son who has unselfishly contributed over three decades of valuable service to his home, the island of Guam.

General Duenas is the son of the late Jesus Camacho Duenas and Juliana Torres Ramirez Duenas. He is the brother of former Senator Jose (Ping) Duenas, retired Army Master Sergeant Jesus R. Duenas and Dr. Vincent A. Duenas. Born on May 11, 1936, in the city of Agana on Guam, he completed his high school studies at Father Duenas Memorial High School in Mangilao, Guam back in 1955. He later acquired a bachelor of science degree in journalism from Marquette University in Milwaukee, WI.

Immediately after graduation, he worked in various capacities from the island's news media. He also took some time out to serve in the Army in 1961 thru 1963. A total of 6 years was dedicated by him in direct service to the people of Guam through his work as a journalist. Between the years 1951 and 1965, he worked for publications and newscasts such as KUAM radio and TV, the Guam Daily News, and the Pacific Journal. He served as sports editor, local news writer, wire editor, and newscaster both in TV and on radio.

His government service began back in 1965. He served initially as public relations officer and later as a staff director for the 8th Guam Legislature. He took care of public relations, prepared news releases, public announcements and was later made responsible for the operations and management of the entire legislative staff.

General Duenas moved to the Governor's office in 1969 after occupying supervisory positions in a couple of government of Guam agencies. As Governor Camacho's press secretary, he handled media relations, prepared speeches, arranged meetings, and compiled information for the Governor's annual report to the Department of the Interior. On three occasions, General Duenas had the chance to bring holiday cheer to Guamanian fighting men in the war zone by accompanying the Governor on Christmas visits to Vietnam in 1969, 1970, and 1971.

A distinguished legislator, General Duenas was elected as a senator in the Guam Legislature back in 1974 and served for nine consecutive terms. As a Guam senator, he introduced over 50 bills and amendments which became law. Among these were laws that created the island's Department of Youth Affairs, Department of Military affairs, Division of Senior Citizens, and the original Commission on Self-Determination. We can also credit his bills for the establishment of a dual-track curriculum for Guam's public high schools, the original Summer Youth Internship Program and, among others, job protection and equivalent pay for Guam National Guard members activated for territorial duty. He also played a pivotal role in the creation of the island's Veterans Affairs Office, the establishment of its clinic, the construction of a veterans memorial building and the completion of the Guam Veterans Memorial Cemetery.

Senator Duenas also chaired a movement that led to the establishment of the Association of Pacific Islands Legislatures [APIL]. He presided over the association in its initial 3 years and he convened the first summit meeting between the APIL and chief executives of its various member nations.

His military background which dates back to 1961 was given a further boost by a direct appointment in March 1982 to the Guam Army National Guard. He received a commission to the rank of major and resumed working on press and public affairs until 1989 when he was picked to be assistant adjutant general for the headquarters of the territorial area command of the Guam National Guard. He later attained the highest possible position in the Guam Guard when he was appointed by former Governor Joseph Ada to office of the adjutant general of the Guam National Guard.

For over 30 years, General Duenas has distinguished himself as one of Guam's premier public servants. The body of work that he has done as a journalist, legislator, and military commander has contributed greatly to the positive direction that the island is currently taking. Therefore, I commend Brig. Gen. Edward Ramirez Duenas for having been the consummate public servant and congratulate him on his well earned retirement.

I also suspect that General Duenas will continue to serve the people of Guam through active participation in civic and political matters. Si Yu'os Ma'ase' Ed.

TRIBUTE TO THE GLADWIN LIONS CLUB

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I rise today to recognize an outstanding organization in the State of Michigan. The Gladwin Lions Club in Gladwin, MI, and its many members have demonstrated their commitment and dedication to helping others for the past 25 years. By sponsoring philanthropic events throughout the year, they have illustrated their desire to improve Gladwin, MI, and positively impact their community and its residents.

It is the spirit of giving that makes the Gladwin Lions Club such a special organization. The Lions Club calls on its members to pool their resources in order to facilitate programs that benefit local citizens. It is this selfless donation of time and energy that makes Gladwin a kind and caring city and sets an outstanding example for other communities to follow.

The Gladwin Lions Club and its members have worked tirelessly to improve their city and the surrounding areas and enrich the lives of residents. They established collection centers at local optical stores to allow those purchasing new glasses to donate their old frames to those less fortunate. All have benefited from their service, from the families who need assistance, to residents who enjoy the improved quality of life in the area.

The United States was founded on the good nature of its citizens and excelled under their willingness to assist neighbors and friends. It is this sense of community that motivates the Gladwin Lions Club to accomplish all they can and to promote this caring nature in others. Mr. Speaker, I know you will join my colleagues and I in honoring the Gladwin Lions Club, the rewarding philanthropic events they sponsor and the sense of community their actions foster. I wish them continued success and look forward to another 25 years of giving.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MARCELINO SERNA

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to posthumously honor Mr. Marcelino Serna of El Paso, TX. My bill would make the late Mr. Serna eligible for the award from the Army of the Congressional Medal of Honor by stipulation that the regulation which says that a nomination for that award must be filed within 2 years of the acts above and beyond the call of duty should be waived in this case. In my judgment, Mr. Serna deserves that medal just a surely as anyone who has ever been so honored.

Marcelino Serna served in the U.S. Army from 1917 to 1919. He was born in Chihuahua City, in the Mexican State of Chihuahua in 1896. He died February 29, 1992 at the age of 95. He had held his U.S. citizenship since 1924. Seventy-one years ago, Mr. Serna was awarded the Army's second highest award for valor in combat, the Distinguished Service Cross. He was decorated with the highest military medals of Italy and France. The descriptions of his exploits on the battlefields of Belgium and France read like casebooks of heroism. In recovering from wounds suffered toward the end of the war, he was personally decorated by General John ''Black Jack'' Pershing.

Some have speculated that Mr. Serna was not awarded the Medal of Honor because he was a buck private for most of the war, because he was not a citizen of this country at the time or because he could not speak English well. I hope that none of these reasons were ever given by anyone in a position of authority in these matters. They are insulting and they have no basis in law.

This bill, once enacted, would begin to right a wrong, and to correct an oversight. I urge the committee of jurisdiction to take up the legislation as rapidly as possible so that the Army may look at the merits of this case.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the time limitations specified in section 3744(b) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor under section 3741 of such title to the late Marcelino Serna of El Paso, Texas, for acts of heroism performed while serving as a private in the United States Army during World War I.

TRAGIC LOSS OF FOUR SEATTLE FIREFIGHTERS

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a few words in memory of the four firefighters who tragically lost their lives while serving the people of Seattle, WA on January 5, 1995.

Although I did not know firefighter James T. Brown, Lt. Walter D. Kilgore, Lt. Gregory Shoemaker, or firefighter Randall R. Terlicker personally, I appreciate their work in service with the Seattle Fire Department. The dangers they daily encountered to protect the residents of the Seventh Congressional District did not deter them, and I share the community's expressions of admiration, gratitude, and sorrow at this time.

All four firefighters exemplified the courageous tradition of their profession. Their implacable bravery and devotion to their work must not go unnoticed in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you join me in extending my condolences to their families, friends, and colleagues in the Seattle Fire Department.

SCHOOL CHOICE

HON. MARTIN R. HOKE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we all know that a quality education is the greatest investment we can make in our children as well as in our Nation's future. It is often remarked that a Nation's most valuable asset is its youth, and as the father of three young children, I know full well the truth of that observation.

School choice is an innovative and overdue idea. At present, the public schools have a monopoly in education because their consumers, students, and their parents, are forbidden to choose which school to attend unless they can afford private or parochial schools. Not surprisingly, this Government monopoly has failed to provide a quality service to its captive consumers.

School choice would allow parents to take the money they already spend on taxes for education and invest that money in the school they believe will best educate their child. Essentially, the funds go where the child goes. The child would be able to go to a public or private school, including a religious one. By putting power in the hands of parents, schools would be forced to compete for students. Competition, in turn, will force school administrators to make much needed reforms in order to attract even more customers.

Father Anthony Pilla of the Catholic Diocese of Cleveland has undertaken an insightful study of the issue and has written a report which I believe will be of great interest to you, which I will submit to the RECORD.

IT'S GOOD PUBLIC POLICY

(By Bishop Anthony M. Pilla, Catholic Diocese of Cleveland)

In recent years at the local and national level discussion and debate about educational vouchers have become more and more prevalent in many and varied circles of society. As discussions occur and subsequently are covered by the media, misconceptions about nonpublic schools are frequently presented as factual (especially by those opposed to vouchers). Clearly the promulgation of misinformation is a disservice as committed citizens, parents, educators, and civic, church and business leaders seek to consider issues and reach valid, just and informed decisions to benefit all children of the United States.

Through this paper I would like to address the imperative that policy makers understand who would benefit most from public policies which would create and finance a system of education vouchers. This statement speaks to the possible ways in which education reform could truly enhance the lives and future of the children whose parents would like to send them to nonpublic schools. I invite citizens, parents, legislators, and leaders who desire to consider with integrity the issue of vouchers to read and refer to the information provided as future discussions take place.

WHO WILL BENEFIT?

There can be no mistaking the fact that it is truly the poor who will gain from such legislation. To assume that education vouchers will benefit only the wealthy is unfounded, based on little fact and much speculation. The people for whom an education voucher will really mean something are the people for whom these dollars will enable them to make choices about the education of their children. This, of course, is the basic economic principle of marginal economic utility. Therefore, to measure the true value of education vouchers, legislators must not only consider the dollar amount, but the value of those dollars in terms of what they can accomplish and for which people.

The assessment of who will benefit in the case of education vouchers is clear and substantiated by hard evidence. In a report titled ''Public and Private Schools,'' issued a decade ago, James Coleman and others, specifically addressed the issue of the impact of public policy changes which would facilitate nonpublic school enrollment. The researchers developed the hypothetical situation of increasing family income and analyzed the effect of such an increase. The report clearly indicates that few students would shift from the public to the private sector, but of those that would a significant number would be minorities and/or from families with incomes at or below the national average. To be more specific such a policy change would mean the following:

1. Only a small proportion of public school students would shift to nonpublic schools;
2. The greatest shift would be among minorities, particularly Hispanics; and
3. The racial and ethnic composition of the groups that would shift to nonpublic schools includes more minorities that are currently in these schools.

To quote the Coleman study itself, ''Because a tuition tax credit or a school voucher would even more greatly facilitate private school enrollment for students from lower income families relative to students from higher income families, we can expect that either of those policies would increase the proportion of blacks or students from low-income backgrounds in the private sector.''

Nowhere has such a detailed and comprehensive analysis been done to see specifically who would benefit most from public policies such as education vouchers or tuition tax credits. Although exact outcomes are impossible to predict, the analysis contained in the Coleman study should allay the fears that such policies would destroy the public schools by encouraging the wealthiest students to move to the private sector. In effect, both the private and public sector should benefit through the equalization of the numbers of poor and minority students in both sectors.

The results of the Coleman study were confirmed in a survey done in 1982 by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) at the U.S. Department of Education. This study, ''Private Elementary and Secondary Education: Congressionally Mandated Study of School Finance,'' estimated that over 50% of public school parents would not even consider leaving the public school system even if all tuition costs were covered. The study also reported that Black and Hispanic families were much more likely than White families to switch their children to a nonpublic school if they were given some financial assistance. For instance, under a $500 tuition tax credit 53.0% of Hispanic and 47.2% of Black parents with children in the public schools said that they were ''likely or somewhat likely'' to switch their children to nonpublic schools, while only 26.8% of White parents with children in public school said they were ''likely or somewhat likely'' to switch their children to nonpublic schools.

More recently, there has been a great deal of research on the impact of public policy changes on nonpublic school enrollment which has even more strongly supported the validity of Coleman's claims. According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching only 19% of public school parents would consider sending their children to a nonpublic school. The Carnegie Foundation study also shows that most parents—87 percent—are satisfied with their children's public school. Furthermore, in those places where local governments have experimented with education vouchers, their has not been a mass exodus from the public schools. The full-scale voucher program recently implemented in Puerto Rico demonstrates that such a fear is unwarranted. During the two years of the operation of the Puerto Rican education voucher program, more school children in Puerto Rico chose to leave nonpublic schools to go to public schools than chose to leave public schools for nonpublic schools.

ARE NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS ELITIST?

So the evidence, both theoretical and empirical, is clear: an education voucher system will not leave the public schools empty; and, of those students whose families will use vouchers to choose nonpublic schools a disproportionate number will be minorities or from poor families. But what about these people who would use education vouchers to go to a nonpublic school? Will education vouchers really benefit participating students educationally? There are several misconceptions about the parents who choose to send their children to nonpublic schools and about the quality of nonpublic education. These misconceptions have been used by opponents of education vouchers to argue that nonpublic schools do not serve children from families who need financial assistance in order to continue to afford their school's tuition, and to argue that it is not good public policy to help parents have a choice about what kind of school their children are going to attend.

First, some people picture nonpublic schools as being white, wealthy and highly selective. These generalizations about nonpublic schools are highly inaccurate. Several recent studies published by the U.S. Department of Education demonstrate that nonpublic schools are not predominately attended by the wealthy. The National Center for Education Statistics recently issued a report which estimated that in 1985, 47% of students in church-related schools and 32% of students in nonsectarian schools were from families with incomes of between $15,000 and $35,000, while 42% of the students in public schools were from families within that income range.

According to research produced by the National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA), there are not significant differences between the income levels of public and Catholic school families. NCEA estimates that in 1992, 6% of Catholic high school families had an income level of under $15,000; 17% had an income level of between $15,000 and $25,000; 26% had an income level of between $25,001 and $35,000; 28% had an income level of between $35,001 and $50,000; and 23% had an income level of over $50,000. Using 1990 Census Data, the percentages nationwide for families of four were not significantly different: 17% of families had an income level of under $15,000; 16% had an income level of between $15,000 and $25,000; 18% had an income level of between $25,001 and $35,000; 20% had an income level between $35,001 and $50,000; and 30% had an income level of over $50,000.

To quote NCEA, ''These data provide additional evidence to refute persistent and pernicious stereotypes of Catholic schools as a refuge for the wealthy. Clearly, many families who choose Catholic high schools for their children must strain to find money for tuition within limited budgets.

Research on elementary schools is even more telling in this regard. For the 1992–93 school year, NCEA estimates that 11.6% of Catholic elementary school families had an income of less than $15,000; 21.5% had an income of between $15,001 and $25,000; 25.1% had an income of between $25,001 and $35,000; 23.4% had an income of between $35,001 and $50,000; and, 18.3% had an income of more than $50,000. What may be more significant than this, is the fact that over 92% of all Catholic elementary school families had dual incomes in 1992–93. These statistics demonstrate that many Catholic school parents make significant sacrifices to send their children to a nonpublic school. In light of this evidence it is difficult to understand how anyone could claim that nonpublic school parents are wealthy, and therefore, not deserving of a share of the tax funds to which they contribute in order to assist them in the educational choice they are making for their children.

Inner-city nonpublic schools, in particular, demonstrate a remarkable willingness and ability to serve the needs of urban students from disadvantaged families. Research indicates that these schools draw from the same populations as the local public schools. According to data from the 1990 Census, there are over one million families living in our country's inner-cities—13.4% of all inner-city families with school age children—who send their children to nonpublic schools. These figures indicate that there are many parents in our cities and urban areas who are in desperate need of a public policy which says to them, ''You may educate your children in the schools of your choice as guaranteed by the Constitution. And furthermore, you will be able to do so even though you may be poor or disadvantaged—whether or not you live in the cities or the suburbs or the rural areas of this country.''

Consistent with the results of the Coleman study, the U.S. Department of Education's 1985–86 study on Private Schools demonstrates that the nonpublic school community has indeed been able to achieve a higher degree of integration relative to the racial backgrounds of their students than the public sector. It is also important to note that the percentage of minorities enrolled in all nonpublic schools has significantly increased over the last decade. Catholic schools, in particular, have performed particularly well in this regard. According to the National Catholic Educational Association, the percentage of minorities in Catholic schools has more than doubled since 1970–71. In 1993–94, the percentage of Black, Hispanic and Asian students made up 22.5% of students in Catholic schools. In light of these figures and of the trends indicated in the Coleman report, can anyone reasonably suggest that nonpublic schools do not serve children from a wide range of economic, racial and ethnic backgrounds?

All of this raises a simple point. Any public policy precluding or denying freedom of choice in education on the assumption that nonpublic schools are racist or elitist is public policy based on misconception. If anything, the facts indicate that a statement of public policy in the form of education vouchers would serve to further improve the racial and economic mix in both nonpublic and public schools.

The second general misconception about nonpublic schools concerns the quality of nonpublic schools and, in particular, as it relates to selectivity. Opponents of education vouchers often argue that nonpublic schools do a better job of educating children because they can be more selective in whom they accept and are free to expel the children they don't want. This viewpoint is quite simply not based on the facts.

Once again, let us consider this misconception in the case of the performance and policies of Catholic schools which, of course, educate over 50 percent of all nonpublic school children in the United States. The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights conducted a study on inner-city nonpublic schools based on an analysis of randomly selected schools in eight major cities around the country. The data from this study indicates that after giving preference for admission to parishioners, approximately 90 percent of these schools exercise open admission policies and rarely expel students. This data is further supported by research done by Dr. Vitullo-Martin. He states, ''No researcher has found any extensive use of expulsion sufficient to explain the statistical differences in achievement rates between public and Catholic schools.'' This is not to say that nonpublic schools never expel nor dismiss students for various reasons, but that such action is not taken lightly, nor is done very often, as some opponents on nonpublic education would have us believe.

WHAT ABOUT QUALITY?

The misconceptions about the selectivity of nonpublic schools should not prevent the provision of education choice to parents and neither should misconceptions about the quality of nonpublic schools. In fact, the quality of nonpublic schools is at least as good as that found in the public sector and in many instances better. Once again, the Coleman data provides conclusive evidence:

1. Given the same kinds of students, nonpublic schools create more contact for students with academic activities. For example, attendance is higher, students do more homework and they take on average more vigorous subjects;

2. There is greater scholastic achievement in nonpublic schools than in public schools, brought about by a more ordered environment;

3. The growth rates in achievement between the public and nonpublic schools differ, with strong evidence that average achievement among nonpublic school students is ''considerably'' greater than in the public sector; and

4. In discussing Catholic schools, in particular, the Coleman report concludes that Catholic schools most closely resemble the ideal of the ''common school.'' That is, they educate children from different backgrounds and obtain greater homogeneity of student achievement.

These conclusions have been supported by more recent examinations of the relative achievement levels in nonpublic and public schools. In his above mentioned book on Catholic schools, Anthony Bryk reported that in 1988, 64% of Catholic school students in grade 10 compared with 45% of public schools students in grade 10 stated that they had plans to attend college. More importantly, Bryk's research showed conclusively that the distribution of academic achievement is more equalized across class, race and ethnic lines in Catholic schools than in the public schools. In other words, the average level of achievement in mathematics, for example, is not only higher in Catholic high schools, it is less strongly related to social class and racial and ethnic background.

The impact of an education in Catholic school clearly has long term benefits as well. For example, the U.S. Department of Education reported that by the spring of 1986, 36% of White Catholic high school graduates, 25% of Black graduates and 25% of Hispanic graduates went on to receive a BA, BS or MA, while only 19% of White Public Schools graduates, 9% of Black graduates and 9% of Hispanic graduates had received one of those degrees.

I do not point out these things to accentuate the differences between public and nonpublic education. More than two-thirds of Catholic school-age children in this country attend public schools, and I remain committed to and supportive of the public schools in this nation.

For too long the nonpublic schools in this country have been accused of being racist, elitist and of inferior quality. Past attempts to establish a public policy which would truly give parents educational freedom of choice have been defeated using these misconceptions as reasons against granting equity to parents, especially the poor parents of our nation. Hard evidence is now available and it reveals these misconceptions for what they are. The evidence tells us that poor parents will benefit most from a system of education vouchers and that the schools to which they would send their child can no longer be considered a priori to be racist or elitist. The evidence also tells us that the quality of nonpublic school education is certainly not inferior. None of the misconceptions which have been attributed to nonpublic schools in the past should stand in the way of the establishment of an education voucher system as a matter of public policy. There should be no doubt that justice and equity demand such public policy, for to be poor without educational choices is in itself a greater poverty. Policy makers have an opportunity to provide that justice and equity, by providing educational choices to minorities and poor of this country. The time to act on education vouchers is certainly at hand. I urge you to support a system of education vouchers—a policy which will bring educational justice and freedom to the people of this country.

TRIBUTE TO DICK AUSTIN

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, Dick Austin's decades of public service deserve more than the typical testimonial accolades.

His career has indeed been unique. In his own quiet but determined fashion, Dick has truly been a pioneer, breaking through a number of barriers in the State of Michigan.

He has represented an important embodiment of the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.—that we be judged by the content of our character rather than the color of our skin. He has been an ambassador of good will among us as citizens of Michigan, in every corner, indeed virtually every nook and cranny of our State.

He has done so by bringing high competence and full integrity to a major office affecting the lives of us all. From our physical security or our highways to honesty in the voting booth, Dick Austin has stood up for Michigan's interests.

Twenty-five years ago, I had the privilege of campaigning statewide with Dick Austin. Our earlier friendship deepened with that experience and has increased with each year's passing. May Dick continue in good health, so that we will continue to be blessed with his good cheer, warn friendship, and usual talents.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN FRIERSON

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. John Frierson, who is retiring this month after a dedicated career of 26 years to the citizens of Los Angeles. On Friday, January 20, 1995, in Los Angeles, John's many friends and colleagues will gather at a retirement dinner in his honor at the Continental Plaza Hotel. In recognition of his service to the community, I am pleased to highlight just a few of his career and community service accomplishments for my colleagues.

Born in Harlem in New York City, John graduated from George Washington High School, and studied history at the City College of New York. He moved to Los Angeles in 1957, and has completed courses in law enforcement and history at the University of California, Los Angeles.

During his career in the U.S. Navy, John served aboard the U.S.S. *Little Rock.* In 1948, he was assigned as a personal 1st Class Steward to Adm. Richard Glassford, commander of the 3d Atlantic Fleet. A highlight of his assignment was a trip to Odessa, Russia—location of the 1947 summit meeting of President Harry S. Truman, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Premier Joseph Stalin.

Following his honorable discharge from the Navy, John embarked on a career in public service that would span nearly three decades. His career in law enforcement includes service as a deputy sheriff for the County of Los Angeles, and as the sergeant in charge of West Los Angeles traffic for the Los Angeles Police Department and the Department of Transportation.

For the past several years, John has served as the senior deputy to 10th district city councilman Nate Holden.

In addition to his public service, John has been actively involved in community affairs. He is a member of the Urban League, NAACP, Service Employees International Union, Local 347, and the Committee to Support Dial 911. He serves on the board of the Oscar Joel Bryant Police Association, and is a charter member of the Harlem Negro Theater. He also served as a member of Los Angeles city attorney James Hahn's Small Business Advisory Committee.

John's commitment to public service and his community is exceeded only by his commitment and enthusiasm for political activism. He is a past president of the New Frontier Democratic Club; former regional director, region 11

of the California State Democratic Party; member of the Democratic County Central Committee; and an executive board member of the California Democratic State Party and the Wilshire Community Police Council.

John is the recipient of numerous awards for his many contributions to the citizens of Los Angeles, including community service awards presented by Assemblywoman Gwen Moore, and Councilman Holden, respectively; the Outstanding Community Service Award, presented by the National Black Police Association, region 5; Member of the Year Award from the New Frontier Democratic Club; and Member of the Year in the 49th and 53d Assembly Districts Awards, presented by the Los Angeles County Democratic Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my sincere pleasure to count John and his lovely wife, Susie, as my friends for many years. And it is especially fitting that a dinner is being held in John's honor to commend him on a fine record of service to the community. I am especially pleased to join in that tribute and to have this opportunity to pay tribute to John on this happy occasion. Please join me in extending to John and Susie best wishes for a retirement that is rich with happiness and full of prosperity.

TRIBUTE TO BRIG. GEN. SEBASTIAN F. COGLITORE, USAF

HON. ANDREA H. SEASTRAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, a friend of the Congress and a long-time leader in this Nation's space programs is retiring from the U.S. Air Force on February 1 of this year, Brig. Gen. Sebastian Coglitore. His most recent position has been as the director of space programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Washington, DC. In this position he has provided leadership and program management direction for development and procurement of all Air Force satellites and launch systems and the related ground infrastructure including communications, navigation, surveillance, weather, radar, and command and control systems.

General Coglitore has had a distinguished career of nearly 30 years of military service. After being commissioned through the New Jersey Institute of Technology Reserve Officer Training Corps Program in August 1965, he started his military career as a deputy missile combat crew commander for the Minuteman Intercontinental Ballistic Missile System at Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND. His last two decades of service have contributed directly to the success of the Department of Defense's space programs in both development and operations. General Coglitore was program manager of the first Department of Defense spacecraft to fly on the space shuttle and later, as the program manager for the United States largest space booster, the Titan IV, he led the Department's efforts to return to space after the *Challenger* disaster. His many tours of duty at the Pentagon included being deputy to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Space Plans and Policy and being military assistant for space to the Secretary of the Air Force. He also held the position of command director at the NORAD Command Center, Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Base, CO. Before returning to the Pentagon in August 1993 he was the Commander of Space Command's 30th Space Wing and Director of the Western Range, Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA, where he was responsible for all west coast launch operations.

General Coglitore has received numerous awards and decorations, including the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, the Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, the Air Force Commendation Medal with oak leaf cluster, and most recently the Distinguished Service Medal, the citation of which is reprinted below.

General Coglitore plans to continue his work in space programs in a civilian capacity, but has not yet picked a specific location. On behalf of my colleagues and the congressional staff who have known and worked with General Coglitore we wish him and his wife Reggi the very best in their future endeavors.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO SEBASTIAN F. COGLITORE

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress July 9, 1918, awards the Distinguished Service Medal to Brigadier General Sebastian F. Coglitore for exceptionally meritorious service in a duty of great responsibility. General Coglitore distinguished himself as Director of Space Programs, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, the Pentagon, Washington, District of Columbia, from 20 July 1993 to 31 January 1995. In this important assignment, the forceful leadership and dedicated efforts of General Coglitore were significantly displayed in the research, development, and acquisition of space systems that are critical elements of the future operational effectiveness of the United States Air Force. The singularly distinctive accomplishments of General Coglitore culminate a distinguished career in the service of his country and reflect the highest credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

PUBLIC OPINION ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS ISSUES

HON. ELIZABETH FURSE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, 1995 is a very important year for the issue of nuclear testing. The U.N. Conference on Disarmament will resume negotiations January 30 on a comprehensive test ban treaty [CTB].

Failure to make significant progress toward a CTB before the Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT] Extension Conference in April could jeopardize the future of the NPT, which is a vital check on the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world. The new Congress must provide the strong bipartisan political support necessary to expand efforts to halt nuclear proliferation and achieve a CTB.

A new poll shows that almost 80 percent of the American people believe that reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now should be an important priority for the U.S. Government. The overwhelming majority favor more aggressive arms control measures. These results were true for Republican, Independent and Democratic voters alike.

The national poll of 1,011 Americans revealed that: 90 percent favor further cuts in the world's total of nuclear weapons; 82 percent favor a global ban on all nuclear tests; and 82 percent favor eliminating all or most nuclear weapons.

Some 80 percent of Republican voters favor a test ban, as do 85 percent of Democratic voters and 81 percent of Independents. Similarly, 90 percent of all three voter groups favor further cuts in nuclear weapons, with 81 percent of Republicans opting for eliminating all, almost all or a lot of the weapons, compared to 84 percent of the Democrats and 83 percent of the Independents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert the poll's findings in the RECORD. We need to listen to our constituents and get on with ridding the world of the scourge of nuclear weapons.

PUBLIC OPINION ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS ISSUES—DECEMBER 30, 1994–JANUARY 3, 1995

WASHINGTON, D.C—A new poll shows that almost 80 percent of the American people believe that reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now should be an important priority for the US government (with 56% saying it was a very important priority). The overwhelming majority favor aggressive arms control measures over the current policies, with lesser majorities supporting building a missile defense system or increasing defense spending. These results were true for republican, independent and democratic voters alike.

The national poll of 1,011 Americans asked about specific policy options:

90 percent favor further cuts in the world's total of nuclear weapons (72% strongly in favor).

82 percent favor a global ban on all nuclear tests (with 56% strongly in favor).

82 percent favor eliminating all or most nuclear weapons.

68 percent favor trying to build a theater anti-missile system for troops (43% strongly favor).

64 percent favor trying to building a global anti-missile system for the US (38% strongly favor).

54 percent favor increasing the US military budget (32% strongly favor).

80% of republican voters favor a test ban, as do 85% of democratic voters and 81 percent of independents. Similarly, 90% of all three voter groups favor further cuts in nuclear weapons, with 81% of republicans opting for eliminating all, almost all or a lot of the weapons, compared to 84% of the democrats and 83% of the independents.

Given a choice, 58 percent favor eliminating all nuclear arms in the world rather than for a few countries, including the United States, having nuclear weapons so no other nation would dare attack or while trying to keep the rest of the world from getting them. Only 40 percent supported the current policy of a few countries in the world having nuclear weapons.

Sixty-three percent say they had read or heard little or nothing about President Clinton's policies on nuclear weapons. Fewer than half (45%) said they were satisfied with the President's actions to reduce the danger of nuclear weapons, with 42 percent saying they were dissatisfied.

The poll was conducted of 1011 Americans over age 18 December 30 through January 3, 1995, by ICR Survey Research Group, which does polling for the Associated Press, The Washington Post, and others. The margin of error is +/− 3.1 percent (at the 95% level of confidence, according to standard polling practice.)

MASTER QUESTIONNAIRE

[Field dates: Dec. 30, 1994–Jan. 3, 1995]

Note: The following precautions were taken to minimize the effect of bias by averaging out small, deliberate biases introduced in question pre-ambles and response choices. This method also serves to prove that small biases do produce comfortingly small changes in the response statistics, so that the resulting averages not only probably produce less bias than the older method of survey design where preambles and response menu choices introduced by the survey designers are not tested at all. The new method also brackets the effect of bias, and often shows how little dependent on wording-bias responses are, and when they do occur what the exceptions to that rule are and how they arise: Questions were read in the order presented to both half samples. Q1 is identical to Q2 except Q1 has a more ''comforting'' introduction and Q2 has a more ''alarming'' introduction. Questions were read to half sample A as presented here. Half sample B had the ''comforting'' and ''alarming'' introductions [the words in brackets, like these] interchanged in Q1 and Q2. Half sample B in Q3 and Q8 were read the response choices in reverse order, and half samples A and B in Q12 tested the support for two strong but different reasons for not aiming toward the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

First a little background—

1. (half sample A). [The nuclear arms race has substantially diminished and many nuclear weapons have been eliminated in the last five years.] Should reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now be an important priority for the U.S. government or NOT an important priority? Is that very or somewhat important/unimportant?

Very important, 46%; Somewhat important, 30%; Somewhat unimportant, 17%; Very unimportant, 4%; and DK/NA, 3%.

Important 76%; Unimportant 21%.

1. (half sample B). Very important, 60%; Somewhat important, 21%; Somewhat unimportant, 10%; Very unimportant, 6%; and DK/NA, 3%.

Important 81%; Unimportant 18%.

2. (half sample A). It is also true that [the U.S. Russia still have many thousands of nuclear weapons. Terrorists could buy or steal nuclear weapons from a nuclear state. And other nations such as Iraq and North Korea may be building nuclear bombs.] Knowing that, I'd like to ask you again: Should reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now be an important priority for the U.S. government or NOT an important priority? Is that very or somewhat important/unimportant?

Very important, 61%; Somewhat important, 18%; Somewhat unimportant; 14%; Very unimportant, 5%; and DK/NA, 2%.

Important 79%; Unimportant 19%.

2. (half sample B). Very important, 58%; Somewhat important, 24%; Somewhat unimportant; 11%; Very unimportant, 5%; and DK/NA, 1%.

Important 82%; Unimportant 16%.

Average of four: Q1 and Q2 responses, A and B samples:

Should reducing the danger of nuclear weapons now be an important priority for the U.S. government or NOT an important priority? Is that very or somewhat important/unimportant?

Very important, 56%; Somewhat important; 23%; Somewhat unimportant, 13%; Very unimportant, 5%; and DK/NA, 2%.

Important 79%; Unimportant 18%.

3. How concerned are you that renegade countries or terrorist groups could get nuclear weapons?

Extremely, 21%; Very, 40%; Somewhat, 28%; Not very, 8%; Not at all, 2%; and DK/NA, 0%.

4. How much have you read or heard about President Clinton's policies on nuclear weapons?

A lot, 7%; Some, 30%; Just a little, 37%; Nothing, 26%; and DK/NA, 0%.

5. Are you satisfied with what President Clinton has done to reduce the danger of nuclear weapons?

Extremely, 3%; Very, 9%; and Somewhat, 33%.

Total satisfied, 45%.

Extremely, 6%; Very, 13%; Somewhat, 23%; and DK/NA, 13%.

Total dissatisfied, 42%.

Now some suggestions for dealing with nuclear weapons—

6. Do you favor or oppose the U.S. negotiating an international agreement to end all nuclear test explosion?

Strongly, 56%; and Somewhat, 26%.

Total favor, 82%.

Strongly, 7%; Somewhat, 8%; and, DK/NA, 3%.

Total oppose, 15%.

7. Do you favor or oppose negotiating an agreement where all nations with nuclear weapons agree to further reduce the world's total stockpile of nuclear weapons?

Strongly, 72%; and Somewhat, 19%.

Total favor, 90%.

Strongly, 4%; Somewhat, 3%; and DK/NA, 3%.

Total oppose, 7%.

8. [Asked of 90.4% who favor in Q7] Reduce the world's nuclear weapons stockpile how much? Of those asked:—

A little, 7%; A lot, 26%; Almost complete, 27%; Completely, 39%; and DK/NA, 2%.

Of total sample:—

Eliminate completely, 35%; Eliminate almost completely, 24%; Reduce a lot, 24%; Reduce a little, 6%; Oppose reduction (from Q7), 7%; and DK/NA (Total of Q7 and Q8), 4%.

Total reduce a lot, complete or almost, 82%.

9. Do you favor or oppose increasing the U.S. military budget?

Strongly, 32%, Somewhat, 21%.

Total favor, 54%.

Strongly, 22%, Somewhat, 21% and, DK/NA, 3%.

Total oppose, 43%.

10. Do you favor or oppose building an anti-missile system to protect the overseas troops of the U.S. and its allies from nuclear missile attack?

Strongly, 43%; and Somewhat, 25%.

Total favor, 68%.

Strongly, 12%, Somewhat, 15%; and, DK/NA, 4%.

Total oppose, 27%.

11. In addition, some say we need a new anti-missile system to protect the U.S. from accidental launches, unauthorized launches and threats of attack from third world nations. Others say that such systems will be expensive, will work poorly—in some circumstances not at all—and would sooner or later violate our ABM treaty obligations. Do you approve or disapprove of trying to build an anti-missile system that will try to shoot down missiles launched at the U.S.?

Strongly approve, 38%; and Somewhat approve, 26%.

Total approve, 64%.

Strongly disapprove, 19%; Somewhat disapprove, 13%; and DK/NA, 4%.

Total disapprove, 32%.

12. (A half sample) As a general goal, which of these two things do you think is more desirable—

1. The elimination of all nuclear arms in the world, 55%; or

2. For a few countries, including the U.S. to have enough nuclear arms so no country would dare attack them, 44%; and

3. DK/NA, 1%.

12. (B half sample). As a general goal, which of these two things do you think is more desirable—

1. The elimination of all nuclear arms in the world, 60%; or

2. For a few countries, including the U.S. to have nuclear arms, while trying to keep the rest of the world from getting them, 36%; and

3. DK/NA, 0%.

A DUAL IN THE DEFICIT WAR

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the January 15 Rocky Mountain News editorial, ''A Dud in the Deficit War.''

The dud in question is the much-ballyhooed balanced budget amendment. The Rocky counsels that the ''Republicans would better spend their time devising real cuts in real programs and leave the hocus pocus to Barnum and Bailey.''

I'm afraid, however, that the Rocky's call for real cuts in real programs is falling on unreceptive ears. One of our distinguished Republican budget-cutters recently launched an assault on the deficit by proposing the elimination of the Board of Tea Tasters.

A DUD IN THE DEFICIT WAR

The issue: The balanced budget amendment.

Our view: Sounds good, but probably wouldn't work.

The centerpiece of the Republican Party's Contract With America promises a line-item veto and a balanced budget amendment. The veto is a good idea, nearly everyone agrees, but the same cannot be said for the budget amendment, even if the principle behind it attracts the supports of 80% of Americans.

Few would deny that the idea of making the federal government spend no more than it takes in is pleasing to the ear. That, after all, is the economic philosophy private citizens ignore at their peril, at least in the long run. There was a time, in fact, when the idea of running a deficit in peacetime was thought to reflect a sort of moral shortcoming.

Yet there are several problems with the GOP's amendment. While the amendment promises to lock the government into a balanced budget and, in fact, outlaw deficits, a quick look at the not-so-fine type finds king-sized loopholes. By the mere act of securing a three-fifths vote, Congress can bust the budget with joyful abandon. We're not talking about wartime emergencies, which would suspend the amendment in order to allow for rapid increases in defense spending. No, the three-fifths vote looms like a bottle in a ''reformed'' drunk's basement—a strong temptation to backsliding.

Another ploy to get around the amendment's demands would be to use unrealistic budget assumptions and balance the budget merely on paper, a trick any politician who has been in Washington 15 minutes knows how to perform. There is also an element of deception in the fact that the amendment applies only to the formal budget document, not the actual operating budget.

A larger concern comes from state governments, which fear, for no little reason, that Washington's strapped politicians will pass on the cost of programs to them. Clearly enough, it is a great deal easier for Washington to force states to take up the slack than

to order service cuts, job losses and new taxes. Washington pols could easily be tempted to make promises to valued constituencies and send the bill to states and municipalities. The federal budget might not suffer, but the jolt to local taxpayers could be immense.

Just now, the GOP hopes to assure governors and state legislators that another plank in its Contract, which calls for a crackdown on unfunded mandates, will eliminate this option. No doubt many Americans, and perhaps their state legislators, are so fed up and frightened by federal deficits that they are willing to take this leap into the unknown. Assurances that unfunded mandates will no longer be allowed may provide the security necessary to make that leap.

Even opponents of the amendment such as ourselves hardly believe it would be the end of the world. But to truly balance the budget, especially without tax increases, will mean eliminating services, slowing the growth of entitlement benefits and ending tax breaks. This is true even under optimistic scenarios for economic growth, given the ballooning deficits projected for the next century when the baby boomers retire.

Republicans would better spend their time devising real cuts in real programs and leave the hocus procus to Barnum and Bailey.

CHURCH RETIREMENT BENEFITS SIMPLIFICATION ACT

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Church Retirement Benefits Simplification Act of 1995. I am pleased to have Representative SHAW of Florida join me as an original cosponsor of this legislation.

The Church Retirement Benefits Simplification Act, which has in past Congresses had nearly 100 cosponsors, will simplify the rules in the Internal Revenue Code which apply to retirement plans sponsored by our country's religious denominations.

The centerpiece of the legislation is a proposed new section 401A of the Tax Code which would bring together in one place and clarify tax rules governing church retirement plans. By providing a separate code section which sets forth these rules as they apply to religious denominations, the bill will remove a great source of confusion and complexity. The relief provided by the bill applies to churches and to church ministry organizations, but not to church-related hospitals and universities.

The bill will extend relief already provided to churches which maintain 403(b) plans to churches and church ministry organizations which offer plans under section 401A. In the Tax Reform Act of 1986, Congress exempted churches with 403(b) plans from coverage and related rules. It is time to provide the same treatment to churches with 401(a) plans and remove the disparity we created then.

The need for this legislation stems from the fundamental differences between churches and the secular business organizations to which the coverage and related rules are primarily designed to apply. Churches and church ministry organizations are tax exempt. They therefore lack the incentive private sector employers have to maximize tax deductible employee benefit payments.

A related point is that the coverage and related rules are designed to limit the amount of income highly compensated employees can be paid on a tax-deferred basis. According to the 1994 Church Pensions Conference, however, ministers' salaries averaged just over $33,000. These modest salary levels leave little cause for concern about the dangers nondiscrimination testing is designed to prevent.

While some provisions of the Tax Code have no meaningful application for church plans, other requirements of the Tax Code are directly at odds with the theology and polity of particular denominations. While some denominations are hierarchical, others include many small, independent churches which have neither the personnel nor the resources to deal with complex compliance requirements.

By exempting churches and church ministry organizations from coverage and related rules, this legislation will permit them to devote their resources to fulfilling their spiritual and community-oriented missions.

A JUST AND LASTING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: WHAT CONGRESS CAN DO

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the leadership of the Churches for Middle East Peace have cowritten a letter to all Members of Congress concerning steps Congress can take to help build confidence between Palestinians and Israelis in order to continue making progress toward lasting peace.

The letter articulates two issues with profound implications for negotiations in the months ahead and which are also of urgent concern to the churches: The future of Jerusalem and the protection of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, the group, Churches for Middle East Peace, are made up of a broad range of religions and religious beliefs and practices, and they include: The American Baptist Churches, USA, American Friends Service Committee, Church of the Brethren, Episcopal Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers, Mennonite Central Committee, Presbyterian Church [USA], Roman Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of Men, Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, United Church of Christ, and the United Methodist Church.

They encourage us, as Members of Congress, to actively support the Israeli-Palestinian peace process which lies at the core of the broader Arab-Israeli conflict, because they believe the process is presently at risk of breaking down. In support of their belief that the process is, or may become, at risk, they particularly cite the following:

Jerusalem: It is critical that the 104th Congress not hinder these negotiations by urging President Clinton to implement a policy that favors Israel's claims to the portion of the city annexed in 1967. Members of Congress can make an important contribution by encouraging the President to keep the question of Jerusalem open for the parties to negotiate and to respect the rights and aspirations of both parties. The letter goes on to say ". . . it is crucial that the U.S. Government vigorously oppose Israeli building of settlements or the expansion of existing settlements in the territory occupied by Israeli forces in 1967."

Human rights: We are concerned that human rights abuses, perpetrated both by the Israeli authorities and the Palestinian National Authority continue and that the U.S. Government in its role as a cosponsor of the peace process is doing little to promote respect for human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues this joint letter, and urge their reading of it in its entirety. The letter is reprinted here with the blessings and hope of the Churches for Middle East Peace for our thorough understanding of the issues, and for all necessary action to further a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

CHURCHES FOR
MIDDLE EAST PEACE,
Washington, DC, January 3, 1995.

Hon. NICK J. RAHALL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAHALL, The members of Churches for Middle East Peace (CMEP), a coalition of the Washington offices of Protestant, Roman Catholic Episcopal, and historic peace churches, encourage your active support for the Israeli-Palestinian peace process which lies at the core of the broader Arab-Israeli conflict. We are writing to you now because we believe that process is at risk and there are steps the U.S. Congress can take to help build confidence between Palestinians and Israelis in order to continue making progress toward lasting peace.

There are a number of problems that may undermine the peace process. We would like to draw your attention at this time to two issues with profound implications for negotiations in the months ahead and which are also of urgent concern to the churches: the future of Jerusalem and the protection of human rights.

Jerusalem: The Declaration of Principles, signed by Israel and the PLO on September 13, 1993, stipulate that the final status of Jerusalem is to be determined by the Government of Israel and the representatives of the Palestinian people in the context of the ''permanent status negotiations'', now scheduled to begin no later than May, 1996. It is critical that the 104th Congress not hinder these negotiations by urging President Clinton to implement a policy that favors Israel's claims to the portion of the city annexed in 1967. Members of Congress can make an important contribution by encouraging the President to keep the question of Jerusalem open for the parties to negotiate and to respect the rights and aspirations of both parties.

Israelis and Palestinians must be encouraged to avoid unilateral actions that would prejudice the permanent status negotiations on Jerusalem. Most importantly, it is crucial that the U.S. Government vigorously oppose Israeli building of new settlements or the expansion of existing settlements in territory occupied by Israeli forces in 1967. Many observers fear that the settlement activity is an attempt by Israel to preempt the negotiations on Jerusalem by creating overwhelming facts on the ground.

The permanent status of Jerusalem, and the process by which it is determined, holds the potential for either promoting reconciliation between Jews, Christians, and Muslims or fostering conflict between them. We urge the U.S. Government to advance a vision of Jerusalem, ''city of peace,'' as a symbol of reconciliation for the three faiths and for Palestinians and Israelis.

Human rights: The protection of human rights is an essential ingredient in the process of peacemaking. We are concerned that human rights abuses, perpetrated both by the Israeli authorities and the Palestinian National Authority (PNA), continue and that the U.S. Government in its role as a co-sponsor of the peace process is doing little to promote respect for human rights.

In mid-September two of our members, Pastor Mark Brown of the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs and human rights attorney Terence Miller of the Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office, met with leaders of Israeli and Palestinian human rights organizations and representatives of international bodies such as the United Nations Secretariat and the International Committee of the Red Cross to assess the human rights situation throughout the occupied territories. The enclosed briefing paper, prepared by Pastor Brown, Mr. Miller and staff of a number of other U.S. religious and human rights organizations, asks that particular attention be focussed on the following four areas:

1. Ensuring the creation of democratically accountable forms of government in the Palestinian partial self-rule areas;

2. Providing for the deployment of international human rights monitors throughout the territories to bolster protection for human rights and the rule of law for all;

3. Preventing the institutionalization of a dual and discriminatory justice system as a consequence of continuing military occupation; and

4. Calling for an end to illegal Israeli settlement activity.

We want you to know that we share the concerns raised in this briefing paper and ask that you will carefully consider the suggestions for U.S. Government action offered in each of the four areas.

We commend Israel and the Palestinian National Authority for their determination to press ahead despite horrendous acts of violence which make the way to peace all the more painful and arduous. We ask that you honor their commitment to the achievement of peace by promoting a U.S. policy which fosters a negotiated solution for Jerusalem and the protection of human rights.

Sincerely,

Robert Z. Alpern, Director, Washington Office, Unitarian Universalist Association; Dale L. Bishop, Middle East Liaison, National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA; Fr. Robert J. Brooks, The Presiding Bishop's Director of Government Relations, The Episcopal Church; Mark B. Brown, Assistant Director, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; J. Daryl Byler, Director, Washington Office, Mennonite Central Committee; Peggy Hutchison, Area Secretary for the Middle East and North Africa, World Division, General Board of Global Ministries, The United Methodist Church; Elenora Giddings Ivory, Director, Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (USA); The Rev. Ted Keating, Director for Peace and Justice, Roman Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of Men's Institutions.

Jay Lintner, Director, Office for Church in Society, United Church of Christ; James Matlack, Director, American Friends Service Committee, Washington Office; Timothy A. McElwee, Director, Church of the Brethren, Washington Office; Terence W. Miller, Director, MaryKnoll Justice & Peace Office; Nancy Nye, Legislative Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Anna Rhee, Executive Secretary for Public Policy, Women's Division, General Board of Global Ministries, The United Methodist Church; Robin Ringler, Peace with Justice Program Director, General Board of Church and Society, The United Methodist Church; Robert W. Tiller, Director, Office of Governmental Relations, American Baptist Churches USA.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN PEACE PROCESS

(A briefing paper prepared by staff of the Human Rights Program of the Carter Center, the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Center for Human Rights, the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, the American Friends Service Committee, the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, and the Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office, Oct. 28, 1994)

The implementation of effective human rights safeguards for all people of the Middle East is essential to the success of efforts to create a just and lasting peace in the region. Respect for human rights in Israel and the occupied territories is an objective of the peace process and can contribute much in this interim phase to building the climate of mutual trust necessary for the achievement of peace.

U.S. policy makers have recognized the crucial importance to the peace process of promoting improvements in the quality of life of Israelis and Palestinians. There are broad public expectations among both communities that if peace is to have any meaning it will bring with it a marked decrease in political violence and human rights abuse. These expectations, which go beyond those that are simply economic, have yet to be addressed, and initial hopes for improved human rights protection are giving way to skepticism and disappointment.

Unfortunately, our government is doing little to ensure that consideration for human rights is at the forefront of the peace negotiations. Administration officials assert that human rights issues are ''something to be discussed between the parties.'' This is an abandonment of the U.S. government's duties as a co-sponsor of the peace process. The administration must take a lead in ensuring that human rights are not the unintended casualty of the single-minded pursuit of a political settlement.

Threats to the fundamental human rights of Palestinian residents of the territories come both from the Israeli occupation authorities, and from the newly created Palestinian National Authority. The U.S. government has a role to play in ensuring that both these powers carry out their responsibilities in accordance with relevant standards of international human rights and humanitarian law. Failure to uphold the rule of law will only fuel mistrust, foster extremism, and interfere with the process of peacemaking.

Particular attention should be focused on the following four areas.

(1) Ensuring the creation of democratically accountable forms of government in the Palestinian partial self-rule areas.

The Declaration of Principles, signed on the White House Lawn just over one year ago, provided for the holding of ''direct, free and general'' elections among Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip to be held within nine months of the signing of the agreement. These elections have not yet been held, and preparations for them are not well advanced. Meanwhile, Chairman Arafat and the appointed Palestinian National Authority (PNA) wield broad discretionary powers over the everyday lives of Palestinians in Gaza and Jericho, including selection of judges and local government leaders. The PNA has already threatened basic rights such as freedom of expression and assembly by banning newspapers, putting constraints on peaceful political gatherings, and other measures that have a chilling effect on democratic discourse.

There is a close correlation between the protection of fundamental human rights and the existence of a representative governing authority. If the habits of democratic governance are to take root in the territories, further delay in the holding of free and fair elections should be minimized.

The United States can help meet the expectations widely expressed by the Palestinian public for democratic and accountable government by actively encouraging both Israel and the PNA to move forward with negotiations preparatory to the holding of elections, and by supporting practical measures conducive to the holding of elections that are free, fair and open to a broad spectrum of political movements. Such measures include protection of fundamental civil and political rights, voter education, support for the independent role of Palestinian human rights groups, and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Palestinian population centers throughout the occupied territories during the election campaign and voting.

The United States should also promote the creation of an accountable form of government in the Palestinian areas after elections. In this regard, the election of an executive council alone, not counterbalanced by an elected legislature nor by an independent judiciary, does not constitute the basis for a functioning democratic form of government.

(2) Providing for the deployment of international human rights monitors throughout the territories to bolster protection for human rights and the rule of law for all.

The human rights situation in the territories remains highly volatile. There are armed extremist groups on both sides each committed to inflicting violence in the hope of derailing the peace process. The temptation is ever present for the Israeli government, PNA and opposition groups to exploit violent incidents for their own political purposes. The possibility of a cycle of violence taking hold in these circumstances, both inter-communally and intra-communally, should not be discounted.

An unarmed international human rights monitoring presence, under appropriate multilateral auspices, could play a valuable role in defusing disputes, and acting as an impartial witness to events. The ability of such a presence to report publicly on its findings should be established at the outset because it would be likely to deter potential human rights violators.

The groundwork for the deployment of such a presence has already been laid in negotiations between the parties and at the United Nations. The Cairo Agreement provided for the deployment of a Temporary International Presence (TIP) in Gaza and Jericho, although the scope of its duties was left to be defined by Israelis and Palestinians at a later date. Security Council Resolution 904, which followed the Hebron massacre of February 1994, also provided for a ''temporary international or foreign presence . . . to guarantee the safety and protection of Palestinian civilians throughout the occupied territory.''

The U.S. government should intercede with both parties to permit the deployment of an independent multilateral human rights monitoring presence throughout the territories occupied by Israel in 1967. For the human rights protection function of such a presence to be successfully accomplished, clear terms of reference need to be drawn up in advance, and agreed to by all parties, firmly rooting

its activities in applicable standards of international law.

(3) Preventing the institutionalization of a dual and discriminatory justice system as a consequence of continuing Israeli military occupation.

The development of democratic norms of governance within Palestinian areas is also impaired by stark inequalities between Israelis and Palestinians in many areas, including the standard of justice available to members of each community. The Cairo Agreement of May 4, 1994, establishing partial Palestinian self-rule within the Gaza Strip and Jericho, provides for the continuation, in many circumstances, of the Israeli military justice system for offenses against Israelis or Israeli security, committed by Palestinians. Palestinian courts have been given no similar jurisdiction over Israelis who may commit offenses against Palestinians. Israelis who commit offenses in the territories are tried in Israeli civilian courts with a high level of regard for due process protection. In contrast, Palestinians are subject to the summary proceedings of the Israeli military courts.

This inequality before the law is deleterious to the cooperation between the Palestinian Authority and the Israeli government in law and order and security matters specifically called for in the agreements. Events such as the abduction of Israeli soldier Nachshon Waxman, and the bomb attack in central Tel Aviv, underline the absolute need for such cooperation. However, cooperation cannot flourish on a basis of institutionalized discrimination.

The U.S. government should urge the Israeli government and the PNA to eradicate disparities between the rights of Palestinian and Israeli criminal suspects from the territories. Members of Congress could contribute positively to this end by supporting Administration efforts to encourage the parties to ensure that administration of justice for all people in the territories guarantees equal protection, due process and other basic legal safeguards.

(4) Calling for an end to illegal Israeli settlement activity.

The building of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories is a violation of international law, and greatly exacerbates Palestinians' fears that they will be left with little land over which to exercise political autonomy. Previous U.S. presidents have stated that the settlements are illegal and constitute an obstacle to peace. Nevertheless, even as the negotiations between the Palestinian Authority and the Israeli government continue, Israeli settlement activity has not abated. For example, the Israeli government is currently considering adding another 700 housing units to the Alfei Menashe settlement near the West Bank city of Qalqilya.

Expansion of settlements undermines Palestinian confidence in Israeli intentions. It also violates the spirit of interim agreements and creates facts on the ground that may prejudice final status negotiations.

The Congress and the U.S. Administration can avoid inadvertently signaling support for these actions by reiterating the importance of halting further Israeli settlement activity and continuing to require that U.S. aid to Israel not be used for settlements as stipulated by U.S. Public Law 102–391, Title VI. By ensuring that no U.S. foreign assistance is used by Israel to support settlement activities, they will contribute to building Palestinian confidence in the agreements.