As a longtime member of the House Banking Committee and the current chairman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, I have an interest in encouraging the use of private sources of credit wherever possible. I believe there is a larger, more active role private lenders can play in addressing the credit needs of electric co-ops. I ask the House Agriculture Committee to hold hearings to explore these reforms of the electric loan program.

FORTY YEARS TO CARE, MOST WITH A FOCUS OF HOPE

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, what do you do when you have someone who keeps coming to you saying that there is a problem, and something needs to be done about it? You let them come up with the solution. That is exactly what happened nearly 27 years ago when the Bishop of the archdiocese of Detroit told Father William T. Cunningham, Jr., that he had his permission to stop teaching as an English professor at Sacred Heart Seminary, become a pastor of Madonna Catholic Church, and the full-time director of Focus: HOPE, an organization he cofounded. In this fashion was born a wonderful organization many of us know as Focus: HOPE, and the beginning of a relationship for millions of Michiganders who have come to know and love Father William Cunningham, who this weekend celebrates his 40th anniversary as a Roman Catholic priest, with masses at his home parish of our Lady of the Madonna.

I am privileged to call attention to the accomplishments of Father Cunningham because he originally comes from Ruth and Ubly, in the thumb of Michigan in my congressional district. He comes back frequently and is well-known to many of my constituents. He has been a parish priest, a teacher, and a leader. He has been a friend and helper to many, and a bane to others who failed to share his belief that people need a helping hand out of poverty. He is caring. He is irascible. He is tender. He is tenacious. He is unique.

Father Cunningham has helped spearhead efforts to revitilze portions of Detroit that had been ravaged by riots, and more importantly to reinvigorate the people who had to live with the riots themselves, or with the aftereffects of the riots. He helped push for food programs for women, infants, and children. He helped push for food assistance to the needy elderly. He worked tirelessly for the creation of a machinists training institute that has grown to a world-class facility, winning quality awards, and helping people get well-paying jobs have a future. He has succeeded in using food as the first step toward independence, and many of us have heard him say time and time again that his fondest hope is that one day he can close the food program and throw away the key because everyone has all the food they need.

Over the years, people never cease to be amazed by his seemingly inexhaustible energy. They are warmed by his bright smile, sometimes beguiled and other times delighted by the twinkle in his eye. After a period of time one learns better than to ask ''so what is your next project,'' especially when one understands that his churning mind is 50 percent innovation, 50 percent determination, and 50 percent divine intervention. It just isn't fair for anyone to deal with him.

Mr. Speaker, Father Cunningham is devoted to his church, devoted to his cause, and devoted to people. He is truly a model of what is best in our Nation. If each State had just one Bill Cunningham. I shudder to think what we could accomplish. I urge all of our colleagues to join me in wishing him the happiest and most blessed 40 anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO LIMIT CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent meeting between you and the President, it was agreed that you would support the creation of a blue-ribbon panel to recommend long-overdue reforms to our campaign finance system.

It has been almost two decades since some of the reforms enacted by Congress in the Federal Election and Campaign Act of 1971 [FECA] were overturned in the landmark Supreme Court case Buckley versus Valeo. The Court ruled that while the Federal Government has an overriding interest in limiting campaign contributions to candidates, it has no compelling reason to limit expenditures under any First Amendment test of free speech and expression. The Court concluded that, unlike limits on contributions, spending caps serve no legitimate purpose in guarding against corruption of the electoral process.

However, several years ago a bipartisan commission, the Committee on the Constitutional System, concluded that one of the greatest threats to our political system is the rapidly escalating cost of campaigns and the growing dependence of incumbents and candidates on money from donors who might expect a favorable vote in exchange for a contribution. Moreover, the Commission found that gridlock could take hold by leaving office holders open to multiply-conflicted opponents, all of whom may believe their contributions should engender a legislator's support. Such activities frustrate all participants in the system and encourage the promulgation of unsound public policy.

The Committee on the Constitutional System concluded that there was only one effective way to fix the problem, through an amendment to the United States Constitution. There is no doubt that concerns about limiting the quantity of speech will be vigorously debated. They should be, since no one should take lightly any proposal to amend that sacred document. However, limits on some kinds of speech, such as debate on the floor of this chamber, are well established as necessary to orderly deliberation. The underlying logic of time limits on debate is the realization that unlimited speech inhibits our ability to govern.

In his dissenting opinion to Buckley versus Valeo, Justice White wrote, ''Expenditure limits have their own potential for preventing the corruption of Federal elections themselves.'' 424 U.S. 264, (1976).

The amendment I propose contains 13 words: ''The Congress shall have authority to limit expenditures in elections for Federal office.'' While brief, the weight of these words is mighty. This amendment, possibly combined with other reforms, would allow the Federal election process to be returned to the people, and permit those who seek and hold elective office to place their energies into solving public policy problems rather than political problems.

I hope that any commission designated to make a recommendation to Congress on campaign finance reform consider the virtue of turning off the constant flow of cash into Federal campaigns through a Constitutional amendment to limit campaign expenditures.

INTRODUCTION OF GILPIN COUNTY EXCHANGE LEGISLATION

HON. DAVID E. SKAGGS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my colleague from Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS, to introduce a bill to facilitate acquisition by the United States of more than 8,700 acres of lands elsewhere in Colorado that are important for recreational and environmental purposes, in exchange for about 300 acres of Federal lands near the town of Black Hawk, in Gilpin County. The bill is similar to one I introduced in the last Congress, on which action was not completed before adjournment.

Under the exchange, the Gilpin County lands would be transferred to Lake Gulch, Inc. There are 133 separate parcels, ranging in size from 38 acres to 0.01 acre, and 90 of them are less than an acre. This part of Colorado was originally acquired by the United States from France through the Louisiana Purchase. After the discovery of gold in Gilpin County, most of the lands in question were claimed under the mining laws and thus passed into private ownership. The 133 parcels the bill would earmark for transfer are leftover fragments.

The Gilpin County lands are essentially unmanageable, and have been identified as suitable for disposal by the Bureau of Land Management [BLM]. However, they can be consolidated with other lands already held by Lake Gulch. Thus, they do have some value for Lake Gulch, but because of their fragmented nature the United States cannot readily realize that value through normal BLM disposal procedures because of the high costs of surveys and other necessary administrative expenses. Enactment of the bill will enable the United States to realize this value, through the acquisition of lands with values, including potential for recreational uses, which give them priority status for acquisition by Federal land-management agencies.

Under the bill, the Gilpin County lands would be transferred to Lake Gulch if that corporation, within 90 days after enactment, offers to transfer the specified lands to the United States. Lake Gulch would be required to hold the United States harmless for any liability related to use of the Gilpin County lands