Smith Elementary School opened in 1956. At Smith, Mrs. Hanlon became a team teacher with Howard Schultz and together they introduced the school's class in astronomy. Their fifth grade classes would return to the school at night for star-gazing from the front lawn. Since the school had no library, the two teachers spearheaded the Library Club of America.

Mrs. Hanlon changed schools again in 1964, with the opening of Meadowbrook Elementary School. As a pioneer in team teaching, she was chosen as team leader for the fifth grade and developed a superior program in team teaching. She studied team teaching in Massachusetts and designed an open classroom and open media center at Meadowbrook.

During 28 years at Meadowbrook, Mrs. Hanlon established Colonial School Day, which evolved into Colonial Capers. She also established Explorer Day, the Heritage Fest and Pioneer Day. Mindful of the value of community cooperation and participation, she developed and orchestrated the Listening Mothers and Teacher Aide programs.

In 1992, with the reorganization of the Hillsdale schools, Mrs. Hanlon was transferred to George White Middle School as the fifth-grade team leader, continuing all the programs she developed at Meadowbrook.

Over the course of her career, Mrs. Hanlon was a finalist for the New Jersey Teacher of the Year and was a recipient of the Governor's Teacher Recognition Award. She has taught two generations of students, including those who have since become fellow members of the faculty, and prominent community members such as Karen Arrigot, wife of Mayor Timothy O'Reilly.

Members of the Hillsdale school system staff, members of the community and countless former students and their parents all have fond memories and deep debts of gratitude for the dedication to their lifetime learning of this outstanding teacher. I wish her much-deserved health and happiness and many years of continued community service.

THE DANGERS OF NEWTSPEAK

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing agreement in America that we suffer from the excessively violent and negative tone of political rhetoric. As is often the case when people find something they dislike, there is a good deal of discussion as to how this unfortunate situation came about. In an excellent article in the Wednesday column of the March 6 issue of The Hill, reporter David Grann analyzes this issue and makes the point, persuasively and accurately, that Speaker GINGRICH bears a great deal of the responsibility for this situation, because of his creative efforts to encourage his fellow Republicans to escalate the vehemence of their rhetorical attacks on the Democrats. As Mr. Grann notes in the article, ''In 1990, Gingrich's now-famous political action committee, GOPAC, sent out a leaflet to Republican candidates nationwide * * * (which) recommended 60 of the Speaker's favorite words to demonize Democrats and the establishment,''.

Speaker GINGRICH in his pre-Speaker days proved very effective in using extremely negative, demeaning language about his opposition, and unfortunately, in politics as in other ventures, success often breeds imitation.

We cannot effectively diminish the unfortunate excessive reliance on rhetoric of this sort without understanding what causes proliferation, and I therefore ask that David Grann's very thoughtful analysis be printed here.

THE DANGERS OF NEWTSPEAK

In 1989, Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) declared that ''nobody would notice if you decapitated the top 12,000 bureaucrats and started over.'' In 1994, sensing a GOP victory, the leader of the Republican revolution denounced the Democratic Congress as ''the enemy of ordinary Americans.''

Today, Pat Buchanan beckons his brigade of ''peasants with pitchforks'' to storm the corrupt establishment and ''lock and load'' their weapons.

But this time the insurgents' guns are pointing at Speaker Newt Gingrich. If ideas have consequences, then Buchanan's peasant rebellion is the logical culmination of Gingrich's relentless rhetorical warfare against Washington. And if lawmakers need to censor TV violence with a V-chip, then Americans may soon need a V-chip for politicians.

In 1990, Gingrich's now-famous political action committee, GOPAC, sent out a leaflet to Republican candidates nationwide titled: ''Language, a Key Mechanism of Control.'' Saying many people ''wish [they] could speak like Newt,'' it recommended 60 of the Speaker's favorite words to demonize Democrats and the establishment, including such poll-tested treats as ''destroy,'' ''traitors,'' ''devour,'' ''lie,'' ''cheat'' and ''threaten.''

''This list is prepared so that you might have a directory of words to use in writing literature and mail, in preparing speeches, and in producing electronic medium,'' the leaflet reads. ''The words and phrases are powerful. Read them. [Emphasis added.] Memorize as many as possible. And remember that, like any tool, these words will not help if they are not used.''

Republicans, like kids discovering matches, used them again and again. Gingrich, who lit the biggest torch, derided the House as a ''corrupt institution.'' ''There are two realities to the current system,'' he railed. ''One is the government is trying to cheat you; and the second is the government is lying to you about what it's doing.''

Other GOP candidates mixed and matched the words, finding rich new combinations: the ''liberal'' ''welfare state'' ''devours'' ordinary Americans with its ''traitorous lies.'' These verbal assaults fueled Americans' distrust of, and disgust for, Democrats and paved the way for the Gingrich revolution. Who, after all, could trust ''a trio of muggers'' like former Speakers Jim Wright (D-Texas), Tip O'Neill (D-Mass.) and Tom Foley (D-Wash.)?

The problem is that talking ''like Newt'' has de-legitimized American democracy to the point that no one—not even Gingrich—can redeem it. Even as the GOP tries to reform the Washington culture and balance the budget, Buchanan decries the current establishment—to a standing ovation—as ''hollow to the core.''

In such an anti-Washington climate, protest candidates like Steve Forbes and Buchanan rise because they have never held public office, while the GOP freshmen, the insurgents of 1994, are suddenly derided as part of the problem.

Which begs the question: How can a country be governed if anyone who governs it is unworthy of governing?

Gingrich, realizing the consequences of his own words, has sheathed his rhetorical sword and tried to muzzle the same freshmen who memorized his list. He understands, more than anyone, that burning down the establishment in 1996, as some of the upstart Republicans have suggested, ''threatens'' to ''devour'' a Republican Congress, not a Democratic one.

None of this seems to bother the bombastic Buchanan, who has his eye on the White House. The commentator of ''Crossfire'' has his own personal political dictionary. (Remember ''pusillanimous pussyfooters?'') But Gingrich, however ruefully, has given him something more important than works: a receptive audience.

The irony is that Gingrich's revolution, despite the rhetoric, is relatively mainstream; a balance budget amendment, a line item veto and tort reform are not exactly radical. Yet, as Gingrich has long noted, words have power. And political cries for revolution, however figurative or fashionable, eventually corrode even the healthiest democracy.

What can be done? To begin with, Republicans can turn to another list of words included in Gingrich's 1990 mailing. These ''optimistic positive governing words,'' the leaflet says, ''help define your campaign and your vision of public service. In addition, these words help develop the positive side of the contrast you should create with your opponent, giving your community something to vote for!''

Some gentle words for Buchananites: ''share,'' ''humane,'' ''listen,'' ''dream,'' ''peace'' and ''common sense.'' But if Republicans keep barking from the other script, Gingrich may soon look out the Capitol window and see an army of peasants with pitchforks rising over the Potomac.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FORMATION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF FOOD AND DRUG OFFICIALS

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a milestone in the United States: the 100th anniversary of the formation of the Association of Food and Drug Officials.

During the latter half of the 19th century, a genuine need existed in the United States for an organization to work with the States, Federal regulatory officials, and industry representatives on the problems that existed within the food and drug industries. Numerous foods were adulterated with a variety of preservatives and chemicals, and, as a result, public safety was an omnipresent threat. The purity of drugs represented another health issue, for the promotion of fraudulent remedies was common practice.

As a consequence of these harmful practices, numerous States began to pass consumer laws, often with the support of manufacturers seeking relief from inequitable competition with the impure products. Despite the positive intentions of the laws, they were often deficient and unenforced due to a lack of control over out-of-State manufacturers. In addition, the manufacturers were subjected to varying State requirements, which led to difficulties with regard to interstate commerce. These problems introduced the need for Federal food and drug laws to impose uniform safety regulations in order to protect the citizens of every State.

In 1896, in Toledo, OH, Joseph Blackburn, the Food and Dairy Commissioner for Ohio, met with his counterpart from Michigan, Elliot Grosvenor, to develop the foundation for an organization whose mission would be defined by the promotion of regulatory uniformity.

The initial meeting of the National Association of State Dairy and Food Departments, which later became the Association of Food and Drug Officials, occurred on August 25, 1897, at the Cadillac Hotel in Detroit, MI. This meeting was attended by representatives from ten States.

Since it's inception 100 years ago, the AFDO has provided the basis for the furthering of uniform and rational regulations and the forum for the exchanging of ideas and the creation of solutions that win approval of both government and industry. The AFDO has also successfully ameliorated the status of consumer protection in the United States, and it has been in the forefront in support of crucial legislation such as the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906 and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the formation of the Association of Food and Drug Officials. I know they will continue their proud tradition on into the next century.

TAIWAN NEEDS US

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy today to give strong support for the resolution introduced yesterday by Mr. COX, myself, the Republican leadership and 82 bipartisan Members, expressing our continued and unequivocal support for the Republic of China on Taiwan. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration's response to the increasingly strident threats made toward the Republic of China has been almost nonexistent. They have pointedly refused to commit to the Republic of China's defense in the event that Communist China should invade or attack our friends in Taiwan. The administration's deliberate ambiguity in this matter sends absolutely the wrong message to Beijing, and practically invites an escalation of an already tense situation.

The Taiwan Relations Act—the law of the land in our dealings with the Republic of China, despite what Beijing would care to think, has at its core our desire to see disputes between Communist China and the Republic of China settled peacefully. We must make it clear to the rulers in Beijing that the United States intends to live up to its commitments under this law, and I think that this resolution will help to demonstrate in no uncertain terms that we take this obligation very seriously.

I would ask all of my colleagues here in the House to support House Concurrent Resolution 148. The people of the Republic of China on Taiwan need us, and the dictators in Beijing need to hear from us.

THE FAMILY SERVICE IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce the Family Service Improvement Act of 1996 this afternoon. I have been working on the concepts behind this legislation for a number of years. The Family Service Improvement Act will eliminate Federal redtape and unnecessary regulation. It will give local programs the flexibility they need to address local problems. It should create incentives for program coordination which serves kids and families better while making more efficient use of our resources. And it will demand accountability based on program results, not on process and paperwork.

I believe that a concerted Federal effort to rationalize and coordinate programs for children and families is long overdue. Over the years, Congress has created hundreds of categorical programs to help communities and families deal with the myriad of issues confronting them. Each of the programs was created with its own rules and regulations to deal with a particular problem. Over time, the list of rules and regulations has grown to stifle, rather than support, the very objectives we are trying to achieve.

In some areas, where local needs don't fit the problems covered by our categorical programs, our services for children and families are vastly inadequate. In other areas, services overlap and duplicate each other. For example, multiple programs may provide caseworkers to a single family, but each caseworker deals only with one aspect of that family's needs.

In many programs, caseworkers spend far too much time dealing with redtape and paperwork, juggling multiple programs with multiple eligibility criteria, application processes, and service requirements. The Federal Government has created hundreds of different taps through which assistance flows—and communities, programs, and families must run from tap to tap with a bucket to get the help they need.

As an appropriator, I am particularly concerned that our tax dollars be spent efficiently and effectively. In 1994, I asked the Department of Education to convene a working group on coordinated services to make recommendations for such a Federal effort. The working group was headed by Jeanne Jehl from the San Diego public schools, whom I would like to thank for her outstanding work. The working group, which met through 1995, included Federal employees and people from State and local governments and organizations across the country. I was particularly pleased that Maryland's outstanding Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick, was able to participate in this effort. The Family Service Improvement Act is based on the recommendations of that group.

FEDERAL FIXES FOR FEDERAL PROBLEMS

While I applaud the efforts of several of my colleagues in developing waiver bills which are now under consideration by this Congress, I believe that the Federal Government—not local programs—should have the responsibility of fixing the problems the Federal Government created. Under the Family Service Improvement Act, a Federal Coordination Council is designated to oversee the effort to eliminate regulations, simplify requirements, and make waiver requests unnecessary. The Council's responsibilities include eliminating unnecessary and burdensome regulations; developing a single eligibility and application form for a range of services to children and families; developing a single information release form which can be used to authorize exchange of information among a number of service providers; and developing RFP's which can be used to apply for funding from multiple Federal programs.

INTERDISCIPLINARY COORDINATION

No effort to make services to families more effective and efficient will succeed unless programs which meet different aspects of family needs are better coordinated with each other. Cross-program coordination is the key to improving service quality and efficiency. The Family Service Improvement Act allows the creation of consortia of program providers in a community. Consortia members could include State, local, or tribal governments, and not-for-profit organizations. Each consortium must include providers in at least three of the program areas of education. Head Start, child care, job training, housing, nutrition, maternal and child health, family support and preservation, juvenile justice, and drug abuse prevention and treatment. In addition, it creates several incentives to encourage coordination, reduce program duplication, and improve services.

INCENTIVES FOR COORDINATION

As any State or local official who has been involved in the process will tell you, requesting a waiver from the Federal Government is time consuming and complicated. Where multiple programs are duplicating the same steps, common sense dictates that they ought to be able to join forces without going through the hoops of requesting a waiver.

For example, authorizing legislation requires many programs to assess community needs each year and to provide case managers to assist families. We certainly want programs to plan based on community needs, and to perform case management, but it simply doesn't make sense for each program to repeat work done by several others. Under the Family Service Improvement Act, a consortium of three programs which are required to do a community needs assessment and to provide a case worker to the same family would be automatically exempted from meeting such duplicative requirements as long as the requirement was met by the consortium or one of its members. Consortia will then be permitted to spend these funds to expand or improve their services.

In addition, the Family Service Improvement Act would allow consortia to set aside up to 10 percent of their Federal funds in a flexible fund. This flexible fund must be used to expand or improve services consistent with the programs run by the consortium. This provision will give service providers much needed flexibility to meet local needs which might not be anticipated by our Federal rules and regulations.

ACCOUNTABILITY

What counts in human service programs is performance: Are our programs working? Instead of measuring input and process, we