Through no fault of their own, ALJ salaries were included as a percentage of the Executive Schedule, which includes Members of Congress and Cabinet Secretaries. Since 1992 Members of Congress have prohibited themselves from receiving COLA's by appropriations bill riders that cover the whole Executive Schedules, including ALJ's. ALJ's in salary structure are more like other Federal employees hired at $75,000 a year and their average salary is about $89,000 a year, much less than Members of Congress or Cabinet Secretaries included in the Executive Schedule. The cost of the legislation is not significant, not even raising the $5 million point of order threshold under the Budget Act. In fact we estimate that the cost of the legislation is under $4 million.

As a matter of fairness, these Federal employees should receive pay adjustments at the same rate as other Government employees. The salaries of the younger administrative law judges are well below the pay level of Members of Congress. Many of the younger administrative law judges have fallen behind the rates of pay of their former Government colleagues. Senior Government attorneys paid under the General Schedule and the Senior Executive Service have received pay adjustments during the same period which has caused their rates of pay to exceed that of administrative law judges. The administrative law judiciary has traditionally recruited these senior attorneys as administrative law judges. The ability to recruit senior Government attorneys, experienced private practice attorneys, and to retain experienced administrative law judges is being impaired because of the disparity between the current pay of administrative law judges as compared with the pay of senior Government attorneys.

We believe that it is important to keep the Federal administrative judge corps competitive with other senior Government attorney positions. The Federal administrative judiciary must be able to recruit from the most able and experienced legal practitioners in both the private and public sectors, able to adjudicate complex and contested legal disputes. Adjudication of citizens' administrative claims by the Government is often the first contact the public has with the justice system. We want to ensure by passage of this bill, that the public has the quality and standard of service that justice deserves.

CONGRATULATING THE CANCER INSTITUTE OF NEW JERSEY

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 1997

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Cancer Institute of New Jersey on being designated as a clinical cancer center by the National Cancer Institute's Cancer Centers Program. This long-sought designation is a well-deserved honor and will mean much not only to the Cancer Institute of New Jersey but cancer patients throughout the State as well.

This designation, a tremendous advancement in health care for New Jerseyans, will allow clinical trials of new cancer therapies sponsored by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to take place in New Jersey for the first time. This is a major milestone for the 6-year-old center, which is part of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey's Robert Wood Johnson Medical School. The medical school will receive an $800,000 Federal grant to help support the center's operations. The designation places the Cancer Institute of New Jersey among the highest regarded cancer centers in the world.

The people of the State of New Jersey deserve the research and care provided by the Cancer Institute of New Jersey. They need to have convenient access to the newest advances in the prevention, diagnosis, and experimental treatment of cancer. Prior to the creation of the institute, New Jersey cancer patients seeking innovative care were forced to travel to either New York or Philadelphia. This was a particular burden for residents of the central portion of the State, which is an hour or more from either city. Such long travel distances are more than inconvenient—with frequent, repeated treatment sometimes needed, they can cause serious disruptions and hardships for the families involved. The opening of the institute has proven a major step forward for New Jersey cancer patients and its new designation as a cancer center brings New Jersey cancer treatment to the state-of-the-art.

The need for the institute is great. New Jersey has nearly 8 million citizens and cancer statistics ranking it as the third highest State in the Nation for estimated cancer deaths and the eighth highest for new cancer cases.

With 120 investigators, the Cancer Institute's clinical care and basic research programs include bone, bone marrow transplantation, gastrointestinal, genitourinary, gynecological, head and neck, leukemia/lymphoma, melanoma/sarcoma, and pediatrics.

The institute becomes one of more than 50 cancer centers designated across the country that engage in multidisciplinary research efforts to reduce cancer incidence, morbidity, and mortality.

The Cancer Institute of New Jersey is a partnership of UMDNJ, Hackensack University Medical Center, New Brunswick Affiliated Hospitals, St. Peter's Medical Center, and Atlantic Health System.

I know personally the tragedy of cancer: My husband, Richard W. Roukema, M.D., and I lost our son, Todd, to leukemia in 1976 at the age of 17. At that time, bone marrow transplants and other techniques that offered hope were only in their experimental stages. Since then, many advances have been made that have spared thousands of other parents the heartbreak we faced. It is thanks to the brilliant researchers and physicians at institutions such as the Cancer Institute of New Jersey that hope can be maintained.

Today, we are within grasp of a cure for many forms of cancer but much research remains to be done. I thank God for those who are willing to labor toward this goal and pray that with their help a cure can be found and that no child will ever again have to suffer from this terrible disease.

SALUTE TO THE CINCINNATI BURNS INSTITUTE

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 1997

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Shriners Hospitals for Children and the Cincinnati Burns Institute for their continuing commitment to the treatment and care of burn-injured children in the Cincinnati area, and to congratulate the Shriners on their 75th anniversary. We thank them for the vision and service that they have so generously given to the Greater Cincinnati community.

The Shriners Hospitals for Children is a network of 22 hospitals, 19 orthopedic units, and 3 burns institutes, offering specialized medical care to children up to the age of 18. The Cincinnati Burns Institute is one of the Shriners Hospitals specializing in acute and rehabilitative care of children suffering from burn injuries. As a regional referral hospital, the Cincinnati unit serves children who live within a 1,000-mile radius of Greater Cincinnati.

The mission of the Shriners is to minimize the devastation of burn injuries and enhance the patient's potential and quality of life. The Shriners provide family-centered and holistic pediatric burn care of the highest quality. And, by providing all medical care to patients at no cost to them or their parents or a third party, the Shriners Hospitals and Burns Institutes not only care emotionally for their patients, but financially as well. Through public education and prevention efforts, the Cincinnati Burns Institute, along with the Shriners, has been instrumental in raising public awareness in the management of pediatric burns.

The leadership of these truly dedicated organizations is an asset to our community and to our Nation. All of us in Cincinnati congratulate the Shriners Hospitals for Children on their 75th anniversary. We are grateful for all they have given to Greater Cincinnati.

AMERICA'S FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 1997

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for America's Federal credit unions on behalf of at least 35,000 people residing in the Second Congressional District who depend on them to receive financial services. As you may know, the original legislation that created Federal credit unions in the 1930's required that their members share a ''common bond of occupation or association.'' Over the years, this statute has been interpreted in a fashion that allows employees from many different companies to join the same credit union. However, in the 1994 Federal District Court case of National Credit Union Administration versus First National Bank & Trust and its subsequent appeals, it was ruled that credit unions must have a ''single common bond of occupation.'' In other words, all the members of the credit union must work for the same employer.

Although the Supreme Court has decided to hear this case, credit unions all across the Nation have been forced to cease accepting new

members from employers outside of those who already belong while they wait for the final ruling. In addition to this disruption in the industry, if this case stands, credit unions may be forced to exclude all employers with the exception of the single original employer that the credit union received its charter to serve.

Mr. Speaker, credit unions are the last source of financial services for millions of Americans who do not have the credit background to receive help from traditional banking institutions. If this case is allowed to stand, as many as 10 million current credit union members could be expelled from their credit unions, and services could be interrupted for all 70 million American credit union members. Many critics of credit unions feel that they have become a threat to the banking industry. However, according to the Credit Union National Association, the average credit union has less than $28 million in assets—less than one-sixteenth the size of the average bank. In fact, Chase and Citibank, the two largest U.S. banks, combined have more assets than the aggregate holdings of all 12,047 credit unions. I do believe that banks play an important role in America's economy, but I believe that a balance can be found between their needs and those of the credit union industry. Banks are likely to remain America's chief source of financial services, but there is no reason that a thriving credit union industry cannot survive and continue to serve those people who cannot be helped by banks. Mr. Speaker, it could take many months before the Supreme Court makes its final decision on this case. The credit union industry can not hang in limbo while it waits for the Supreme Court to act. Representative LATOURETTE has introduced a bill to this Congress in order to clarify this issue. The Credit Union Membership Access Act of 1997, of which I am a cosponsor, will protect the status quo by allowing employees from more than one company to become members of the same credit union. I support this legislation wholeheartedly, and I urge this Congress to act to prevent a disaster for America's credit union industry.

HELP COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY BASE CLOSURE

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 1997

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation that will facilitate the swift transfer of closed military bases to local communities. This action is necessary because current law hinders the large and complex transfer of military base property with economic redevelopment in mind.

Many of the laws governing the reuse of military bases are antiquated and filled with confusing terms and conditions. One major existing hindrance is a clause prohibiting the obtainment of profit by local communities. This is a problem because it prevents local communities from generating profits through subleasing for the purpose of reinvestment to maintain and improve landscaping, maintenance, and infrastructure. The remedy for this situation is to replace the clause with legislation embodying the provisions of the base closure laws and amendments of the 1990's.

The interim lease provisions have not been as successful as planned because many of the terms and conditions act as disincentives to economic development conveyance. For example, there is no commitment for final ownership by Federal agencies upon assumption of control or occupancy of transfered property. Commercial firms are willing to enter into leases, but are refusing this option because of the lack of commitment for final ownership. In addition, the new occupants of closed base property are unable to conduct major renovations unless they agree to restore the property to its original condition. Many of the facilities require major alterations from their original condition just to bring them to local code standards. Why are we requiring restoration of undesired conditions? This makes no sense and ultimately results in taxpayer waste.

Prior to 1996, departure of Federal agencies reverted property to the Federal Government for disposal by GSA. A leaseback provision was established in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996 to protect communities from a Federal agency revolving door. Under this law, property approved for Federal usage would be transferred to the local redevelopment agency, then leased to a Federal agency at no cost for up to 50 years. The reasoning behind this is to ensure transfer of property to local communities in the event of departure by Federal agencies. The lack of a mandatory requirement for leaseback acceptance allows for circumvention of the legislative intent. In Orlando, FL, the Veterans Administration has requested Orlando Naval Training Center property through the Federal screen process. VA has refused to enter into a long-term lease which would allow enaction of a leaseback provision. This creates major problems for community redevelopment authorities as it limits their ability to finalize reuse plans. My legislation guarantees an option for communities to obtain reuse property after the departure from the property by the first Federal agency lessee.

We must allow common sense to prevail in this base reuse process. There are some instances where it makes sense to lease to organizations affiliated with the branch of service that previously occupied the base property. This is currently prohibited, yet doesn't it make sense to relocate recruiting stations, reserve centers, and military processing centers onto closed base property? This type of action will allow these units to function in a military environment while reducing taxpayer burden generated by lease of civilian property.

The four branches of the U.S. Armed Services are currently able to contract with local governments for fire and police services for 6 months prior to the closure of a base. Families remaining on closed bases need these services, yet there is no provision for bases being closed in phases as the services do not define phased closures as operational. In simpler terms, local communities bear the burden for fire and police services because the service branches are unable to contract for services.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I'm introducing today will make major strides in reforming the base closure reuse process. We must enact this legislation to protect our local communities. I urge my colleagues' support.

HONORING DAVID ALLEX

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 1997

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend David Allex of Harlingen, TX, and to commend his life's work of improving the economic conditions of south Texas.

David is a legend in south Texas. He has served as the president of the Harlingen Industrial Foundation, Inc. [HIFI] since its inception in 1968. That is an incredible tenure, but David Allex is quite the economic pioneer. Few people have had the effect that David has had on the economic fortunes of the south Texas business and professional community. David is leaving HIFI, and his presence will be sorely missed.

During David's tenure, his efforts attracted a host of industries to the south Texas area. He was actively involved in bringing the following companies to the Rio Grande Valley: Tex Steel, Fruit of the Loom, Anderson, Greenwood and Co., Valley International Cold Storage, Atlantic-Durant Technology, Inc., Tadim, Levi Strauss, William Carter Co., Velcon Filters, and Aloccorp.

The high unemployment rate in the valley has always been my paramount concern since coming to Congress. These companies would not have relocated to south Texas if not for David's assertiveness and commitment to the economic development of our area. His vision, innovation, and ideas have made the valley a force in our Nation's new economy.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the quality, loyalty, integrity, and accomplishments of David's service to the economy of south Texas. I offer David my personal thanks and best wishes.

TRIBUTE TO MARCIA STEIN

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 1997

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, this morning I rise to pay a well earned tribute to Marcia Stein, who retired from this body on January 20, 1997. For 15 years, Marcia provided exemplary service as one of the Official Reporters of the House. She and her husband, Robert P. (Bob) Stein, an oceanographer with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, are present this morning, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to commend Marcia for her outstanding service to this institution.

A native of Abilene, KS, Marcia attended Phillips University in Enid, OK, before relocating to the Washington, DC, area. After working for a number of years at Andrews Air Force Base, she attended Strayer College and graduated as a court reporter in 1975. She worked several years as a freelance reporter before joining the staff of the Official Reporters of the House on November 12, 1981. Marcia especially enjoyed specializing in hearings on national security and intelligence; 10 of her 15 years were spent as a reporter for the Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security. Some of the highlights of her Hill career included reporting the Iran-Contra hearings and