

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF RALPH J. PERK

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

HON. STEVE CHABOT

OF OHIO

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

HON. DAVID L. HOBSON

OF OHIO

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

HON. JOHN R. KASICH

OF OHIO

HON. STEVE C. LaTOURETTE

OF OHIO

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

HON. DEBORAH PRYCE

OF OHIO

HON. RALPH REGULA

OF OHIO

HON. THOMAS C. SAWYER

OF OHIO

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

HON. TED STRICKLAND

OF OHIO

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I along with my colleagues from Ohio, Messrs. BOEHNER, BROWN, CHABOT, GILLMOR, HALL, HOBSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. KASICH, LaTOURETTE, NEY, OXLEY, PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE, Messrs. REGULA, SAWYER, STOKES, STRICKLAND, and TRAFICANT rise to salute an extraordinary public servant, Ralph J. Perk. He has devoted his life to helping others and is beloved by the people of Cleveland, the people of Ohio, and people throughout the world.

Born under the shadow of the steel mill smokestacks of Cleveland, Ralph Perk was raised in poverty. At age 7, he began his day delivering the morning paper and ended it de-

livering the evening paper. At age twelve he began selling ice door to door. During the Depression of the 40s when he was still selling ice, Perk routinely extended credit to poor families. "If we don't give them ice, their children's milk will spoil," Perk would say. So, instead of making one-hundred dollars a week, he made twelve. That generosity and heart, paid rich dividends when Perk entered politics. Every election, the families he helped during the depression became the nucleus of Perk's campaigns. Their loyalty could not have been bought at any price. From those humble beginnings, Ralph Perk rose to serve five terms on the Cleveland City Council and nine years as county auditor.

In 1971 Ralph Perk was elected the 51st Mayor of Cleveland. He was not bound by party label. Rather, he achieved his popularity by following public service rather than party politics. His motto was simple: Do hard work, keep in touch with the people, and serve honestly. He did all three.

As Mayor, he deeply cared for those whom he represented. He secured hundreds of millions of dollars from the federal government to improve the city. And despite high inflation and a recession, Mayor Perk delivered quality basic city services to the neighborhoods of Cleveland.

Although he achieved high office in his city, Ralph Perk never forgot his humble beginnings and continued to help others. He understood people and their needs; but more important, he truly cared. He helped organize the diverse ethnic community and imbued it with a common pride in Cleveland. He was the founder of the Nationality Movement in Cleveland; and a driving force behind the recognition of the rights and cultural heritage of ethnic American in the United States. He served on numerous civic and fraternal organizations including, The Citizens League, The Council on Human Relations and The Knights of Columbus.

My fellow colleagues, Ralph Perk does not seek our praise. He is far above it. Rather, I ask you to join me in recognizing him for his many contributions. For if we learn from his dedication, we will all be better public servants.

HONORING REVEREND ROBERT O. SIMPSON'S 25TH PASTORAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Robert O. Simpson's 25th Pastoral Anniversary at Janes United Methodist Church, Brooklyn, New York.

Reverend Robert O. Simpson assumed responsibilities as Pastor of Janes United Methodist Church in July 1973. Reverend Simpson's formal education began, ironically, in a

nursery school at Janes United Methodist Church. He attended both public and private schools in Brooklyn before earning a Master of Divinity Degree from Yale Divinity School in June 1973.

Since Reverend Simpson's tenure at Janes United Methodist Church, active membership has tripled. Many positive programs have been implemented. The Church's Community Outreach has included a tutorial program, the Senior Citizens' Friendship Club, the Voter Registration and Information Project, the Meals-on-Wheels Program for the homebound elderly or disabled in the community, and "God's Sheltering Arms," Janes' ministry to the homeless who inhabit public places.

Reverend Simpson's greatest challenge came in 1984, when a fire destroyed Janes Church. With his dynamic leadership, Reverend Simpson led his congregation through this crisis. With his hard work and dedication, the new Janes Church was build and consecrated in April 1991.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in saluting Reverend Robert O. Simpson on the occasion of his 25th Pastoral Anniversary at Janes United Methodist Church.

TRIBUTE TO THE BRONX-LEBANON HOSPITAL CENTER AND THE AIDS RESEARCH COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Bronx-Lebanon Hospital Center and the AIDS Research Community Advisory Board for their commitment to fighting AIDS and preventing the spreading of the deadly HIV. On Saturday, June 20, they will hold a prevention fair, Safety Jam, for adolescents and adults at the Claremont Neighborhood Center in the South Bronx.

Safety Jam will feature informative educational presentations and workshops on issues related to health and HIV prevention. Fun, food, live multicultural entertainment, and free raffles will be provided throughout the day, helping to draw people to the fair.

It is a privilege for me to represent the 16th district of New York, where the Bronx-Lebanon Hospital Center is located. I have witnessed first-hand the exemplary work they are doing for our community and I am deeply impressed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring the physicians, nurses, case-workers, administrators, clerical workers, and all of the other caregivers and support staff of the Bronx-Lebanon Hospital Center and the AIDS Research Community Advisory Board for their outstanding efforts at this important milestone, and in wishing them continued success.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK C. JONES,
SR.

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend Frederick C. Jones, Sr. as he is retiring from state government.

He most recently was the Project Supervisor of Vocational Rehabilitation Services at South Carolina State Hospital. His duties included coordinating and implementing Vocational Rehabilitation services for seriously mentally ill patients within inpatient and community based mental health programs. He has been involved in Vocational Rehabilitation for much of his career, along with work with juveniles.

Mr. Jones is a life member of National Rehabilitation Association, a member of Professional Staff Association, SCVR, a member of the Action Council for Cross Cultural Studies, chairman of the Membership Committee of Capital City Club, and a member of St. John Baptist Church, in Hopkins South Carolina. He is best known to Columbians and South Carolinians as the manager of the "Friends Band" and for the musical accompaniment of his lovely wife Bunny.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join with me in wishing my friend Frederick C. Jones, Sr. a fulfilling retirement.

ASSISTANT CHIEF PATRICK D.
BRENNAN: A POINT-OF-LIGHT
FOR ALL AMERICANS

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, it is generally recognized that the great drop in the national crime rate is due mostly to changes in the deployment of police officers and in the adoption of new attitudes with respect to police and community partnerships. No police and law enforcement leader in America has done more to advance these approaches and methods than Assistant Chief Patrick D. Brennan, one of New York's and Brooklyn's finest. On the occasion of the retirement of Chief Brennan we wish to express our gratitude and appreciation for his many years of service. I have met him at many late night community meetings and I know that Assistant Chief Brennan deserves the rest he will be able to get after retirement. On behalf of the constituents of the 11th Congressional District I salute Patrick D. Brennan as a POINT-OF-LIGHT for all Americans.

Assistant Chief Patrick D. Brennan, who is retiring after serving as the commanding Officer of Patrol Borough Brooklyn South, began his career with the New York City Police Department as a patrolman for the 84th Precinct in September 1965. Before achieving the rank of Assistant Chief in July 1997, he was promoted to Sergeant in May 1973; Lieutenant in March 1984; Captain in December 1987; Deputy Inspector in May 1993; Inspector in October 1994; and Deputy Chief in August 1995. Assistant Chief Brennan has served as the Commanding Officer of the 5th, 72nd, 84th

and 90th Precincts, as well as the Criminal Justice Bureau. He has served as the Commanding Officer of the 5th and 70th Precincts and 72nd Precinct Detective squad. Before joining the New York City Police Department, Assistant Chief Brennan received a Bachelor of Science Degree from John Jay College.

Throughout his career, Assistant Chief Brennan has been supported by his wife, Monica, for 35 years. They are the proud parents of six children: Maureen, Tara Ann, Martin, Dermott, John and Patrick.

Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn has encountered many problems involving the police within the last five years. Some very dramatic cases have received national attention. We must all strive to maintain a balanced perspective and continue to understand that the great majority of our police officers are productive and dedicated citizens. From the ranks of law enforcement we also repeatedly see the emergence of outstanding leaders like this one. Assistant Chief Patrick D. Brennan is an outstanding POINT-OF-LIGHT whose career can inspire all Americans.

CONGRATULATING REGINAL RYAN
FOR HIS AWARD-WINNING
AMVET ESSAY "MY FAVORITE
AMERICAN HERO"

HON. CHET EDWARDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate an exceptional young man, Reginal Ryan of Itasca, Texas, which is in my 11th Congressional District. Reginal recently won the AMVET's Americanism state level competition for ninth graders with a strong and moving essay entitled "My Favorite American Hero."

Reginal is a 15-year-old sophomore at Itasca High School. His accomplishment is all the more extraordinary considering that late last year he was living on the streets in Austin, Texas. However, he now lives in the Presbyterian Orphans Home in Itasca where he spends time putting together prize winning essays.

His prize for winning the AMVET's contest is an all expense paid trip to Valley Forge, Penn., to visit the Freedoms Foundation. Members of AMVET's Post 72 in Hillsboro were so moved by his essay that they took up an additional collection to finance a trip to Washington, D.C. While in Washington, Reginal's wish to visit the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and pay his respects was fulfilled.

I ask members to join me in congratulating this special young man for his accomplishment. I would also like to share his essay with the members.

MY FAVORITE AMERICAN HERO

(By Reginal Ryan)

My favorite American hero does not have a name, but I assure you he is real in many ways. Everyone remembers and knows what he did for our country and how he gives his life for others with devotion. He has shown commitment in many examples of his compassion as in the many wars in which he has fought such as World War I and World War II and even Vietnam.

My favorite American hero represents the heart of our country, because he is the common American. When called to serve, he is always ready and willing to protect his country by fighting in strange and foreign lands far away from home, away from friends and family with no assurance that he would ever return to them. Nevertheless, it was important for him to go to ensure that the freedom of America would be preserved.

My favorite American hero is visited by many people each year. They are always quiet and reverent in his presence. Flowers are often presented to him. The visitors come from all across America, and many shed a few tears as they leave because he may be their hero, too. It is the common thread that links and unites all Americans.

Because he is a true hero, he is the most likely to come to my mind. Symbolically, he stands for all the freedom fighters we have today in America. His efforts have allowed me and all Americans to continue to exercise all rights as a citizen of the United States. He has helped to preserve my life, my liberties, and my pursuit of happiness.

I hope by now that everyone who reads this, knows that my favorite American hero is the "Unknown Soldier." It matters not that he does not have a specific name. What matters is that he stands for every soldier who has ever fought to keep our nation free. This gift is the greatest gift America can receive—the gift of freedom. I hope someday I get to pay my respects at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

SALUTING OLD GLORY: OUR FLAG
AND ITS DEFENDERS

HON. JAMES E. ROGAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, my family and I joined millions across the country to celebrate Flag Day. With its passage, I would like to share with my colleagues the story of one of my constituents.

Vito Cannella was born in Italy and later naturalized as an American citizen. He is a lifelong public servant, dedicated to serving our community and our nation. As a public official in Los Angeles County, he is committed to working to share the benefits of his adopted homeland with his neighbors. His patriotism is a lesson for us all.

Upset by anti-government protests and civil unrest during the 1960's, Vito joined with Bill Bailey, an old friend, and set about preserving and defending our most precious national emblem: The American flag. In 1966, the two Montrose, California residents worked with local civic groups to convince our former colleague H. Allen Smith to introduce and successfully pass House Joint Resolution 763. With its passage, the week surrounding Flag Day was thereafter dedicated national Flag Week. Sadly, this holiday has been quietly omitted from news stories ever since. It is my hope that this will change.

Mr. Speaker, the Stars and Stripes are a noble symbol of our republic. As we stand in this chamber, we rise before this bold symbol of our freedom. As we engage in debate with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we should take pride in our right of dissension. And as we work to shape policy affecting our children, we should be ever mindful of those who sacrificed so much for this right. We honor all these by recognizing Flag Week.

I challenge my colleagues to do their part to spread the word and celebrate this important holiday. Too often, the news of Flag Week is pushed aside for flashier stories, or relegated to the back pages on a slow news days. It is our duty to carry on the proud tradition of this week.

Mr. Speaker, progress in our country often originates from the efforts of just one man. The establishment of Flag Week serves as an important reminder of the same. In recognition of Vito Cannella's patriotism, and to honor the sacrifice of Americans through the ages dedicated to preserving our liberty, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Flag Week, 1998.

HABITAT FOR HUMANITY
HOUSTON PROJECT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the contributions to my district that Habitat for Humanity and its sponsors have made to my district over the past week.

Through the efforts of former-President Jimmy Carter, Habitat for Humanity, a handful of private sponsors, and several thousand miracle-working volunteers, 100 homes will be built for needy families this week in the city of Houston.

Houston was chosen as the site for this project because of its tremendous need for housing. Of the 1.7 million people that live in the city, 150,000 of them are considered to be "marginally" homeless. That number is completely unacceptable for America's fourth largest city.

Even when people are able to find housing, there is a good chance that it will be inadequate. Over 100,000 of the housing units in Houston are dilapidated, and 72,000 of them are officially overcrowded.

Yet as awful as those conditions are, there are still over 9,000 families on waiting lists for public housing. Unfortunately, the government cannot solve the housing shortage for all of them. Someone else needs to step up to the bat and help these people help themselves. Fellow colleagues, someone has.

Habitat for Humanity and the Jimmy Carter Work Project have come to bat for the people of Houston. With them, they brought an army of volunteers, and a fabulous group of sponsors.

The supplies needed for these 100 houses were all supplied by contributions from private corporations, organizations, church groups, and businesses. Many of these organizations also contributed manpower, either through their employees or their members. I am grateful to all of them. Specifically, I want to name those sponsors who made donations for the homes built in my district. They include: South Main Baptist Church; U.C.C. Celebration House; Presbyterian House—First Grace, Memorial Drive and St. Andrews; St. John the Divine Episcopal; St. Martin's Episcopal Church; Congregation Beth Israel; Congregation

Emanu El; Presbyterian House No. 2; the Shell Oil Company Foundation; Umland International House; the Junior League of Houston; Fondren Foundation; Exxon; St. Luke's Episcopal Health System; Notre Dame Alumni Association; Notre Dame Student Chapter; El Paso Energy; Continental Airlines; Newsradio 740 KTRH; The Brown Foundation; Apache; Friends of Habitat; Stanley Tools; Dow Chemical; Indianapolis Life; PMI; Paul Leonard House; Weyerhaeuser Co.; Churchs Chicken; the Aluminum Association; Southwest Airlines/Oprah Angels; the Farris Foundation Inc.; Houston Habitat for Humanity Revolving Fund; Houston Apartment Association; and Habitat World. To all the sponsors—You have all done a great service to this community, and to our future generations. I congratulate you all.

I also want to thank and congratulate a particular group of very special people—the Gibson Family. I worked alongside of Mr. and Mrs. Gibson for the better part of the day on Monday. They have two girls, both under the age of ten, and they have another child on the way. For the past few years, they have lived in a small apartment in a dilapidated building, the whole while, looking for ways that they could better their living situation. Like many families, they have searched for options that would keep them from having to send their hard-earned money to the landlord every month, knowing that they would never own a piece of that property.

I am happy to report to you that the Gibson Family, with the help of Habitat for Humanity and their sponsors, are on their way to owning their first house. They had to work hard, physically, to get this opportunity, but they seized it.

T.S. Eliot once said, "Home is where one starts from." With the help of President Carter, Habitat for Humanity, and thousands of volunteers and sponsors, the Gibson Family has a new start. It is a fresh chance to raise their children, and grandchildren in a way which every American deserves. I also want to congratulate the other 99 families who will also be receiving homes as a part of this effort. Each and every one of them deserves this tremendous opportunity as well.

As grateful as I am, for this effort to better the community in Houston, there is still substantial work to be done, and need left. There are still too many people who need adequate shelter. There are still too many cities who need adequate housing. There are far too many children growing up in unsuitable conditions.

I hope there are many more people, out there across America, who are willing to follow the example of the miracle-workers of Houston. I urge corporate America to follow the lead of the many corporate sponsors I named earlier, who put aside profit for the sake of humanity.

I pledge my loyal support to Habitat for Humanity and the people that make it work—the sponsors and the volunteers. I ask that my colleagues do the same. These people truly embody the best of the human spirit, and I applaud their heroic efforts.

JAPAN; IT'S TIME FOR REFORM

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Japan's economy is in recession. As an editorial in the Thursday, June 18 edition of The Washington Post noted, "the fact that once again U.S. pressure was needed to spur a commitment to reform is one more sad indication of the abdication of leadership in Japan."

While Japan has been a strong and loyal ally of the U.S. since the end of World War II, that does not mean friends cannot provide constructive criticism. I have some constructive criticism for Japan.

As one of the world's largest economies, Japan has a responsibility to provide open and fair market access for imports. To this day, Japan continues to maintain restrictive barriers to its domestic market. While Japan has reduced tariff rates on imports to reasonable levels, non-tariff barriers continue to hinder imported goods and services from the U.S. and other parts of the world.

From 1996 to 1997, the U.S.-Japan trade deficit increased from \$47.6 billion to \$55.7 billion. Our trade deficit with Japan is the largest out of any other nation in the world, and it points to the systemic problems with Japan's market.

Now is the time for Japan to show real leadership to the international community by initiating wide-spread economic reforms specifically targeted to rescinding excessive and outdated government regulations. A U.S. Trade Representative report stated, "[Japan's] unnecessary regulations restrain economic growth, raise the cost of doing business in Japan, lower the standard of living for Japanese consumers, and impede imports." Japanese economists estimate that 40 percent of all economic activity in Japan is regulated by the government. The regulations included burdensome testing and certification requirements, outdated price control measures, and unnecessary and archaic standards.

While I understand that most of these regulations were implemented when Japan was still a developing nation when it was necessary to protect certain infant industries, they are no longer needed and, in fact, retards Japan's economic growth. A nation with a mature economy such as Japan's must jettison those outdated regulations in order to expand the economy. Japan's reluctance to do so has clearly caused its current recession. By placing archaic and unnecessary restrictions to imports, Japan has only wound up hurting itself.

The solution to Japan's economic problems, Mr. Speaker, is quite simple. The Administration must work with Congress to put more pressure on Japan to provide open and fair markets, and Japan must take the necessary steps to fully honor its trade agreements with the U.S. Only by implementing this and other reform measures can the Japanese economy recover from its current recession.

HONORING REVEREND DR.
WASHINGTON L. LUNDY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Washington L. Lundy's 30th Pastoral Anniversary at the Evening Star Baptist Church in Brooklyn, New York.

Reverend Lundy is a native of McKenney, Virginia. Prior to his appointment at the Evening Star Baptist Church, Reverend Lundy had experience in pastoring at First Baptist Church in McKenney, Virginia. Following his appointment to the Evening Star Baptist Church, Reverend Lundy obtained a Bachelor of Sacred Theology and a Doctor of Divinity from Baltimore College of Bible in 1971 and 1975, respectively.

Since Reverend Lundy's tenure at Evening Star Baptist Church, many wonderful things have happened to both the church and the surrounding community. Reverend Lundy founded the Eastern Baptist Association School of Religion in 1989. The Reverend also led the congregation through a five million-dollar renovation and dedication in 1994.

Reverend Lundy's accomplishments do not end there. In 1991, C.S.B.C. Housing Development named him Father of the Year. Reverend Lundy also received the Contemporary Leadership Award in July, 1992, and the History Maker Award in February, 1995. In addition to this, Franklin Avenue, in Brooklyn, New York will soon be named "Dr. Washington Lee Lundy" Boulevard.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in saluting Reverend Washington L. Lundy on the occasion of his 30th Pastoral Anniversary at the Evening Star Baptist Church.

TRIBUTE TO THE MECHLER HALL
SENIOR CENTER

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Mechler Hall Senior Center for a decade of success working for senior citizens in the South Bronx.

On Wednesday, June 24, the Mechler Hall Senior Center will celebrate as a Tenth Anniversary Party at the Holy Family Church on Watson Avenue, where the Center is located.

The Mechler Hall Senior Center was established in 1988 as a non-profit, all-volunteer community-based organization to serve the needs of senior citizens in our community.

During the past ten years, the dynamic Mechler Hall Senior Center has been instrumental in providing the services that senior citizens need. It serves meals to 115 people daily and organizes activities for about 150 people. Its wide range of programs and services to the community include: counseling, seminars, workshops, dancing lessons, trips, aerobics, nutritional programs, knitting, and drawing lessons, among other activities.

It is a privilege for me to represent the 16th district of New York, where Mechler Hall Senior Center is located. I have witnessed first-

hand the exemplary work they are doing for our community, and I am deeply impressed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Mechler Hall Senior Center for a decade of achievements in the Bronx and in wishing them continued success.

TRIBUTE TO INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY ON HYPERTENSION IN BLACKS

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the International Society on Hypertension in Blacks. Their Society is about to hold its 13th International Interdisciplinary Conference on Hypertension in Blacks, and I believe it is timely to recognize their efforts to publicize a disease that has disproportionately affected minority populations.

The International Society on Hypertension in Blacks encourages increased medical research efforts, supports hypertension awareness programs targeted to minority communities, and lends assistance to put an end to the alarming statistics that show the greater prevalence of severe hypertension in Africa Americans.

The International Society works to promote treatment for all. Hypertension affects one out of three African Americans compared to one out of four people in the general population. One of the challenges to prevention or control is to adequately address the physiologic, epidemiologic and genetic differences to develop strategies appropriate for each population.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me today in honoring the International Society on Hypertension in Blacks for their efforts to initiate such research forums at their annual conference and their work to spread information to community members.

FORMER REAGAN AND BUSH JUSTICE OFFICIAL CALLS FOR INVESTIGATION OF MR. STARR'S LEAKS TO THE PRESS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the following opinion editorial from today's New York Times.

KENNETH STARR STRETCHES THE RULES
(By Ronald K. Noble)

What are we to make of Steven Brill's article contending that Kenneth Starr, the independent counsel, and his deputy, Jackie Bennett, may have leaked grand jury information about their investigation of President Clinton?

Many opponents of Mr. Clinton want to dismiss Mr. Brill's article, which appeared this week in his magazine, Brill's Content. But that would be a mistake. These leaks may violate Federal laws and Justice Department regulations. The possibility of such improper disclosures must be investigated.

In his article, Mr. Brill wrote that Mr. Starr and Mr. Bennett had given reporters

background information—including accounts by witnesses who were to appear before a grand jury—regarding the investigation into Mr. Clinton's relationship with Monica Lewinsky.

Mr. Starr has issued two denials to the article. His first denial did not challenge Mr. Brill's facts; instead, the independent counsel challenged the conclusion that such disclosures were illegal and unethical.

In his second denial, Mr. Starr stated that his office "does not release grand jury material either directly or indirectly, on the record or off the record" and that it "does not release (and never has released) information provided by witnesses during interviews, except as authorized by law."

These denials beg the question of what Mr. Starr considers grand jury material, what he believes is authorized by law and what he and Mr. Bennett actually said to reporters. Indeed, before the Brill article appeared this week, many press reports had already attributed information about the investigation to the prosecutor's office.

We don't know all the facts, but Mr. Starr, as quoted in Mr. Brill's article, does not give us confidence about his interpretation of the law and Justice Department regulations. In the article, Mr. Starr said that certain disclosures do not violate a Federal criminal law that prohibits prosecutors from disclosing information about grand jury proceedings.

"If you are talking about what witnesses tell F.B.I. agents before they testify in the grand jury or about related matters," Mr. Starr said, that is "definitely not grand jury information."

Mr. Starr also said that the Justice Department's ethical guidelines allow disclosures when the public needs reassurance that an investigation is being conducted properly. Indeed, in the article, Mr. Starr suggested that it was his duty to make such disclosures if doing so would boost the public's confidence in his office.

But the laws on disclosure contain few loopholes. Last May, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ruled that it is a violation of Federal law not only to release unauthorized information about what witnesses said to the grand jury, but also to disclose what witnesses said to prosecutors and agents in preparing for their grand jury testimony.

Moreover, Mr. Starr and his staff members are also covered by the Privacy Act, which prohibits disclosing confidential information about individuals. This law covers all Federal employees, not just prosecutors, who have access to such information because of their jobs.

Justice Department guidelines are no more lenient. To make a case for an exception, Mr. Starr seems to rely on a department rule that allows disclosure of "matters about which the community needs to be reassured that an appropriate law-enforcement agency is investigating the incident."

This is a stretch. The Justice Department specifically forbids prosecutors from answering questions about an ongoing criminal investigation or from commenting on its progress—including the serving of subpoenas before the documents have been publicly filed. And department guidelines on media relations state that no one in the department should release information that is likely to prejudice any legal matter.

In short, there are few situations where substantive information on an investigation can be released. And if information is released, it should be on the record. Any off-the-record conversation between prosecutors and reporters is by definition suspect. If the prosecutor is permitted to say what he is saying and is prepared to be held accountable for it—why not do so on the record?

That way the public and the judge presiding over the grand jury investigation can decide whether the prosecutor is following the rules.

Last February Mr. Starr claimed that he was investigating whether his office was leaking information. Given the allegations about Mr. Starr's and Mr. Bennett's background conversations with reporters, one wonders how thorough that inquiry could have been.

Now, Mr. Starr has no choice but to ask for an independent investigation to determine what, if any, information his office revealed to the press and whether that information violated any rules. Unless action is taken quickly, it will appear that the Independent Counsel's Office is above the law.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
REORGANIZATION

HON. JOE SKEEN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, last month I introduced legislation to reorganize the United States Forest Service in an attempt to bring reform to that troubled federal agency. Today, I introduce legislation to further the goal of streamlining government and save additional money for the taxpayers of this nation, without decreasing services.

Continuing what Congress began in 1995, my legislation would dissolve the Department of Interior's (DOI) Minerals Management Service (MMS) and transfer the two major functions to other locations in DOI. By this transfer, the Department would realize significant savings by elimination of the administrative support component of the current MMS.

Under this legislation, the Minerals Management component of MMS would be transferred to the Bureau of Land Management. The Royalty Management component would be transferred to the office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget. Day to day operations of these two divisions would go on, almost totally undisturbed by this legislation.

I would point out that the MMS was established in 1982, following an internal reorganization of the Department of Interior. Expectations for the new federal agency were high. The MMS took components that were formerly located elsewhere in the Department and placed them under one roof, headed by a director appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) oil and gas leasing program was expected to be the real centerpiece of this new agency. Leasing activities were to be expanded from small areas in California, the Gulf of Mexico and in Alaska to large areas off the entire East and West Coasts as well as the Eastern Gulf of Mexico. Industry interest was extremely high and energy self sufficiency was just around the corner.

However, something happened along the way and public support for this effort never materialized. In fact, in spite of an outstanding safety and environmental record, widespread and rabid opposition to expansion of the program developed and continues today. Therefore, the grand plans of 1982 never materialized. In fact, just last week, President Clinton called for extending the current Congressional

moratorium on oil and gas activities in these new areas for another 10 years. For all practical purposes, the OCS program today remains active in the Gulf of Mexico and in Alaska waters. The program remains a vital component of our energy supply. This is especially true for natural gas.

In terms of the royalty management program, the lack of expansion of federal oil and gas leasing and production, coupled with technological advances, have diminished the need for widespread expansion of this component of the MMS. With Congressional interest in new Royalty-in-Kind proposals, MMS royalty management could well downsize even further.

The American taxpayers, who in essence are government's stockholders, are demanding a leaner government. This legislation is a step towards that goal. We cannot wait for this Administration to do the right thing. It is time for Congress to act.

HONORING DR. THOMAS P.
GRISSOM, JR.

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the dedication and achievements of Dr. Thomas P. Grissom, Jr.

Dr. Grissom has earned two Doctorate degrees, and it was his desire to teach before retiring.

Dr. Thomas P. Grissom, Jr. has a vast amount of experience as a pastor. He began his ministry 49 years and 9 months ago. He first became the Associate Pastor of St. Mark United Methodist Church in Manhattan. From there he went to Janes United Methodist Church in Brooklyn. After this position, he moved to Taylor Memorial Church in Oakland, California. He later returned to New York in October 1980 to pastor Salem United Methodist Church in Manhattan. He remained at Salem until the end of June in 1990. On the first Sunday of July 1990, Dr. Grissom became the Pastor of Hanson Place Central United Methodist Church, where he has served until the present time.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saluting Dr. Thomas P. Grissom, Jr. for his tremendous devotion and dedication to his profession.

THE STRATEGIC TRANSITIONAL
EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (STEP)

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Strategic Transitional Employment Program Act or STEP, and I thank Senator WELLSTONE, who will introduce the bill in the Senate today, for his leadership. The unemployment rates in many parts of this region are so low that almost anybody can find a job. Yet in the District and other large cities and in rural areas, unemployment rates remain unaffected by the excellent Clinton economy. Entire sections of our society scratch their collective heads at daily reports of the splendid economy.

The STEP Act seeks to link long-term unemployed Americans with the roaring economy. It provides the three indispensable elements that most often are missing: job readiness, job experience and job placement. STEP is tightly structured. The program would be available only for individuals who meet three criteria: individuals unemployed for 15 weeks or more, whose families are at or below the poverty line, and who live in communities of concentrated poverty and unemployment.

Clearly, individuals who face all three of these conditions are walled off from self-sufficiency. If they have not found jobs after 87 months of an exceptional economy, we cannot expect jobs for them to appear miraculously. They obviously need our help. Transitional jobs that provide work experience while some transportation and child care services are provided can make the vital difference. Unlike some job programs, at the end, STEP would come with vital job placement for those who had not found work in 12 months. Moreover, paid part-time participation in education and training, including college, would insert a vital missing link to decent employment sadly lacking in last year's welfare bill.

I am also preparing an Omnibus Welfare Reform Amendments bill that will incorporate amendments from members of the House to last year's welfare reform statute, in the hope that one or the other provision might be pulled out for passage. However, STEP hops over welfare reform and confronts the missing ingredient for all the long-term unemployed—a realistic way to get them to a real job that pays a liveable wage.

STEP's \$20 billion cost over four years, creating 1.8 million entry level jobs, would be money well spent from a budget that now boast a surplus. The challenge to those who have no plan for the hard core unemployed is, if not this what? The challenge to those who do not want to spend the money is, if not in this roaring economy, when?

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT EDWARD
BATES, JR. & STANLEY K. WIL-
LIAMS

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Robert Edward Bates, Jr. and Stanley K. Williams who will be honored as Men of the Year by the Shiloh Baptist Church of Washington, D.C. on Sunday, June 21, 1998.

It has been my privilege to have known Robert Bates for many years. He has been a member of Shiloh Baptist Church since his youth. He is the son of the late Deacon and Mrs. Robert E. Bates, Sr. He was a member of the Fund-raising Committee for the Henry C. Gregory, III Family Life Center and currently serves as Chairman of the Family Life Center Foundation Board.

Active in the civil rights movement, Mr. Bates worked as an aide to Senator Edward Kennedy early in his career and went on to a successful career with Mobil Oil Company. He was one of the first African Americans to represent a major company on legislative matters on Capitol Hill. While secure in his own position, he established the Second Wednesdays

Group, an organization to enhance opportunities for African Americans in the lobbying arena. In addition, Mr. Bates has been a strong supporter of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation. He is the father of three—Dawn, Hillman and Brandon.

After joining Shiloh nearly two decades ago, Stanley Williams immersed himself in church activities. Today, he serves as Vice President of the Brotherhood of Shiloh Men. He has been a Sunday School teacher in the Youth Department and served as an Assistant Superintendent; Chairman of the Men's Day Committee; and, Co-chaired the Children's Day Committee. He was recently appointed by the Pastor to Co-Chair the Victory Through Faith Campaign Committee.

Mr. Williams currently works at the U.S. Department of Labor where he serves as the Director of Veterans' Employment and Training. He recently was recognized by the Assistant Secretary of Labor for his outstanding knowledge and dedication in his field. He is married to Judy C. Williams and is the father of two children, Lanita and Malek.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Father's Day across the country this Sunday, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting these two outstanding fathers—Robert Edward Bates, Jr. and Stanley K. Williams today for their dedication to the Shiloh Baptist Church, their families, and to the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, I was speaking before a group of Arkansas students and missed roll call vote No. 237. If I had been here, I would have voted "present."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House voted on final passage of the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2646, the Education Savings Act for Public and Private Schools. I do not believe that we should be taking resources away from our public schools and directing them towards private schools. I am strongly opposed to H.R. 2646, and cast my vote against the Conference Report (Roll Call Vote No. 243). Therefore, I was concerned to discover this morning that I was listed as not voting on Roll Call No. 243. Apparently, my vote was not properly recorded by the electronic voting system. I am deeply concerned about this incident.

COMMEMORATING THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESS-BUNDESTAG YOUTH EXCHANGE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the 15th anniversary on June 19th of the creation of the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange.

In 1983, marking the 300 years of German immigration to the United States, the Congress and the German Bundestag created a unique program, the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange. This exchange was designed to ensure that the close ties of friendship and partnership which had developed between our two countries since the founding of the Federal Republic of Germany would continue in successor generations, and to foster the relationship between our two national legislative bodies.

In each of the past fifteen years, up to 800 American and German high school students and young professionals have taken part in this program. The high school students become aware of the wider world and establish ties which will benefit them for the rest of their lives. Thanks to a combination of classroom education and on-the-job training during their year abroad, young professionals are able to bring valuable experience into their working life: Americans can take advantage of Germany's "dual system" of education and practical training, while German youth can benefit from American strengths in areas such as telecommunications, environmental technology and the service sector. In both cases, the young people of our two countries gain knowledge and experience which will serve them well later in life.

Let me quote from the letter of a recently returned American high school student, reflecting on her year in Germany:

Now, I am able to speak Germany fluently. I have made many strong friendships and have experienced a culture I was not used to; I have learned a great deal about who I am and about life in general. I have learned to be more tolerant of others and the ideas that they offer. Being an exchange student does not just benefit the exchange. My first weeks in Germany were spent trying to disprove many of the stereotypes the Germans had about the United States and its society. Through this Exchange, all participants are able to return home feeling proud that they had the opportunity to represent the United States.

The Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange program also organizes reciprocal visits by staffers of the Congress and Bundestag. I hope that more of my colleagues will encourage their staffers to take advantage of this opportunity to get to know Germany and the working of its government and legislature. The staff exchange can be of tremendous assistance as our two countries grapple with shared problems.

Germany is a uniquely important ally of the United States. We have a strong national interest in maintaining the closest ties and the best understanding possible with both the current leadership and the successor generation. The Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange represents one of the best ways to cement our

partnership. During his recent visit to Germany, marking the 50th anniversary of the Berlin Airlift, President Clinton declared, "we will be working hard to expand our support for the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange, which has already given more than 10,000 German and American students the chance to visit each other's countries."

German leaders in the Bundestag value the relationship with the United States and with the Congress, and recognize the contribution which the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange program has made to the close ties which exist. On June 19th, the President of the German Bundestag, Prof. Rita S. Smuth, will mark the 15th anniversary of the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange program by sending the Bundestag's greetings to all Members of Congress and by congratulating the 200 American participants in this year's program, who will be present during the Bundestag session.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in extending special greetings to our fellow legislators in the Bundestag, in commemorating the creation of this exchange and in noting its contribution to the distinctive ties between the peoples and the governments of these two great nations.

INTRODUCTION OF THE
TAXPAYER'S DEFENSE ACT

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today I join with Mr. HAYWORTH and 52 of our colleagues to introduce the Taxpayer's Defense Act. This bill simply provides that no federal agency may establish or raise a tax without the approval of Congress.

One of the principles on which the United States was founded was that there should be no taxation without representation.

In the Second Treatise of Government, John Locke said, "[i]f any one shall claim a power to lay and levy taxes on the people, . . . without . . . consent of the people, he thereby . . . subverts the end of government." Consent, according to Locke, could only be given by a majority of the people, "either by themselves or their representatives chosen by them." The Boston Tea Party celebrated Americans' opposition to taxation without representation. And the Declaration of Independence listed, among the despotic acts of King George, his "imposing Taxes on us without our Consent." First among the powers that the Constitution gave to the Congress, our new government's representative branch, was the power to levy taxes.

The logic of having only Congress establish federal taxes is clear: only Congress considers and weighs every economic and social issue that rises to national importance. While any faction, agency, or sub-agency of the government may view its own priorities as paramount, only Congress can decide which goals are of the importance to merit spending taxpayer dollars. Only Congress can determine the level at which taxpayer dollars should be spent.

The American ban on taxation without representation has not been seriously challenged

during our nation's history. The modern era of restricted federal budgets, however, threatens to erode the essential principle of "no taxation without representation." In ways that are often subtle or hidden, federal agencies are taking on—or receiving from Congress—the power to tax. They may tax by adding extra charges onto legitimate fees charged for services they provide. They may tax by requiring businesses to take on affirmative obligations (as opposed to complying with proscriptions on behavior that harms the public) as a condition of operating. Administrative taxes pass the costs of government programs on to American consumers in the form of higher prices. These secret taxes tend to be deeply regressive and they add inefficiencies to the economy. The take money from everyone without helping anyone.

The worst example of administrative taxation is the Federal Communications Commission's Universal Service Tax. "Universal service" is the idea that everyone should have access to affordable telecommunications services. It originated at the beginning of the century when the nation was still being strung with telephone wires. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 included provisions that allowed the FCC to extend universal service, ensuring that telecommunications are available to all areas of the country and to institutions that benefit the community, like schools, libraries, and rural health care facilities.

Most importantly, the Act gave the FCC the power to decide the level of "contributions"—taxes—that long-distance providers would have to pay to support universal service. The FCC now determines how much can be collected in taxes to subsidize a variety of "universal service" spending programs. It charges long-distance providers, who pass the costs on to consumers in the form of higher telephone bills. In the first half of 1998, the tax was \$625 million, and the Clinton Administration's budget projects it will rise to \$10 billion per year. Mr. Speaker, this administrative tax is already out of control.

The FCC's provisions for universal service have many flaws. Among them are three "administrative corporations" set up by the FCC. The General Accounting Office has determined that the establishment of these corporations was illegal. The head of one of these corporations was, until recently, paid \$200,000 dollars per year—as much as the President of the United States. And reports are already coming in about sweetheart deals between government contractors and their State government friends, who have access to huge amounts of easy universal service money.

The FCC has been contumacious to the will of Congress in implementing the Universal Service Tax. Chairman BLILEY has assiduously pursued the FCC's missteps and misdeeds, as have I. In the Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee, I chaired a hearing on administrative taxation, focusing particularly on the Universal Service Tax, on February 26, 1998, at which I raised several issues and concerns. The FCC's response to my concerns, and those of many other Members, has been anemic at best.

This can only happen because the FCC collects taxpayer dollars at levels it sets without approval from Congress or the people. The FCC can defy Congress and the people because it has the power to levy taxes on its own. It can ignore Congress without threatening its generous spending programs, which

cost Americans millions and millions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, some people thought the tax-and-spend liberals had left Washington. Not so.

Washington interest groups who want to feed at this federal trough are already geared up to accuse the Republican Congress of cutting funding for education and health care if any attempt is made to rein in the FCC. They will cynically frame the issue as a matter of federal entitlements for sympathetic causes and groups.

But the most sympathetic group is the American taxpayer, whose money is being taken, laundered through the Washington bureaucracy, and returned (in dramatically reduced amounts) for purposes set by unelected Washington poohbahs. This is why we must require the FCC, and all agencies, to get the approval of Congress before setting future tax rates.

Should tax dollars be used for federal universal service programs? In what amounts? Or should Americans spend what they earn on their own, locally determined priorities? Requiring Congress to review any administrative taxes would answer this question.

My bill would create a new subchapter within the Congressional Review Act for mandatory review of certain agency rules. Any rule that establishes or raises a tax would have to be submitted to Congress and receive the approval of Congress before it could take effect. In essence, the Act would disable agencies from establishing or raising taxes, but allow them to formulate proposals for Congress to consider, under existing rulemaking procedures. It is a version of a bill introduced and ably advocated for by Mr. HAYWORTH. He joins me today as a leading cosponsor of this bill.

Once submitted to Congress, a taxing regulation would be introduced (by request) in each House of Congress by the Majority Leader. The rule would then be subject to expedited procedures, allowing a prompt decision on whether or not it should take effect. The rule would take effect once a bill approving it was passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. If the rule were approved, the agency would retain power to reverse the regulation, lower the amount of the tax, or take any otherwise legal actions with respect to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the cry of "no taxation without representation" has gone up in the land before, and today we are hearing it again. Congress must not allow a federal agency comprised of unelected bureaucrats to determine the amount of taxes hardworking Americans must pay. While preserving needed flexibility, the Taxpayer's Defense Act will allow Congress alone to determine the purposes to which precious tax dollars will be put.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on the evening of June 11, 1998, and unfortunately missed roll call votes 230 and 231. If present I would have voted "yea" on roll call vote 230 and "yea" on roll call vote 231.

HONORING THE SAVE OUR YOUTH INITIATIVE'S CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH COUNCIL

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the member of my Save Our Youth Initiative's Congressional Youth Council.

One of the major challenges facing Brooklyn, and other parts of our Nation, is finding ways to open doors of opportunity for youth who constitute a disproportionately large share of the unemployed, underemployed, and incarcerated. Through the Save Our Youth Initiative, I am striving to eliminate this bleak outlook for our youth, and to provide the necessary resources so that youth can build successful lives. An important vehicle in this effort is my Congressional Youth Council.

Since Spring 1996, the Youth Council's leadership role in the community encourages youth to become more active citizens. Through organizing community forums such as a Youth Town Hall meeting attended by over 200 youth and adults, participating in public hearings and other local events, and discussing policy issues with public officials such as Mayor Rudolph Giuliani and Brooklyn Borough President Howard Golden, these youth blossomed into dedicated advocates. Each young leader—April Hudson, Irvin Daniels, Felix Ramos, Akilah Holder, Tanya Cruz, Latoya Baker, Dunni Owolabi, Jethro Jellidine, Nicole Brathwaite, Michelle Warner, Yolanshe, Alexander, Fellanthin King, and Kalonji Curwen—is a shining beacon of hope for the future of our community.

I am tremendously proud of their achievements in both school and the community. This month, four of these dedicated youth advocates will receive their New York State high school diplomas. They have truly shown that Generation X is a generation of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting all of the members of my Congressional Youth Council.

TRIBUTE TO INTEGRATION 2000

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, each year a new group of children walks into a school for the first time. They are our future leaders, the hope of America. Students rely on the support they get from parents, mentors, and teachers as they prepare for their future. Harry Istok, at Malow Junior High in Shelby Township, MI, has developed an innovative technical program called Integration 2000. With the help and support of businesses throughout the Metro Detroit area, Integration 2000 has changed the way we look at technical education in Michigan.

Harry Istok is a veteran teacher. For twenty-seven years, he has taught drafting to students at Malow Junior High. But during the school year of 1995/1996, Harry took drafting to a new level. By taking skills from art, drafting, technology education, and general business, Harry integrated the manufacturing side

to show students how their final product would be produced. Students in 7th, 8th, and 9th grades have designed, engineered, manufactured and marketed products such as key chains and pen and pencil holders proudly bearing the Malow Mustang. Harry Istok is preparing students for life after secondary school. Harry has stated, "the whole purpose of education after the Industrial Revolution is to prepare students for the world of work. We have to show the kids that there are viable alternatives to a four year college education." Integration 2000 provides students and business with the opportunity to work together in a hands-on educational environment.

Since 1995, Harry has enlisted twenty-seven area businesses to participate in Integration 2000. Each business donates time and materials to the education of the students. Without their dedication and commitment Integration 2000 would not be possible. On March 8, 1998, Harry and his partners were honored with the Program Excellence Award at the 60th International Technology Education Association in Fort Worth, Texas. The participating businesses are: RCO Engineering, Northern Metalcraft, Joint Production Technologies, Thunder Tool, Shoe Design, Entire Reproductions, Rhetech, Pinnacle Technologies, Proper Mold, Macomb Sheet Metal, P-Ess Sheet Metal, Breed Technologies, Kinzer Collision, International Hardcoat, Shelby Mold Inc., Modulated Metals Inc., E & E Engineering, Advanced Machining Ltd., Mt. Clemens Steel Inc., R.-J.'s E.D.M., DCT Inc., Unique Fabricating, Acra Grinding, 3-Dimensional Services, Powder Cote II, Interplas and Consumers Lumber.

As a parent and congressman, I am impressed so many young people will have the opportunity to experience the world of high tech manufacturing when they are as young as twelve years old. Harry Istok's vision has brought together a unique partnership between Malow Junior High and businesses in southeastern Michigan. Integration 2000 will serve as an example for other schools to follow. I would like to thank Harry and all of his twenty-seven partners for their lasting contribution to education in the United States.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, during roll call vote numbers 245, 246, and 247, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on 245, and no on 246, and 247.

BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3150) to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes:

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in qualified support of this legislation to overhaul our nation's bankruptcy laws. H.R. 3150 is an imperfect bill that addresses a very real and pressing problem. I will vote for this bill to advance it through this stage of the legislative process. However, if this bill does not improve in conference negotiations with the other body, I am prepared to vote against the conference report.

Although the rate of personal bankruptcy filings in Texas in 1996 was well below the national average, it is still high at 8.4 bankruptcies per 1000 households. Nationally, filings increased 20% from 1996 to 1997, and the economic cost of these bankruptcies is passed on to all consumers, creating a hidden tax of \$400 on every household.

While there are multiple factors contributing to this recent surge in bankruptcy filings, the ease with which a debtor can file for Chapter 7 bankruptcy is surely one of them. There are certainly scattered cases of debtors running up their debt and then filing Chapter 7 bankruptcy to discharge that debt when they are capable of paying a substantial portion. The bankruptcy system should not assist debtors in evading debts they could otherwise pay. Instead, our nation's bankruptcy laws should offer a fair and honest way for those overwhelmed by financial pressures to pay off as much of their debt as they can and begin a fresh start.

This bill takes a good initial step at limiting a debtor's ability to "game the system" or take advantage of our bankruptcy code. However, the bankruptcy code affects millions of working Americans annually, and any changes to the code will have significant ramifications for many of them. We must undertake any rewrite of this code with extreme diligence and caution.

Amendments to this bill, both in committee and on the House floor, addressing child support and alimony payments, have allayed some of my fears. However, I still have significant lingering concerns that making some credit card debt nondischargeable places this debt in direct competition with child support and alimony payments. Although child support and alimony payments retain priority designation, credit card companies will generally have a better ability to collect these debts than an ex-spouse. Before this bill is enacted into law, we must be absolutely certain that it will not benefit credit card companies at the expense of women and children who rely on these payments for their survival.

This bill, as reported by the House Committee on Judiciary, would have preempted provisions in the Texas Constitution which protect a debtor's homestead from seizure. The bill would have capped the homestead exemption at \$100,000, while Texas law has no monetary limit on the homestead exemption. I was adamantly opposed to this provision, and was pleased that it was eliminated from the bill on the House floor. However, I still have concerns that this bill would intrude on state law by prohibiting a debtor from exempting assets transferred into one's homestead within one year of filing for bankruptcy. I hope to see this provision eliminated from the bill in negotiations with Senate.

I will vote for this bill now, but I urge the conference committee to address these very significant issues before this legislation returns to the House for final passage. If women and

children are not adequately protected in this rewrite of the bankruptcy code, I will vote against the conference report.

RECOGNIZING WPST'S DAVE
McKAY AS TOP 40 SMALL MAR-
KET PROGRAM DIRECTOR OF
THE YEAR

HON. MICHAEL PAPPAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mr. Dave McKay who was recently named Top 40 Small Market Program Director of the Year at the Gavin Seminar in San Diego, California. He is truly outstanding at what he does, making it my pleasure to recognize him today.

Every day many of us enjoy listening to the radio but are probably largely unaware of the hard work that goes into a successful broadcast. It is rare that we have the opportunity to give our thanks to those who stand out in the radio industry and provide us with daily entertainment.

Selected from hundreds of candidates across the country, Mr. McKay has proven to be at the top of his field, as is evident by the fact that he has received this honor for two consecutive years. He graduated from the University of Maryland in 1992 and has excelled in his endeavors ever since. Hired immediately as an air talent at WPST in 1993, he was recognized as a great prospect in the industry. Just five months later, he was promoted to the position of Music Director, a position that gained him many accolades. As Music Director, Mr. McKay won \$10,000 in the AIR Competition, one of the greatest achievements in the radio industry, as well as numerous other awards. Finally, in 1996, he was named Program Director at WPST, a position that he remains in at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to recognize Dave McKay for his recent honor in being named as the Top 40 Small Market Program Director of the year. I want to congratulate him and wish him and WPST my best wishes.

FOURTH ANNUAL CITIZENSHIP DAY EVENT

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, June 13, my staff and I hosted our Fourth Annual Citizenship Day Event. This is a one-stop application processing opportunity for residents who wish to become U.S. citizens.

With the help of local volunteers, elected officials, and community-based organizations, we were able to help 350 residents take their first step to becoming a U.S. citizen.

The Citizenship Day process consisted of completing INS forms, taking photographs, and having attorneys and INS representatives review the application. Upon completing this process, the application is photocopied for the applicant and immediately mailed to INS.

Every year, I am amazed at the number of people who attend this event. While some of us tend to take for granted that we live in a great a country, others wait in line all night long simply to submit an application to become a U.S. citizen.

Although an event like this takes many months of coordinating and planning, the rewards are remarkable. Not only does it provide a service to our community, but it also increases awareness among legal residents about the importance of becoming a citizen. Moreover, it's encouraging to see volunteers return every year to contribute their time and effort.

I am extremely thankful of the following volunteers, groups and organizations who assisted in making this event possible: Houston Community College—Northeast Campus, Harris County Constable Victor Trevino, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Postal Service, Houston Industries, League of United Latin American Citizens, National Association of Latino Elected Officials, Hispanic Women in Leadership, Rio Posada Restaurant, Fiesta Mart, Inc., Hispanic Organization of Postal Employees, Houston Coca Cola Bottling Co., Pizza Hut, Chase Bank, Telemundo—Channel 48, Univision—Channel 45, College Democrats @ University of Houston, Quan, Burdette & Perez, Attorneys at Law, Esther Alaniz, Alicia Almandariz, David Airhart, Artie Blanco, Delia Barajas, Debra Barnes, Yasmine Cadena, Mary Closner, Mitchell Contreras, Romero Cruz, Hector De Leon, Anselmo Davila, Armando Entenza, Arthur Flores, Charles Flores, Dr. Margaret Ford, Celia Garcia, Cyndi Garza, Juan Garcia, Rosa Garcia, Reynaldo Garza, Victor Gonzalez, Juana Gonzalez, Priscilla Gonzalez, Manuel Gonzalez, Mary Guerrero, Rebecca Guerrero, Joe Granados, Ben D. Huynh, Ana Maria Lopez, Dorothy Ledezma, Alfred Martinez, John Martinez, Benny Martinez, Margaret Mata, Edward Melendez, Josephine Mendoza, John Meyer, Diana Morales, Sally Morin, Mercedes Nassar, Janie Munoz, Frances Munoz, Art Murillo, Ana Nunez, Sandra M. Orellana, Juan Padilla, Cesar De Paz, Richard Perez, Candy Perez, Andre Rodriguez, Jesse P. Ramirez, Francisco Rodriguez, Mayor Cipriano Romero, Juana Rosales, Rosa Ruelas, Yeannett Salazar, Thomas Sanchez, Olga Soliz, Diana Trevino, Marco Torres, Vera Vasquez, Suzanne Villareal, Patricia Valdez, Ralph Vazquez, and Shahid Waheed.

OSHA WORKPLACE VIOLENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration recently issued a document called "Recommendations for Workplace Violence Prevention in Late-Night Retail Establishments."

Although workplace violence is an issue that we are all concerned about, I and many of my colleagues have serious reservations about OSHA's involvement in this issue. In September 1996, more than 100 members of the House of Representatives wrote to then Assistant Secretary for OSHA, Joseph Dear, re-

garding an earlier set of "guidelines" for workplace violence prevention programs for night retail establishments, expressing a number of concerns, including the enforceability of the guidelines and the lack of scientific basis and procedural safeguards in their promulgation.

I continue to be concerned that OSHA's involvement in workplace violence has not been supported by objective analysis nor been subject to procedural safeguards. There is little evidence that OSHA is in a better position than state and local authorities to investigate incidents of workplace violence perpetrated by either 3rd parties or co-workers, or that OSHA's involvement in those investigations would help to bring the perpetrators to justice.

Nonetheless, I do want to underline a clarification that OSHA made in its recent recommendations for late night retail establishments. It is my understanding from both the actual text of OSHA's final recommendations, as well as from comments made by OSHA officials, that its recommendations are not a new standard or regulation, and do not create any new OSHA duties, and that an employer's decision not to adopt any of the recommendations will not be deemed evidence of a violation of the General Duty Clause in section 5(a)(1) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. To quote OSHA's recommendations directly, "These recommendations do not impose, and are not intended to result in, the imposition of any new legal obligations or constraints on employers or the states."

Mr. Speaker, a great many employers in the late night retail industry have worked hard to develop violence prevention programs that may not conform to all of OSHA's recommendations. It is my understanding that OSHA's recent "recommendations" are intended as suggestions to late night retailers of a variety of steps that may be taken as part of such violence prevention programs. The particular recommendations in the April 28 OSHA document are not intended to create any legal obligation, duty or consequence.

Mr. Speaker, workplace violence, like violence throughout our society, is a serious problem. Employers in all sectors of the economy are taking steps to prevent violence against their employees, whether it be violence perpetrated by 3rd parties or by disgruntled and disturbed employees. I commend OSHA for clarifying that its recommendations do not impose new legal duties on employers but are intended to provide employers with suggestions and recommendations of steps that employers may consider as part of their own efforts to reduce the likelihood of violence occurring against employees in their workplaces.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. PAUL C. ZANOWIC

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Paul C. Zanowic, who served as a law enforcement officer in Somerset County, New Jersey for fifty years.

President Warren G. Harding once said, "Whenever a man contributes to the better-

ment of his community, whenever he contributes to the enlarged influence of his State, whenever he contributes to the greater glory of the Republic and makes it a better place in which to live and in which to invite men to participate and aspire, he contributes to himself as he contributes to the welfare of his fellow men."

Paul Zanowic dedicated his life to the betterment of his community, through the honorable profession of law enforcement. On February 12, 1998, Paul Zanowic reached his 91st birthday. His commitment to public duty and the public trust truly deserves recognition by this body.

Paul Zanowic started as a patrolman with the North Plainfield Police Department in 1931. After serving as the Office in Charge of the Detective Bureau for eight years, he was elevated to Chief of Police in North Plainfield, New Jersey, in 1960, which is in my Congressional district. Beginning in 1967, he was elected to four straight terms by the citizens of Somerset County to serve as their Sheriff. He retired from law enforcement in 1980. His tenure as Chief of Police was marked by his becoming President of the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police and he has the honor of being the first Chief ever elected to office in the Association from Somerset County. He was past president of the North Plainfield Police Benevolent Association, and received an honorary lifetime membership in the New Jersey State PBA.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in honoring the dedication of Paul C. Zanowic. His record of public service should serve as a model for the citizens of our nation.

LAWRENCE MEINWALD, OUT-
STANDING CITIZEN OF GOSHEN,
NEW YORK

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of our colleagues the birthday of an outstanding American and resident of the Town of Goshen, New York, Lawrence Meinwald. Today, Mr. Meinwald celebrates his 84th birthday, and I want to take this opportunity to share with our colleagues the remarkable life story of this incredible person.

Mr. Meinwald came to the United States in 1920 as a young boy from Warsaw, Poland. His first ten days in America were spent at Ellis Island while waiting to enter our nation. Ellis Island had such a strong impact on him that he decided to make New York State his home, and remains unpersuaded by the recent ruling reverting Ellis Island to New Jersey.

Larry Meinwald, along with his wife, Carolyn, have made lasting contributions to their adopted home of Goshen, New York. Chief among these contributions has been the complete restoration of eight commercial buildings in the Village of Goshen, all which preserve the historic nature of the area.

Mr. Meinwald's most recent restoration is that of an office building at the very spot at which the former Erie and Western Railroad had the initial trip on what proved to be a long

and fruitful era. During that period Goshen served as a major rail distribution center. In recognition of this important maiden run, George M. Lyons, the Mayor of Goshen, has named the street "Railroad Avenue."

Mr. Speaker, I invite our colleagues to join with me in extending birthday greetings and our best wishes to this outstanding American citizen, Mr. Lawrence Meinwald.

FATHER'S DAY

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our nation's fathers. As all of us are aware, this Sunday, June 21 is Father's Day. While Father's Day is a relatively new holiday, originating in the early part of this century, there is no limit to the amount of respect and honor we have shown our fathers over the years.

In 1909, a daughter thought of the idea of Father's Day. She and her five siblings had been raised by her father after their mother died. She wanted to honor her father, realizing as she reached adulthood how much he had sacrificed for her and her brothers and sisters. The concept of Father's Day was born.

Our parents often teach us many things about life that we don't realize at the time of the lesson; however, slowly we metamorphose into this person that "becomes like our parent." I still live and remember many of the lessons my own father taught me. My father was one of the most honest, loving, men of integrity I have ever known. He taught me the value of hard work, and of a faith born not of words, but deeds. I couldn't have asked for a better example of all that is good in a man, than the example of my dad.

Mr. Speaker, again, I rise today to extend my gratitude to those fathers in our nation who remember the job they have and keep the promises made to their children.

RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS OF THE NEW JERSEY BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION

HON. MICHAEL PAPPAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the New Jersey Broadcasters Association whose outstanding work has affected the lives of many of my constituents. They have truly served the public interest in the communities of New Jersey, and for this I commend them.

Broadcasters have a mandate to serve the public interest of the communities in which they operate. Given the diversity of communities in New Jersey as well as in the entire United States, there are a multitude of needs to be addressed over the public airwaves. Whether it be public service announcements, public affairs programs, or the communications of other various community issues, the NJBA has educated and involved the citizens of New Jersey in a unique way.

They have gained the respect of the listening audience by reporting on those issues important to the community. Issues such as AIDS, alcohol abuse, drunk driving, and crime are addressed by the association and relayed to the public through public service campaigns. Our youth are significantly affected by what they hear over the radio, and based upon the outstanding job by the NJBA, they are being steered in the right direction. In addition, emergency closings of businesses and schools as well as local weather crises are reported by stations through the NJBA.

New Jersey radio and TV stations, through the good work of the NJBA, do so much good work each and every day to assist in the improvement of the community. All events and activities that they work on, no matter what the size, are important to the citizens of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Phil Roberts and the entire NJBA for their continuous excellent work and wish them every future success in keeping the citizens of New Jersey educated and informed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on June 16, as United Flight #200, scheduled to depart San Francisco at 8 am did not depart until 10 am due to mechanical difficulties. I landed at Dulles International Airport at 5:34 pm, and therefore missed Roll-call votes 232 and 233. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on both.

A TRIBUTE TO STEVE OHLY—1998 ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON FOUNDATION COMMUNITY HEALTH LEADER

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest pleasures of serving in Congress is the opportunity to recognize the exceptional individuals of our Nation. Today, I rise to pay tribute to one such person, my constituent Steve Ohly, for his many contributions to the City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Recently, Steve was recognized by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Community Health Leadership Program as one of ten outstanding American leaders who have found innovative ways to bring health care to communities whose needs have been ignored and unmet.

I would like to offer my congratulations to Steve on his receipt of this distinguished award and to take this time to touch on his accomplishments. Steve, a nurse practitioner by trade, was instrumental in founding the Madison Street Outreach Clinic on Milwaukee's south side in 1994. From the outset, the Madison Street Outreach Clinic has been a welcome and open door for the city's uninsured and homeless. The clinic provides health care

to families and individuals, who because of poverty, hopelessness, location, immigration status, mental or physical illness, face unique and difficult obstacles to receiving needed services through more traditional channels. The Madison Street Clinic serves the most ethnically diverse community in the State and every month more than 600 patients walk through the clinic doors for care.

In addition, in 1997, Steve helped open the Clarke Square Family Health Center, the Midwest's first medical clinic to operate in a grocery store. The clinic, located in the neighborhood Pick 'N Save, is open seven days a week and provides both primary and urgent care to patients who live in the area. Truly "one-stop shopping," Clarke Square provides a safe environment in the central city for individuals to receive primary and urgent care services right in the grocery store.

Through the efforts of Steve Ohly, countless homeless and unemployed Milwaukeeans are given needed medical care and a chance to lead more healthy and productive lives. I congratulate Steve and thank him for his tireless dedication and service to our great city. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you, and the other Members, join with me in honoring Steve for his commitment to his community and acknowledge his admirable service as a role model to our entire Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION REGARDING PROTECTING FUNCTION PRIVILEGE

HON. TOM DELAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that President Clinton should immediately withdraw his appeal of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia's recent decision rejecting the fabricated "protective function privilege." Judge Johnson correctly observed that this new privilege, which would prevent Secret Service agents from testifying, is not based in the Constitution, statute or common law. In short, there is no legal basis for a protective function privilege.

The fact that this administration would assert such a specious privilege is deeply troubling for a number of reasons. First, the president has apparently decided, contrary to his public pronouncements, that he will not cooperate with the grand jury investigation. I recall President Clinton looking the American people in the eye and proclaiming that the "American people have a right to get answers" regarding questions about the Monica Lewinsky investigation? He said it was his intention to supply more information rather than less, sooner rather than later. Does any one recall his promise to give "as many answers as we can, as soon as we can, at the appropriate time, consistent with our obligation to also cooperate with the investigations."

Instead, the President has decided to hide behind an army of lawyers, most of whom are paid with taxpayer money. President Clinton and his attorneys have decided to throw as many legal obstacles in front of the investigation as possible. They have apparently been

instructed to go so far as to claim the newly fabricated "protective function privilege." The Attorney General should be ashamed that she is now part of the conspiracy of obstruction and silence.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned about the assertion of this privilege because of the signal it sends across America. President Clinton is demonstrating that if one has enough money and power, one can use the legal system to delay, obstruct, and avoid accountability. The President is willing to abuse America's justice system to avoid coming clean with the American people. Like so many of his liberal friends, the President and his lawyers urged the court to legislate a new law where there was none. That is not the appropriate use of our court system. Only Congress can make new laws in this area as Judge Johnson so aptly noted. If the President is so concerned about harm to himself or the Secret Service, he should propose legislation to Congress not abuse our judicial system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to direct the Attorney General to immediately withdraw her appeal of Judge Johnson's correct decision. The time has come for the President to fulfill his commitment to the American people.

I also ask that the resolution, various editorials, and a letter from Professor Jonathan Turley on behalf of former Attorneys General Barr, Thornburgh, Meese, and Bell be included in the RECORD immediately following this statement.

H. RES.—

Whereas the Office of the Independent Counsel and a Federal grand jury are investigating allegations of personal wrongdoing and possible crimes in the White House;

Whereas certain Secret Service agents asserted a "protective function privilege" and refused to answer questions before a Federal grand jury (In Re Grand Jury Proceedings, Misc. No. 91-148 (NHJ), redacted version at 1, (D.D.C. May 22, 1998) (hereinafter referred to as "Grand Jury Proceedings"));

Whereas "none of the questions at issue relate to the protective techniques or procedures of the Secret Service" (Grand Jury Proceedings at 1);

Whereas Federal Rule of Evidence 501 provides that evidentiary privileges "shall be governed by the principles of the common law as they may be interpreted by the Courts of the United States in the light of reason and experience";

Whereas the Supreme Court has interpreted Rule 501 to require courts to consider whether the asserted privilege is historically rooted in Federal law, whether any States have recognized the privilege, and public policy interests (Grand Jury Proceedings at 2, citing *Jaffee v. Redmond*, 518 U.S. 1, 12-15 (1996));

Whereas the Supreme Court has emphasized that it is "disinclined to exercise [its] authority [under Rule 501] expansively" (*University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC*, 493 U.S. 182, 189 (1990)) and has cautioned that privileges "are not lightly created nor expansively construed, for they are in derogation of the search for truth" (*U.S. v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 710 (1974));

Whereas the district court found "no constitutional basis for recognizing a protective function privilege," "no history of the privilege in Federal common or statutory law," "[n]o State [recognition of] a protective function privilege or its equivalent," and "the policy arguments advanced by the Secret Service are not strong enough to overcome the grand jury's substantial interest in obtaining evidence of crimes or to cause this Court to create a new testimonial privilege" (Grand Jury Proceedings) at 3, 6-9;

Whereas no administration has ever sought congressional enactment of a protective function privilege;

Whereas Chief Judge Norma Holloway Johnson refused to establish a protective function privilege (Grand Jury Proceedings at 9) and correctly noted such claims should be made to Congress, not to the courts (Grand Jury Proceedings at 4);

Whereas the Attorney General, who is the Nation's chief law enforcement official, should not assert claims of privilege, such as the protective function privilege, that have no basis in law and the assertion of which substantially delays the work of the grand jury;

Whereas former Attorneys General Barr, Thornburgh, Meese, and Bell encouraged Attorney General Reno to forego appealing the district court's decision because they believe the decision was "legally and historically well-founded," and "any appeal would likely result in an opinion that would only magnify the precedential damage to the Executive Branch" (Letter from Professor Jonathan Turley to Attorney General Reno, May 25, 1998); and

Whereas the Attorney General has appealed the district court's decision: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that the President of the United States, if he believes such a policy is warranted, should submit to the Congress proposed legislation which would establish a protective function privilege and also direct the Attorney General to immediately withdraw the appeal of the district court's decision in the matter styled *In Re Grand Jury Proceedings*, Misc. No. 91-148 (NHJ), redacted version, (D.D.C. May 22, 1998).

[From the Las Vegas Review-Journal, May 27, 1998]

PHANTOM "PRIVILEGE"

By now, everybody who follows the White House scandals knows that a federal judge has shot down the groundless claim that Secret Service agents enjoy some special "privilege" which shields them from having to testify in court proceedings.

Arguing on the president's behalf, the Justice Department contended that compelling Secret Service agents to testify would damage the relationship between the president and the agents assigned to protect him and would put the president's life, and those of future chief executives, in jeopardy.

Last week, federal district court judge Norma Holloway Johnson ruled that Secret Service agents enjoy no immunity from testifying—no "privilege" whatsoever under law, precedent, tradition or even the rules of common sense.

Judge Johnson's decision is worth examining further because it helps expose the White House "privilege" ploy for what it was: the latest in a host of tactical moves designed not to "protect the presidency"—as Mr. Clinton's more simple-minded apologists would have it—but to delay, to obfuscate and to keep the president's fat out of the fire for as long as possible.

In her ruling, Judge Johnson found:

(1) The Constitution says nothing and implies nothing about any such privilege for the Secret Service.

(2) Nowhere in U.S. history or custom or common law—or in the law of any state as regards protection for governors—is there any basis for such a claim.

(3) Not only did Congress not give the Secret Service immunity from testifying, Judge Johnson wrote in reference to the United States Code, "under section 535(b), Congress imposed a duty on all executive branch personnel to report criminal activity

by government officers and employees to the attorney general. . . . Secret Service employees are not only executive branch personnel subject to 535(b), but they are also law enforcement officers."

(4) Wrote Judge Johnson: "The court is not ultimately persuaded that a president would put his life at risk for fear that a Secret Service agent might be called to testify before a grand jury" on a rare occasion.

In all respects, the judge's ruling was sound and correct. Only Mr. Clinton's most vapid defenders can believe that "the presidency" is somehow harmed by calling upon Secret Service agents to tell the truth about possible felonious actions.

[From the Tampa Tribune, May 23, 1998]

SECRET SERVICE AGENTS AND THE LAW

In plenty of palaces in the backwaters of the world, a dictator's bodyguards never testify against the boss. It is outrageous that such an issue should even be under debate here.

Yet the Justice Department is arguing that Secret Service agents assigned to protect the president shouldn't be allowed to answer questions by the special prosecutor investigating possible obstruction of justice in the Monica Lewinsky episode.

The White House argues that if Secret Service agents had to tell what they might have seen while guarding the president, it would destroy their "relationship" with him and damage their ability to protect him. The president would "push the agents away," says Justice Department lawyer Gary Grindler.

That assumes the president is doing things he wouldn't want a grand jury to know about. Requiring agents to see no evil would require them to help obstruct justice, which is to say make them assist their boss in the commission of a crime. For officers sworn to uphold the law, such a position is untenable.

Whitewater prosecutor Kenneth Starr is right that absolutely nothing in federal law allows for such a privilege. In our form of government, no one is above the law. Starr points out that federal law actually requires employees of the executive branch to report any evidence of a crime.

Even the president himself can be subpoenaed to testify. Surely his bodyguards don't deserve more protection than he does.

If the president, in his desperation to avoid embarrassment or worse, is allowed to turn the Secret Service into the Silent Service, he will have done the country a great disservice.

[From the Washington Times, May 26, 1998]

THE PRESIDENT'S TOUGH TIMES IN COURT

Things certainly have all been going Kenneth Starr's way, legally speaking, in his attempts to carry out a thorough investigation of possible perjury, subornation of perjury and obstruction of justice by Bill Clinton, Vernon Jordan and Monica Lewinsky.

U.S. District Judge Nora Holloway Johnson found in Mr. Starr's favor when she rejected the demonstrably preposterous White House claim that conversations Mr. Clinton had with aides Bruce Lindsey and Sidney Blumenthal about how to deal with the President's Lewinsky problem were covered by executive privilege.

Judge Johnson also came down on Mr. Starr's side in rejecting Miss Lewinsky's claim that Mr. Starr had made an immunity deal with her on which he then reneged. An appeals court last week refused to overturn that decision, which leaves Miss Lewinsky with the delicate task of squaring her sworn testimony that she and Bill Clinton had no sexual relationship with her statements on

the Linda Tripp tapes that she had indeed had such a relationship, that she was prepared to lie about it in her sworn deposition, and that she hoped Mrs. Tripp would do the same.

And, putting another chink in the Clintons' stone wall, last week Judge Johnson agreed with Mr. Starr that there is no legal basis for granting a hitherto unheard of "protective function privilege" to Secret Service agents who guard the president, and that the state's interest in gathering evidence in a criminal case must outweigh qualms about any damage that might be done to the trust between a president and his guards. Actually, Judge Johnson cut right to the heart of the issue in the particular case of this particular president.

"The court is not ultimately persuaded," wrote the judge, "that a president would put his life at risk for fear that a Secret Service agent might be called to testify before a grand jury about observed conduct or overheard statements. . . . When people act within the law, they do not ordinarily push away those they trust or rely upon for fear that their actions will be reported to a grand jury. . . . It is not at all clear that a president would push Secret Service protection away if he were acting legally or even if he were engaged in personally embarrassing acts. Such actions are extremely unlikely to become the subject of a grand jury investigation."

In other words, as has been suggested before in this space, a president could feel free to do a lot of things in front of his Secret Service detail—short of breaking the law, that is—without conjuring up the spectre of the grand jury. Only a president who had broken the law would have reason to worry that the agents guarding him might be asked to testify against him.

President Clinton himself, clearly distraught about the ruling, warned that it would have a "chilling" effect—and went on to commit the kind of inadvertent honesty that may be becoming a habit (such as his statement at his recent press conference that he is the last person in the world who ought to comment on the question of character). Thinking to chastise Mr. Starr for demanding Secret Service testimony, the president said after the ruling, "I don't think anyone ever thought about [Secret Service agents testifying] because no one ever thought that anyone would ever abuse the responsibility that the Secret Service has to the president and to the president's family. . . . But we're living in a time which is without precedent, where actions are being taken without precedent, and we just have to live with the consequences."

Mr. Clinton and his various legal problems in a nutshell, no?

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
LAW SCHOOL,
Washington, DC, May 25, 1998.

Hon. JANET RENO

*Attorney General of the United States,
U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM ATTORNEYS GENERAL: I am writing on behalf of four former United States Attorneys General, who have asked me to assist them in the on-going controversy over the proposed "protective function privilege." In deference to the Court and your office, the former Attorneys General have been highly circumspect in their public statements on this issue despite their strong concerns about the proposed privilege. After the May 22, 1998 decision by the Court, however, these concerns have become more acute with the possible appeal of the decision rejecting the proposed privilege. It is to the question of an appeal that I wish to convey

the view of former Attorneys General William P. Barr, Griffin B. Bell, Edwin Meese III, and Richard L. Thornburgh.

It is the collective view of the former Attorneys General that the decision of Chief Judge Norma Holloway Johnson was legally and historically well-founded. Moreover, any appeal would likely result in an opinion that would only magnify the precedential damage to the Executive Branch. While Secret Service Director Lewis Merletti has already stated his intention to appeal this matter to the United States Supreme Court, it falls to you and Solicitor General Seth Waxman to make such a decision. For the reasons stated below, the former Attorneys General encourage you to exercise your authority to forego an appeal in this matter.

The former Attorneys General take no position on the merits or underlying allegations of this investigation. However, the former Attorneys General have watched the on-going confrontation between the White House and the Office of the Independent Counsel with increasing unease and concern. As the investigation becomes more embroiled in claims of executive privilege, the danger of lasting and negative consequences for both the Executive Branch and the legal system has grown considerably. In an area with little prior litigation, we have already seen a series of new rulings on issues ranging from attorney-client privilege to presidential communications to civil liability of sitting Presidents. While many of these rulings were not unexpected, they constitute significant limitations for future presidents. Despite their unease, the former Attorneys General have avoided any direct involvement in the crisis and waited for the decision of the trial court in the hope that an appeal would not be taken after the widely anticipated rejection of the proposed privilege.

As you know, during their service over the last two decades for both Democratic and Republican administrations, the former Attorneys General have played central roles in the development of executive privilege principles and advocated the rights of the Executive Branch on numerous occasions. While strong supporters of executive privilege, they feel equally strongly that such privilege claims must be carefully balanced and cautiously invoked in litigation. Certainly, such claims should not suddenly emerge from the fog and frenzy of litigation with no historical antecedent or legal precedent. In adopting such common law privileges, the Supreme Court relies upon "historical antecedents" and evidence that the privilege is "established" and "indelibly ensconced in our common law." *United States v. Gillock*, 445 U.S. 360, 366, 368 (1980). Accordingly, common law privileges develop slowly within the federal system through general acceptance and recognition. Judge Benjamin Cardozo described this gradual process as developing "inch by inch" and "measured . . . by decades and even centuries." Benjamin N. Cardozo, *The Nature of the Judicial Process* 25 (1921).

In comparison, rather than developing a new privilege by precedential inches, the proposed protective function privilege represents a great leap—in the wrong direction. This proposed privilege was suddenly crafted to meet the immediate demands of a criminal investigation. Rather than offering "historical antecedents," the proposed privilege would spring fully grown without prior recognition or development in the common law. Rather than emerge through general acceptance, the privilege would be created amidst sharp divisions and opposition among the Bar and legal academics. Moreover, a protective function privilege appears to be designed to permit what is expressly disavowed in established privileges, specifically (1) a

general claim of privilege that is not directly tied to specific presidential communications or policy processes, and (2) a refusal to supply information in criminal inquiries as a matter of common law.

Not only is there an absence of any prior judicial recognition of this privilege, the proposed privilege would conflict with the traditional view of the obligations of federal employees in supplying information in criminal proceedings. As noted by the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in *In re: Grand Jury Subpoena Duces Tecum*, 112 F.3d 910, 919 (8th Cir. 1997) (citing 28 U.S.C. §535(b)(1994)) "executive branch employees, including attorneys, are under a statutory duty to report criminal wrongdoing by other employees to the Attorney General." Courts have repeatedly stressed that law enforcement personnel have an obligation running to the public to disclose any evidence of crime and the failure to do so would be grounds for removal, or even prosecution, in some circumstances.

While the proposed privilege refers to the protective function of the Secret Service, it is important to note that the actual physical protection of the President, and information relevant to protective functions, is not at risk of disclosure. Existing common law privileges and statutory sources protect security-related information. Most security-related documents and information would be easily shielded from disclosure under the military and state secrets privilege. In addition to this established privilege, classification laws impose heavy restrictions and procedures for the disclosure of such information. Thus, the protective function privilege would not serve any direct protective function in the withholding of sensitive information.

Ironically, as to non-security related information, the proposed privilege cannot possibly achieve its objective of assured confidentiality since it shields only a small percentage of the federal employees who witness presidential communications and conduct. Specifically, the proposed privilege would not prevent the identical communications from being revealed by legal staff, political staff, administrative staff, household staff, retired security staff, or state or local security officers. For example, in the Oval Office, a pantry is staffed by employees who can be (and have been) called as witnesses in criminal investigations. As public employees, these employees must give relevant testimony to criminal investigators. Likewise, White House lawyers, secretaries, and administrative staff can be (and have been) called to testify in criminal investigations. These "unprivileged" employees would hear the same communications presumably overheard by Secret Service agents. Even security staff would not be completely barred from disclosures under a protective function privilege. The President is often guarded by a host of state and federal law enforcement personnel beyond the relatively small contingent of Secret Service personnel. As a result, this proposed privilege would achieve little in terms of added guarantees of non-disclosure for the President but would change much of our traditional view of the Secret Service and its function.

In the end, all that will be achieved is an alarming anomaly in which every public employee in the White House, from office secretaries to cabinet secretaries, would be required to give evidence of criminal conduct with the sole exception of the law enforcement officers stationed at the White House. Only the personnel trained to enforce federal law would be exempt from the most basic fulfillment of public employment. This would be a considerable, but hardly a commendable, achievement.

The proposed privilege would be equally unique in its invocation and application. Unlike the standard executive privilege protecting presidential communications, the proposed privilege would be invoked by the Secretary of the Treasury rather than the President of the United States. Not only would the new privilege invest this single cabinet officer with unique and troubling authority, it allows a political appointee of a President to create a major barrier to a criminal investigation that is, by statute, meant to be independent of the Executive Branch. *Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654, 661 (1988). Such exclusive and unilateral authority claimed by the Secretary of the Treasury is completely unprecedented and unanticipated in our history.

Even if successful on appeal, this privilege would be secured at a tremendous and prohibitive cost for the traditions of the Secret Service. Created as a law enforcement agency, the new privilege would shift an obligation running currently to the public in favor of an obligation running to the personal household of the President. This creates a unit more closely analogized to a Praetorian or palace guard and introduces a dangerous ambiguity for law enforcement officers. Secret Service agents are law enforcement professionals, not members of a personal household guard. Moreover, a new privilege would create a legal morass for future cases for other law enforcement officers. Federal law enforcement Officers, including United States Marshals, currently guard hundreds of dignitaries, judges, and other officials. The status and controlling duties of these individuals would become hopelessly and dangerously ambiguous under a protective function privilege. Currently, there is a clear line for protective personnel. Their jobs require them to protect the physical safety of those officials in their care but their status as law enforcement officers require them to share any relevant criminal evidence. This has been a bright-line rule under which federal enforcement personnel have served for many decades without objection.

The common law cannot guarantee a President that his conduct will never be the subject of criminal investigation. However, few Presidents have ever been the subject of criminal allegations and even fewer have faced criminal inquiries. The likelihood of future court-sanctioned inquiries into either criminal or non-criminal conduct of the President is extremely remote. In any area where a President may fear possible allegations of criminal conduct, the chilling effect of a criminal inquiry would be a positive, not a negative, influence. Put simply, it is not in the public's interest for their President to feel comfortable discussing possible criminal information in front of any public servant, let alone a law enforcement officer.

The former Attorneys General are deeply concerned about the inherent dangers in recognizing a special privilege for the Secret Service. To that end, the former Attorneys General have asked me to prepare an *amicus curiae* brief opposing the privilege for their consideration, should an appeal be taken in this case. The immediate question, however, rests with your evaluation of the relative merits and costs of an appeal from the Court's decision. There are clearly many competing interests weighing into the decision of an appeal in the case. In making this decision, I hope that the unique perspective of your predecessors will assist you in the coming days.

Respectfully,

JONATHAN TURLEY,
Professor of Law.

ELLIS ISLAND MEDALS OF HONOR AWARDS CEREMONY

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1998

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

ELLIS ISLAND MEDALS OF HONOR AWARDS CEREMONY—NECO CHAIRMAN WILLIAM DENIS FUGAZY LEADS DRAMATIC CEREMONY DEDICATED TO LATE MEDAL RECIPIENT, ERIC BREINDEL AND LINDA EASTMAN MCCARTNEY

Ellis Island, NY, May 9—Standing on the hallowed grounds of Ellis Island—the portal through which 17 million immigrants entered the United States—a cast of ethnic Americans who have made significant contributions to the life of this nation, among them Senator George Mitchell; New York Times photojournalist Dith Pran; College Football's All-Time Winningest Coach Eddie Robinson; and the U.S. Olympic Women's Hockey Team today were presented with the coveted Ellis Island Medal of Honor at an emotionally uplifting ceremony.

NECO's annual medal ceremony and reception on Ellis Island in New York Harbor is the Nation's largest celebration of ethnic pride. This year's event was dedicated to the memory of Eric Breindel, a 1994 Ellis Island Medal recipient and Linda Eastman McCartney.

Representing a rainbow of ethnic origins, this year's recipients received their awards in the shadow of the historic Great Hall, where the first footsteps were taken by the millions of immigrants who entered the U.S. in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

"Today we honor great ethnic Americans who, through their achievements and contributions, and in the spirit of their ethnic origins, have enriched this country and have become role models for future generations," said NECO Chairman William Denis Fugazy. "In addition, we honor the immigrant experience—those who passed through this Great Hall decades ago, and the new immigrants who arrive on American soil seeking opportunity."

Mr. Fugazy added, "It doesn't matter how you got here or if you already were here. Ellis Island is a symbol of the freedom, diversity and opportunity-ingredients inherent in the fabric of this nation. Although many recipients have no familial ties to Ellis Island, their ancestors share similar histories of struggle and hope for a better life here."

Established in 1986 by NECO, the Ellis Island Medals of Honor pay tribute to the ancestry groups that comprise America's unique cultural mosaic. To date, approximately 1000 ethnic American citizens and native Americans have received medals.

NECO is the largest organization of its kind in the U.S. serving as an umbrella group for 250 ethnic organizations and whose mandate is to preserve ethnic diversity, promote ethnic and religious equality, tolerance and harmony, and to combat injustice, hatred and bigotry.

Ellis Island Medal of Honor recipients are selected each year through a national nomination process. Screening committees from NECO's member organizations select the final nominees, who are then considered by the Board of Directors.

1998 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Anthony S. Abbate, Italian, Business Leader.

Hon. Gary L. Ackerman, Eastern European, Member of Congress.

William H. Adkins, African, Business Leader.

Antigone Agris, Hellenic, Business Leader.
Ace (Armando) Alagna, Italian, Publisher.
John B. Alfieri, Esq., Italian, Attorney.
John A. Allison IV, Scottish/Irish, Business Leader.

John A. Amos, African, Actor/Playwright.
Ernie Anastos, Hellenic, News Journalist/Author.

Thomas V. Angott, Italian, Business Leader.

Michael S. Ansari, Iranian, Business Leader.

Norman R. Augustine, German, Business Leader/Educator.

William J. Avery, Irish/Welsh, Business Leader.

Farhad Azima, Persian, Business Leader.
Brian M. Barefoot, English/German, Community Leader.

Archbishop Khajag Barsamian, Armenian, Religious Leader.

George D. Behrakis, Hellenic, Business Leader.

Hon. Joseph W. Bellacosa, Italian, Judge of the Court of Appeals.

Francis X. Bellotti, Italian, Attorney.
Eric A. Benhamou, French, Business Leader.

Michael Berry, Esq., Lebanese, Community Leader.

Albert C. Bersticker, German, Corporate Executive.

Elias Betzios, Hellenic, Community Leader.

Thomas R. Bolling, Swedish, Business Leader.

Frank J. Branchini, Irish/Italian, Business Leader.

John G. Breen, Scottish/Irish, Business Leader.

Duncan A. Bruce, Scottish, Author/Community Leader.

Michael G. Cantonis, Hellenic, Business Leader.

Louis J. Cappelli, Italian, Business Leader.

Hon. Richard Conway Casey, Irish, United States District Court Judge.

Robert B. Catell, Italian, Business Leader.
William Cavanaugh III, Irish, Business Leader.

Jerry D. Choate, English, Business/Community Leader.

Christopher Christodoulou, Cypriot, Educator/Lecturer.

Dr. Kenneth A. Ciongoli, Italian, Community Leader.

E. Virgil Conway, Irish, Public Official.

Dr. Takey Crist, Hellenic, Community Leader/Educator.

Karen Davis, Swiss/German, Philanthropic Leader.

Diane H. Dayson, African, Business Leader.
Theodore Deikel, Russian, Business Leader.

George J. Delaney, Irish, Business Leader.
Hon. Gustave Diamond, Hellenic, Justice.

Jim Donald, Irish, Business Leader.
Lewis Robert Elias, M.D., Lebanese, Medical Practitioner.

Victor Elmaleh, Moroccan, Business Leader.

Pamela Fiori, Italian, Journalist.

Brian T. Gilson, Norwegian/German/Italian, Business Leader.

Richard H. Girenti, Italian, Attorney.
Bernice Gottlieb, Austrian/Hungarian, Advocate for Children.

Charlie N. Hall, Sr., African, Labor Leader.
James F. Hardyman, English, Business Leader.

Derek C. Hathaway, English, Business/Community Leader.

William Hetzler, German, Community Leader.

John A. Holy, Slovak, Publisher.

Vahakn S. Hovnanian, Armenian, Business/Community Leader.

Darrell Edward Issa, Lebanese, Business Leader.

Robert M. Johnson, Swedish/English, Business Leader.

Mitchell J. Joseph, Italian, Business Leader.

Thomas Peter Kazas, Hellenic, Business Leader.

Hon. John F. Keenan, French Canadian/Irish, U.S. District Judge.

Andrew Sokchu Kim, Korean, Business/Community Leader.

A. Eugene Kohn, European, Architect.

Alexander R. Koproski, Polish, Business/Community Leader.

Haralambos S. Kostakopoulos, Ph.D., Hellenic, Business Leader.

Thomas C. Kyros, Cypriot, Business/Community Leader.

Vincent V. LaBruna, DDS, Italian, Community Leader/Educator.

Lee Liu, Chinese, Business Leader.

Dr. Pamela Loren, Argentinean/English, Business Leader.

William Losapio, Italian, Business Leader.

Alan Barry Lubin, Russian, Labor Leader/Educator.

Leon Machiz, Russian, Business Leader.

Hon. Carolyn B. Maloney, English/Irish/French, Member of Congress.

Joseph L. Mancino, Italian, Business Leader.

Frank G. Mancuso, Italian, Business Leader.

John Willard Marriott Jr., English, Business Leader.

Anthony A. Massaro, Italian, Business Leader.

Fernando Mateo, Hispanic, Community Leader.

Joseph M. Mattone, Esq., Italian, Business Leader.

Col. William Surles McArthur, Jr., Scottish, Astronaut.

Linda Eastman McCartney, (Posthumous).

Michael R. McCoy, Irish, Business Leader.

Bryan M. McGuire, Irish, Business Leader.

Josie Anderson McMillian, African, Labor Leader.

James R. Mellor, English, Business Leader.

Hon. Robert Menendez, Cuban, Member of Congress.

Arthur L. Mercante, Italian, Community Leader.

Lee Miglin, (Posthumous).

Alan B. Miller, Russian, Business Leader.

Hon. Patsy T. Mink, Japanese, Member of Congress.

Hon. George Mitchell, Lebanese/Irish, Senator.

Tita Scandalis Monti, Hellenic, Community Leader/Philanthropist.

William D. Moses, Syrian, Business/Community Leader.

Thomas J. Murphy, Irish, Community Leader.

Mary Murphy, Irish, Television Journalist.

John Francis O'Brien, Irish/Italian, Business Leader.

Cmdr. Timothy Stuart O'Leary, USN, Irish/Croat, Naval Officer.

Harry J. Pappas, Hellenic, Business Leader.

Carl F. Pascarella, Italian, Business Leader.

Nicholas Anthony Penachio, Italian, Business Leader.

James George Petheriotes, Hellenic, Community/Business Leader.

William G. Poist, German, Business Leader.

Dith Pran, Cambodian, Photojournalist/Lecturer.

Leslie C. Quick, III, Irish, Business Leader.

Bradford J. Race, Jr., Irish/English, Secretary to the Governor.

John G. Rangos, Sr., Hellenic, Business Leader.

Michael T. Reddy, Irish, Business Leader.

Ronald K. Richey, Swedish/Scottish/Irish/German, Business Leader.

P. Anthony Ridder, German/French, Business Leader.

John J. Rigas, Hellenic, Business Leader.

Eddie Robinson, African, College Football's All-Time Winningest Coach.

Edward J. Robson, English, Business Leader.

Steven A. Rosenberg, MD, PhD, Eastern European, Surgeon/Scientist.

Robert J. Rotatori, Esq., Italian, Attorney/Educator.

Dr. John W. Ryan, Irish, Educator.

Philip Adeeb Salem, MD, Lebanese, Educator/Research Scientist.

Joseph D. Sargent, CLU, Irish/English, Business Leader.

George D. Schwab, Ph.D., Latvian, Foreign Policy Leader.

Steven Seagal, French Canadian/Italian, Actor/producer.

Tosano J. Simonetti, Italian, Business Leader.

Amb. Richard Sklar, Russian/Hungarian, Ambassador to the U.N.

Orin R. Smith, English, Business Leader.

Philip J. Smith, Irish, Business Leader.

William S. Stavropoulos, Hellenic, Business Leader.

Michael R. Steed, Irish, Business Leader.

Pergrouhi (Najarian) Svajian, Ph.D., Armenian, Educator.

Laszlo N. Tauber, M.D., Hungarian, Surgeon/Real Estate Investor/Philanthropist.

Hon. Nicholas Tsoucalas, Hellenic, Judge.

Vincent Viola, Italian, Business Leader.

Randi Weingarten, Russian/German, Labor Leader/Educator.

Melvyn I. Weiss, Esq., Russian/Hungarian, Attorney.

H. Daniel Wenstrup, Danish, Business Leader.

Siggi B. Wilzig, German/Prussian, Business Leader/Holocaust Lecturer.

Margaret W. Wong, Chinese, Community Leader.

John B. Yasinsky, Lithuanian, Business Leader.

Zachariah P. Zachariah, M.D., Asian Indian, Physician/Community Leader.

Robert Thomas Zito, Italian, Business Leader.

Past Ellis Island Medal of Honor recipients have included several U.S. Presidents, entertainers, athletes, entrepreneurs, religious leaders and business executives, such as William Clinton, Ronald Reagan, Jimmy Carter, Gerald Ford, George Bush, Richard Nixon, George Pataki, Mario Cuomo, Bob Hope, Frank Sinatra, Michael Douglas, Gloria Estefan, Coretta Scott King, Rosa Parks, Elie Wiesel, Muhammad Ali, Mickey Mantle, General Norman Schwarzkopf, Barbara Walters, Terry Anderson and Dr. Michael DeBakey.

Congratulations To The 1998 Ellis Island Medal of Honor Recipients.