a Master of Arts in Psychology and Counseling from Ashland Theological Seminary, a Doctorate of Divinity from Calvary Bible College, and an Honorary Doctorate from Selma University, Reverend Crenshaw is the author of a book, ''A Reality Roadmap for Delinquent Youth'' and a teaching video, ''The Reality of Therapeutic Techniques in Working with Delinquent Youth.''

In addition to pastoring to his congregation, engaging in outreach to troubled youth, and raising a family, Reverend Crenshaw has also found time to serve on several key area boards including the Lucas County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, Lucas County Mental Health Advisory Council, Baptist Pastors' Conference, Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance, Interracial Religious Coalition, Board of Community Relations, the Board of Education's Alternative School Programming Committee, Baptist Ministers Conference, and Chairman of the Advisory Board of the American Baptist Theological Seminary Extension of Toledo.

His unwavering commitment to the causes of social justice, his dedication to God and living His Word, and his deep involvement in the fabric of our community have earned Reverend Crenshaw the admiration of many in our area who hold him in high esteem. He has been showered with honors too numerous to mention, has received commendations from federal, state, and city officials, and has received accolades from his peers in the psychology, counseling, and ministerial fields.

Reverend Crenshaw is married to Frances, and together they have raised five children: Marvin, Shirley, the late Marilyn, Vanessa and Kay. They are also proud and loving grandparents to O'Shai and O'Lajidai, and great grandson O'Mauryai.

The constant thread through Reverend Crenshaw's life of service is his devotion to ''his ministry in saving souls.'' I am greatly honored and deeply humbled to join his congregation and community in offering thanks for his 30 years as pastor of Jerusalem Missionary Baptist Church. May God continue to bless him, his wife, their family and the Jerusalem Missionary Baptist Church congregation.

## INTRODUCTION OF HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT OF 1999

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 11, 1999*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be introducing the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999, along with Representatives MORELLA, BALDWIN and FORBES. As of today there are 118 original cosponsors. This legislation will amend Federal law to enhance the ability of Federal prosecutors to combat racial and religious savagery, and will permit Federal prosecution of violence motivated by prejudice against the victim's sexual orientation, gender or disability.

In 1963, the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, was dynamited by the Ku Klux Klan. The killing of four African-American girls preparing for a religious ceremony shocked the Nation and acted as a catalyst for the civil rights movement. Last month, 36 years after the brutal bombing in Birmingham, Alabama was witness to another heinous act of violence motivated by base bigotry. The beating and burning of Billy Jack Gaither is testament to the reality that a guarantee of civil rights is not enough if violence motivated by hatred and prejudice continues. The atrocity, coming on the heels of last year's torture and murder of James Byrd in Jasper, TX and Matthew Shepard in Laramie, WY illustrates the need for the passage of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999.

Current Federal hate crimes law only covers crimes motivated by racial, religious or ethnic prejudice. Our bill adds violence motivated by prejudice against the victim's sexual orientation, gender or disability. This legislation also makes it easier for Federal authorities to prosecute racial, religious and ethnic violence, in the same way that the Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996 helped Federal prosecutors combat church arson by loosening the unduly rigid jurisdictional requirements under Federal law for prosecuting church arson.

Under my legislation, States will continue to take the lead in the persecution of hate crimes. In the years 1991 through 1997 there were more than 50,000 hate crimes reported. From 1990 through 1998, there were 42 Federal hate crimes prosecutions nationwide under the original hate crimes statute. Our bill will result only in a modest increase in the number of Federal prosecutions of hate crimes. The Attorney General or other high ranking Justice Department officials must approve all prosecution under this law. This requirement ensures Federal restraint, and ensures that States will continue to take the lead.

At one time lynchings were commonplace in our Nation. Nearly 4,000 African Americans were tortured and killed between 1880 and 1930. Today, Americans are being tortured and killed not only because of their race, but also because of their religion, their disability, their sex, and their sexual orientation. It is long past time that Congress passed a comprehensive law banning such contemptible acts. It is a Federal crime to hijack an automobile or to possess cocaine and it ought to be a Federal crime to drag a man to death because of his race or to hang a man because of his sexual orientation. These are crimes that shock and shame our national conscience and they should be subject to Federal law enforcement assistance and prosecution. There certainly is a role for the States, but far too many States have no hate crimes laws and many existing laws do not specify sexual orientation as a category for protection.

This problem cuts across party lines, and I am glad to be joined by so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in proposing this legislation today. This is a battle we cannot afford to lose—we owe it to the thousands of African Americans who have been lynched, and we owe it to the families of James Byrd, Matthew Shepard and Billy Jack Gaither.

## SOCIAL SECURITY

### HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 11, 1999*

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to an article printed in the March edition of the Labor Party Press, and submit the article to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my colleagues' benefit:

[Labor Party Press, Volume 4, Number 2, March 1999]

''DON'T BLOW AWAY SOCIAL SECURITY'' (PART 2 OF 3)

WHAT'S WRONG WITH PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY?

*1. The stock market is volatile.*

The stock market goes up and up. And sometimes it goes down and down. Even without an economic catastrophe, the stock market's volatility would make our retirement income entirely unpredictable. Dean Baker has noted that if the economy grows as slowly as the Social Security trustees are predicting, then the prognosis for the stock market isn't too rosy either. Social Security barely covers seniors' expenses as it is now.

Former Congressional Budget Office director Robert Reischauer has pointed out that if we had private Social Security accounts back in 1969, a person retiring in that year would have had a 60 percent larger payout upon retirement than someone retiring seven years later, after the market dipped. John Mueller, a former economic advisor to the House Republicans, makes a similar observation. Since 1900, he notes, there have been three 20-year periods in which returns on the stock market fell to about zero. In between were periods of positive returns. ''This meant that some people earned a negative real return from investing in the stock market, while others received a real pretax return as high as 10 percent.'' For retirees, it would be the luck of the draw.

Under our current system, the government bears the risk of economic downturn, and we're all promised a constant monthly amount of retirement income. Under a privatized system, we each individually bear the risk. Even the cleverest investor will likely lose money in a major financial downturn. And not all of us are so clever—or can afford to spend our time playing amateur Wall Street trader.

*2. Shifting to a privatized system would require a hugely expensive period of transition.*

Say we begin establishing private Social Security accounts for all of us Americans who are currently working and under 65. Who will generate funds to cover the current retirees? You and me. Essentially, the next several generations of Americans would have to pay twice—once into our own fund, and again to sustain current retirees. According to one estimate, full-scale privatization of Social Security would require about $6.5 trillion in additional taxes over the next seventy-two years. The Employee Benefits Research Institute estimates that transition costs could amount to something like 5 percent of the nation's Gross Domestic Product for the next 40 years. By instituting privatization, we'd be starting a Social Security crisis, not ending one.

*3. Maintaining private accounts will be costly.*

Many of us tend to think that any federal program must be incredibly inefficient and bureaucratic. A Roper poll asked Americans to estimate the administrative costs of Social Security as a percentage of benefits. They guessed, on average, 50 percent. The real answer is one percent. Only one percent of the money that goes into Social Security is spent on administration. By comparison, the administrative costs for private insurance are about 13 percent of annual benefit amounts.

The main reason Social Security administration is so cheap is that the whole fund is invested in one place, the U.S. Treasury. Imagine the administrative cost of managing

millions of separate accounts invested in a myriad of stocks and bonds. Much of the money would go to Wall Street investment houses which is why they like the privatization idea so much.

In Chile, which privatized its retirement system in 1981, people pay between 10 and 20 percent of their annual retirement contribution just to maintain their account. The stock market would have to perform spectacularly to make up for that kind of expense.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH INVESTING THE SOCIAL SECURITY FUND IN STOCKS?

Clinton and others are advocating that part of the Social Security system's extra money be invested in the stock market instead of the Treasury, hoping that it would collect more interest there. Because the money would still stay in one big lump, the administrative costs wouldn't stack up the way they would if everyone had their own account.

But again, the stock market is volatile. There's no guarantee that the gamble would pay off.

Dean Baker and others also worry that investing the Social Security Fund in the stock market just opens the door to further privatization. ''I think it plays into the hands of people who want individual accounts,'' he says. ''It logically leads people to believe that there's a fortune to be made in the stock market. And if there's a fortune to be made, well then, let me get access to that as an individual. But in fact, there isn't a fortune to be made, because they've overestimated the returns.''

As it happens, financial institutions hate this aspect of Clinton's plan. If dollars are going to be invested in the stock market, they want to get a cut. But that won't happen if the government does the investing in one big lump. Financial types have also complained about the ''danger'' of having the government controlling such a big chunk of change on Wall St.

Because so much of the Social Security reform debate is being driven by Wall Street, Baker believes this plan isn't going anywhere. And he's glad.

RAISING THE RETIREMENT AGE & OTHER ''POPULAR IDEAS''

There are many other proposals afloat for ''saving'' Social Security. There's Clinton's idea of setting up voluntary ''Universal Savings Accounts'' outside the Social Security system. Workers could contribute through payroll deduction and the government would match their contribution. Workers could then invest this pot of money in the stock market. What's ironic about this plan is that it does nothing to address the alleged crisis in the Social Security system. But it does address the deep desire of Wall Street brokers to get a massive new influx of commissions. And it would also ease the way for cutting back Social Security in the years to come.

Some people have proposed shoring up Social Security by cutting back or even eliminating rich people's access to Social Security. At a time when the rich are filthy rich, this does sound appetizing. But politically, it's probably poison. Because these days, any program that's perceived as a poor people's program is likely to end up on the chopping block—just like Medicaid and welfare.

Some of our elected officials propose raising the eligibility age to get full Social Security benefits as a way of keeping money in the system. The retirement age is already slated to rise from 65 to 67 in the coming years, but they want to force us to work even longer. Proponents of this idea think it's only fair, since Americans are living longer than they used to.

Anyone who can make this argument has probably never worked in a hospital, a refinery, or on a railroad. No one should be forced to do this work at the age of 70! The average black man can't possibly like this idea, since in this country a black man born in 1950 was expected at birth to live only 59 years, on average: he'll never see a dime of Social Security money. Instead, we should be talking about lowering the retirement age to match that in other industrialized countries—and to reflect our growing productivity (See ''But Other Countries Do Better.'')

One plan by two leading Democrats, Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York and Sen. Bob Kerrey of Nebraska, would both increase the retirement age to 68 and reduce Social Security's cost-of-living adjustment by a percentage point. Dean Baker points out that such a COLA cut would really add up for people who live into their 80s and 90s. By the time someone reaches 85, they would see their annual benefit reduced by 19 percent. That makes it hard to pay the rent.

There are more equitable ways to being more money into the Social Security system. The Labor Party and others advocate eliminating the cap on the payroll tax. But our main message is this: When it comes to Social Security, our most popular and efficient social program . . . if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

## EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

### HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 10, 1999*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 800) to provide for education flexibility partnerships:

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Miller Amendment to the Ed Flex Bill to promote educational accountability. We all recognize that education is central to the lives of America's children and is central in our effort to develop healthy communities. At today's Appropriations Subcommittee Labor-HHS-Education Hearing, I listened to the Department of Education's testimony.

They stress the importance of results and performance based educational instruction and funding. While Federal education programs should be administered with flexibility, this flexibility must be met with effective accountability provisions and assurances funds targeted for America's impoverished children.

For these reasons, I support Democratic amendments to strengthen educational reporting and accountability requirements and to require local districts to target funds to economically disadvantaged students. To be effective and accountable, states and schools must develop and maintain effective management and information systems, collect student data, design and implement effective assessment plans, and issue timely and parent-friendly reports.

I support Representative MILLER's amendment to require States that seek waivers to first have in place a viable plan to assess student achievement. It also requires States to use the same plan throughout H.R. 800's full five-year flexibility plan. States must establish, as they determine appropriate, concrete quantifiable goals for all their students as well as specific student subgroups, such as impoverished students. If states find achievement gaps between student subgroups, they must set goals to close these gaps.

We must not choose between flexibility and accountability. America's children deserve both. We must work for both and target our education funds effectively. I urge my colleagues to support the Miller amendment.

## EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

### HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 10, 1999*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 800) to provide for education flexibility partnerships:

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 800, the Education Flexibility Partnership Act. This bill would expand the ''Ed Flex'' demonstration program, which is currently in use in 12 states, to allow all 50 states to participate, and has broad, bipartisan support from a number of groups from our governors to our local school boards.

I support this bill because I believe that our states need more flexibility when it comes to making decisions on spending Federal education dollars. Local school board members and school administrators are better positioned than Federal bureaucrats in Washington to make decisions that will lead to positive improvements in our children's education.

The ''Ed Flex'' bill will allow local school districts to have greater flexibility in how they spend Federal education dollars. It empowers them to determine how to best meet the needs of their students. In exchange, states will get greater accountability from local school districts on how that money is being spent, and whether the flexible spending has improved results.

We hear of numerous examples from the pilot states that have benefitted from the ''Ed Flex'' program. In these states, scores have increased and students have excelled, even in the poorest areas. My governor in New Jersey, Christine Todd Whitman, has made clear what ''Ed Flex'' will mean to our students. She said, ''Ed Flex would be another tool in our arsenal to better coordinate state and Federal requirements to provide maximum support for our reform efforts with the specific goal of improving student performance.''

''Ed Flex'' is an idea whose time has come. The flexibility will allow school districts to stretch limited dollars farther, and use money where it is most needed. There must still be accountability from our local school districts on how the money is being spent, and whether core needs—such as math and science education—are being met. This bill provides that accountability.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 800, and urge my colleagues to do the same.