

Sixth, continuity and expertise are critical to successful oversight. Excessive staff turnover and turnover of chairmen harm the institutional continuity and expertise so essential to the job of oversight. This is also why I generally favor having standing committees do oversight rather than special, ad hoc communities. Also, oversight should not be used or directed by interest groups.

Seventh, there is such a thing as too much oversight. Good oversight draws the line between careful scrutiny and intervention or micro-management. Congress should examine broad public policies, but it should not meddle and it should avoid a media show. It should certainly expose corrupt and incompetent officials, but it should avoid attacking competent, dedicated officials. Oversight requires reports to be informed, but the reporting requirements should not be excessive. In general, the quality of oversight is much more important than the quantity.

Eighth, good oversight involves documentation. The more you can get things in writing, the better off you are.

Ninth, follow-through is also important. It is one thing to ask agencies to improve their performance, but it requires the work of Members, committees, and staff aides to make sure that the changes have taken place.

Tenth, Member involvement in oversight is important. Certainly much of the work needs to be done by staff. Yet I found that Members often left too much of the responsibility with staff. Having Members involved brings additional leverage to any oversight inquiry.

Eleventh, good oversight takes clear signals from the leadership. Structural reforms and individual efforts by Members can be helpful, but for oversight to really work it takes a clear message from the congressional leadership that oversight is a priority and that it will be done in a bipartisan, systematic, coordinated way. The key role of the House Speaker and the Senate Majority Leader in successful oversight cannot be overstated.

And finally, there needs to be greater public accountability to congressional oversight. The general public can be a very important driving force behind good oversight. Congress needs to provide clear reports from each committee outlining the main programs under its jurisdiction and explaining how the committee reviewed them. As citizens understand how important congressional oversight is to achieving the kind of government they want—government that works better and costs less—they will demand more emphasis on the quality of oversight by Congress, and they will be less tolerant of highly personalized investigations that primarily serve to divert Members' attention from this critical congressional function.

#### CONCLUSION

My personal belief is that conducting oversight is every bit as important as passing legislation. President Wilson thought that "the informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislating function." Our founding fathers very clearly recognized that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty".

A strong record of congressional oversight of—"continuous watchfulness"—will do a lot to restore public confidence in the institution. It will show that Congress is taking its responsibilities seriously and is able to work together.

I'm not Pollyannaish about all of this. Certainly there will be roadblocks and obstacles in the effort to strengthen and improve oversight. The work is not particularly easy under the best of circumstances, and we can't expect all of the hard feelings and dis-

trust about the direction of oversight in recent years to dissipate overnight. But it is my firm belief that this is an area in which Congress simply must do better. And your willingness to participate in these workshops gives me good reason to think that this is an area in which Congress will do better.

## AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. RON KLINK**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, July 16, 1999*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa:

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 434, and I am proud to say I was an original co-sponsor of a much better trade bill, H.R. 772, the "HOPE for Africa Act" introduced by my colleague JESSE JACKSON of Illinois.

I supported H.R. 772, and opposed H.R. 434, for reasons centering on concerns for labor, the environment, women's rights, and the HIV/AIDS problem faced worldwide.

First, in labor terms, I opposed H.R. 434 because it is bad for both American and African workers. Over the past twelve months, 118,000 jobs in the textile and apparel industry have been lost in the United States—more jobs than in any other industry. The reason is competition with low-wage imports, manufactured in nations where worker compensation and working conditions are deplorable. As a result, U.S. textile workers are losing their jobs, and African workers work in sweat-shop style conditions.

On the other hand, H.R. 772, the Jackson bill, would have required that labor rights be adhered to in the workplace, while the H.R. 434 has no binding language to protect worker rights. The Teamsters, International Longshoremen and Warehousemen, AFSCME, Paper Allied-Industrial Chemical and Energy Workers (PACE), Transport Workers of America, Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE) and the United Auto Workers all opposed H.R. 434.

Second, in environmental terms, I opposed H.R. 434 because the bill text does not even mention the environment. The bill contains no environmental safeguards in its core text—which is a startling oversight. This encourages U.S. firms to move to sub-Saharan Africa in order to evade the standards they must meet here at home.

On the other hand, H.R. 772, the Jackson bill, provided a new model for trade by combining expanded trade, open to all sub-Saharan countries, with the requirement that multinational corporations operating in these countries comply to the same environmental standards that apply here in the United States.

For these reasons, H.R. 434 was opposed by—and H.R. 772 was supported by—the Sierra Club, Defenders of Wildlife, Friends of the Earth, American Lands Alliance, Earth Island Action, International Rivers Network, Native Forest Council, International Law Center for Human, Economic and Environmental Defense, and the International Primate Protection League.

Third, in women's rights terms, I opposed H.R. 434 because it simply called on the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) to give special consideration to women entrepreneurs and to investments that help women and the poor.

On the other hand, H.R. 772, the Jackson bill, targeted investment financing for small businesses and women-owned and minority-owned businesses, including provisions for human rights, labor rights and environmental protections.

Fourth, in HIV/AIDS terms, I opposed H.R. 434 because it completely ignored the AIDS crisis. The bill failed to mention the word "AIDS" nor did it specify any funding to combat the AIDS epidemic in Africa. However, since the beginning of the AIDS crisis, 83% of AIDS deaths have occurred in sub-Saharan Africa.

On the other hand, H.R. 772, the Jackson bill, targeted direct assistance from the Development Fund for Africa for AIDS education and treatment programs. For these reasons, many HIV/AIDS community groups opposed H.R. but supported H.R. 772—ranging from the Human Rights Campaign Fund to Project Planet Africa.

In closing, I want to turn for a moment to general trade policy. I read a disturbing quote from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation (MOFTEC) given on March 3, 1999: "Setting up assembly plants with Chinese equipment, technology and personnel could not only greatly increase sales in African countries but also circumvent the quotas imposed on commodities of Chinese origin imposed by European and American countries."

H.R. 434, had very weak transshipment provisions, with no safeguard against China using sub-Saharan Africa as a transshipment point for Asian manufacturers of textile and apparel products. On the other hand, H.R. 772, the Jackson bill, contained strict, enforceable rules guarding against transshipment from China and other locales. For these reasons, the National Cotton Council and the American Textile Manufacturers Institute opposed H.R. 434.

By passing H.R. 434, which I voted against, nothing was accomplished to give relief, and to save the jobs of, American and African textile workers; to protect the environment; to help African women; to give aid to victims of HIV/AIDS; nor to deny China the right to circumvent the trade laws which impose quotas on Chinese goods.

This is a sad day for American trade relations with sub-Saharan Africa.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 19, 1999*

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the following rollcall vote: Rollcall vote No. 295, H.R. 2466. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. DAN BURTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 19, 1999*

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to a prior commitment, I was unavoidably detained during the following rollcall votes. Had I been there, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 302; "no" on rollcall vote No. 303; "yes" on rollcall vote No. 304; "yes" on rollcall vote No. 305; "yes" on rollcall vote No. 306; and "no" on rollcall vote No. 307.

## HECTOR G. GODINEZ POST OFFICE BILL

**HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 19, 1999*

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the House of Representatives to introduce a bill to rename the Santa Ana U.S. Postal Processing Center after a true American, Hector G. Godinez. Mr. Godinez gave so much to his country and community, and this bill will recognize his life long efforts.

Santa Ana has been Mr. Godinez' home since 1925. After graduating from high school he joined the military, beginning his service to our country. He served during World War II and in recognition of his strength and bravery in General Patton's tank unit, was awarded a Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

When Mr. Godinez returned home from the war, he decided to continue his record of public service as a letter carrier. During his 48 years in the U.S. Postal Service he rose from letter carrier to Southern California District Manager.

Mr. Godinez' belief that individual action can help build a better community is clearly illustrated by his active involvement in Santa Ana. Mr. Godinez was deeply committed to the Orange County District Boy Scouts of America and was their chairman in 1985. He served as president of the Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce and was a board member of the California Regional Center Program for Handicapped and Special Needs Children in Orange County.

Mr. Godinez was a founding member of the Santa Ana League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) Council and served on the Board of Directors LULAC Foundation. He and the other Santa Ana LULAC members were participants and supporters in the 1948 case of *Mendez v. The Board of Education*, a monumental civil rights case ending discriminatory practices against Mexican American children in Orange County schools.

He guided our citizens through decades of change in California, both as a public servant and an activist. Our lives as Orange County residents are better for his life's work, and as his Congressional representative, I feel obligated to seek this honor on his family and community's behalf.

I believe it is only fitting to honor this man who gave so much to his community and country. I hope my colleagues will support this bill to name the Santa Ana U.S. Postal Processing Center after Hector Godinez.

## TRIBUTE TO GEORGE E. "SHORTY" MCGRAW

**HON. MARION BERRY**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 19, 1999*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great Arkansan. This man served his country with intelligence, courage, and dedication, Mr. George E. "Shorty" McGraw.

Mr. McGraw was born in 1918 in Gillett, Arkansas. He worked as an auto mechanic until 1941, when he enlisted into the military. Mr. McGraw went on to graduate from Air Mechanic School and Flight Engineer School. He later served overseas with the Twentieth Air Force, 6th Bomb Group. On July 20, 1945, while flying his 33rd mission, Mr. McGraw was shot down and wounded. He was captured, beaten, and taken as a prisoner of war until his release on his 27th birthday. Mr. McGraw later attended Navigator Training School. He eventually retired as a Captain in 1961 with a total of 10,000 flying hours over his twenty years of service.

George E. "Shorty" McGraw is not only a wonderful citizen, neighbor and friend, he is a brother, husband, father, grandfather and great-grandfather. He is the heart and soul of his community. Captain McGraw was recently bestowed with a Purple Heart for his selfless service of his country. His devotion and love for his country never diminished. Captain McGraw serves as an inspiration to all.

## A DIPLOMAT'S DIPLOMAT RETURNS HOME

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 19, 1999*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, Mr. Pat Hennessy, the Political Counselor at the Irish Embassy here in Washington, returns home for service in his government's Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA). The DFA's gain will be our loss here in America at a critical point in Irish history.

Pat is known to many of us in the Congress, on both sides of the aisle, as a diplomat's diplomat. He previously served with distinction in the Irish Consulate in New York City before his tenure at the Irish Embassy here in Washington. In New York, he got to know and worked closely with the large Irish American community and the many friends of Ireland in America's largest and greatest city. He understands our nation and people well.

Pat has worked tirelessly for lasting peace and justice in the north of Ireland during his service in the U.S. He has also helped to advance greater U.S.-Irish relations in many areas, whether cultural, economic or otherwise.

During an important transition to Republican control of the House and new congressional leadership in the cause of lasting peace and justice in Ireland and improved U.S.-Irish relations, Pat did not miss a beat. He treated all of those many friends of Ireland equally and fairly.

In 1997, then-Speaker Newt Gingrich reintroduced the long dormant Irish American

interparliamentary exchange. Pat has played a vital role in fostering and improving these parliamentary exchanges since then.

Our sessions on both sides of the Atlantic since 1997 have served to further the bonds of friendship and understanding between the Congress and the Dail, the Irish Parliament, in Dublin. They increased interest in the Congress on events in Ireland, whether in the north, or the Republic in the south with its booming economy and many American firms' vast investment in the "Celtic Tiger."

The success of these legislative exchange programs is in no small part due to Pat's efforts and the growing and expanding U.S.-Ireland links in so many areas of common interest and support. We wish Pat and his wife Pauline and their family much happiness and success as he returns to Ireland.

Our door will always be open when Pat decides to return to America, whenever or in whatever capacity.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 19, 1999*

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday July 15, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 302. If I had been present, I would have voted "nay" on this amendment.

## THEATER HIGH ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE

**HON. DOUG BEREUTER**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 19, 1999*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends this editorial from the July 15, 1999, Norfolk Daily News to his colleagues regarding the need for development of the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) in light of recent successful tests and North Korea's intention to launch a long range missile capable of reaching Alaska or Hawaii.

IT CAN BE DONE—FIRST "HIT" OF MISSILE INTERCEPT SYSTEM AN INDICATION THE TECHNOLOGY DOES WORK

In hindsight, it would appear that the media gave too little coverage to a report several weeks ago that had U.S. intelligence sources confirming that North Korea is preparing a late-summer launch of its Taepo Dong 2 missile, an ICBM capable of reaching Alaska or Hawaii. This will make North Korea one of only a few countries above to strike U.S. soil with long-range missiles.

But what should be given even bigger coverage is the news that the U.S. Army's new anti-missile system successfully intercepted a target ballistic missile launched 120 miles away in a test that was conducted last month.

Without using an explosive warhead, the interceptor destroyed the incoming missile by crashing into it at an altitude of almost 60 miles. What's called the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) is designed, however, to defeat intermediate-range missiles. That means it will not be able to stop North Korea's Taepo Dong 2. But it proves that "hit-to-kill" technology can work,