deeds for the benefit of all human beings. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of Dr. John Holloman a man who today we owe a great deal of gratitude for his work on ensuring equitable access to health care.

A TRIBUTE TO HADASSAH

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 2002

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay a special tribute to one of our nation's most outstanding organizations, a group recognized as both the largest women's and the largest Jewish membership organization in the United States, Hadassah. Hadassah is a name that has come to be synonymous with strength of purpose and humanitarianism. The women of Hadassah are a force for change with an unchanging commitment to serving human needs.

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, recently celebrated its 90th anniversary. Throughout its long history, the women of Hadassah have exemplified the highest ideals of civic awareness and action. They have long combined an agenda of vital international and domestic issues. Proponents of a strong Israeli nation and a peaceful Middle East, they are also champions of fundamental social and domestic programs.

In many ways, Hadassah exemplifies the heart and soul of our democratic society—active involvement in public policy making and civic life. The Hadassah members have successfully channeled their remarkable energies toward an agenda that spans from education and health care, to religious freedom and social justice, to energy and the environment. They are genuinely devoted to serving the human cause.

In so many fundamental ways our nation changed forever last September 11, and we have begun a new chapter in our history. As leaders in Congress, we strive to restore the strength of the American spirit and confidence that was eclipsed by the terrorist events. In this role I am inspired by the women of Hadassah. They have long exercised a very special and unique commitment to domestic and international issues. They are an organization of courageous women whose faith, perseverance and strength of purpose flourishes and thrives in the face of challenge and adversity. I salute Hadassah for its longstanding commitment to enhancing the quality of life for both the people of the United States and the people of Israel. Hadassah members are a source of inspiration and guidance for all Americans as we strive to meet the challenges of achieving peace and domestic security in the years ahead.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ''RESTORATION OF FAIRNESS IN IMMIGRATION ACT OF 2002''

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 2002

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the ''Restoration of Fairness in Immigration Law Act of 2000,'' a bipartisan bill that is supported by the leaders of the Congressional Hispanic, Black and Asian Pacific Caucuses as well as over 60 immigration advocacy groups.

Since this nation's founding, more than 55 million immigrants from every continent have settled in the United States. Immigrants work hard to make ends meet and pay taxes every day. They have lived in this country for decades, married U.S. citizens, and raised their U.S.-citizen children. Laws that single these people out for no other reason than their status as immigrants violate their fundamental right to fair treatment.

Yet, for too many years, Congress has witnessed a wave of anti-immigrant legislation, playing on our worst fears and prejudices. Since 1994, we have considered proposals to ban birthright citizenship, ban bilingual ballots, and slash family and employment based immigration, as well as to limit the number of asylees and refugees. In 1996 we passed laws denying legal residents the right to public benefits and denying immigrants a range of due process and fairness protections.

Recently we have seen the tragedy of September 11th used as an excuse for even more assaults on the rights of immigrants. The Justice Department is now holding deportation hearings in secret and detaining immigrants even after they are ordered released. The Attorney General is reducing both the independence and number of judges that handle the appeals of immigration cases. We are fending off legislation almost daily intended to reduce if not eliminate immigration to this country.

Those who urge us to restrict the due process rights of immigrants forget the reason these rights were established in the first place. We grant due process rights to citizens and non-citizens alike; not out of some soft-hearted sentimentality, but because we believe that these rights form an important cornerstone to maintaining civilized society.

The ''Restoration of Fairness in Immigration Act of 2002'' furthers this proud legacy by restoring our nation's longstanding compassion for individuals seeking to build a better life and reunite with their families.

The bill restores fairness to the immigration process by making sure that each person has a chance to have their case heard by a fair and impartial decision maker. No one here is looking to give immigrants a free ride, just a fair chance.

Our work will not stop with the introduction of this legislation. While this bill lays the benchmark for future Congresses of what our immigration policy should be, I believe that many provisions of this bill can be passed into law, including the restoration of section 245(i), Congressman FRANK's Family Reunification Act and Senator KENNEDY's Immigrant Fairness Restoration Act.

Justice and fairness, as well as our own economic interests, demand that we take these actions.

HONORING RICHARD ''DICK'' DAY

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 2002

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Richard ''Dick'' Day, a man who walked his talk with both integrity and good humor, and whose life should encourage every citizen working for a better community.

Born in Idaho of a large and boisterous family 67 years ago, Dick Day matured in the hot political atmosphere of the California of the 60's. Not one to fear overwhelming odds, the young Dick Day chaired John F. Kennedy's presidential campaign in the Republican heartland of Orange County. Later, Day attended U.C. Berkeley's Boalt School of Law balancing his studies with a whimsical campaign for a seat in the California legislature, which he lost handily.

After gradation in 1968, the 32-year-old lawyer moved to the fast growing city of Rohnert Park in Sonoma County. The next year, Day moved to Santa Rosa and won election to the Sonoma County Board of Education. In 1970 he lost election to the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors. In 1979, Day was selected by Governor Jerry Brown to fill a vacancy on the Sonoma County Municipal Court, a position he lost in a mid-year election a year later.

Dick Day's destiny was not to be an officeholder, but to be a man who seized on important issues from the grassroots. Day joined with Bill Kortum, Chuck Rhinehart and others to fight against an attempt by private developers to block 13 miles of spectacular coast from coastal access. As the attorney for Californians Organized to Acquire Access to State Tidelands (COAAST), Day was able to convince the state Supreme Court to overturn a county supervisor decision favorable to developers; and later become instrumental in the passage of a statewide measure that guaranteed public access to beaches in the state and formed a new agency, the California Coastal Commission which is chartered to protect California's coastline from overdevelopment.

In an ongoing fight against unrestrained growth, Day served on the board of Sonoma County Tomorrow; was a founder of a coalition of Santa Rosa neighborhood groups and became chair of the Committee to Oppose Warm Springs Dam. Later he helped form Concerned Citizens for Santa Rosa, which became an influential player in Santa Rosa politics and a training ground for several future leaders, including current California Assemblywoman Pat Wiggins. Day was also a founder of Sonoma County Environmental Action, an effective grassroots political organization that helped elect numerous environmental progressives to Sonoma County city and county government. Fighting against sprawl, Day pushed for city-centered transit as a founder of the Sonoma County Transportation Coalition and for downtown revitalization as a member of Heart of Santa Rosa.

Dick Day provided both legal advice and political savvy to all of these groups. Always outspoken, he learned he was most effective in a background role. When there was a press release, a letter to the editor, a legal challenge to be written, Dick Day was always ready to serve. He didn't always carry the day, but working with others, he won significant victories in protecting the Russian River against dredging, limiting campaign contributions in local elections, creating greenbelts around the county's cities, and defeating tax measures to widen highways without developing public transit. Representing the Sierra Club he won a settlement from the Santa Rosa City Council

in the early 90's, after charging that the Council acted improperly in providing tax incentives to the developers of a shopping center.

Dick Day had many opponents, but no real enemies. It was clear that he was coming from a place of integrity. He was a gregarious man, always armed with a quip. He loved to hold court in Mac's Delicatessen in downtown Santa Rosa, advise and josh his friends, and debate and trade barbs with folks of other political persuasions. Politics was play to Dick as much as it was serious business.

He was blessed with a long and loving relationship with his wife, Jean, who was a partner in all of his endeavors, and helped provide a home full of warmth, good conversation and books. Jean died last year, and Dick carried on bravely though his heart was broken.

We will miss Dick Day. His activism showed us that dedicated, informed citizens can make democracy work. And clearly, for all who knew him, Dick Day has been elected to our hearts for life.

BREAKING THE CONTRACT

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 2002

Mr. ISRAEL Mr. Speaker, here is an article that I would like to submit for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 2002]

BREAKING THE CONTRACT

(By Paul Krugman)

If converting Social Security to a system of private retirement accounts is such a good idea, why can't advocates of that conversion try, just once, to make their case without insisting that 1 + 1 = 4?

Last week George W. Bush did it again, contrasting Social Security benefits with what retiring workers would have if they had invested all that Social Security taxes in the stock market instead. As an article in The Times pointed out, this was a misleading scenario even on its own terms, financial planners strongly advise against investing solely in stocks, and diversified retirement account wouldn't have risen nearly as much in the 1990's bull market.

But there's something much more serious wrong with Mr. Bush's story. Indeed, the latest remarks perfectly illustrate how he uses bogus comparisons to make private accounts sound like a much better idea than they really are. For by emphasizing what today's 65-year-olds could have done if they hadn't paid Social Security taxes. Mr. Bush has forgotten something rather important. Without those taxes, who would have paid for their parents' benefits?

The point is that when touring its plan to privatize Social Security, the Bush administration conveniently fails to mention the system's existing obligations, the debt it owes to older Americans. As with so many other administration proposals, private accounts are being sold with deceptive advertising.

The truth—which Mr. Bush's economists understand perfectly well—is that Social Security has never been run like a simple pension fund. It's really a social contact: each generation pays taxes that support the previous generation's retirement, and expects to receive the same treatment from the next generation.

You may believe that Franklin Roosevelt should never have created this system in the first place. I disagree, but in any case Social Security exists, and older Americans have upheld their end of the bargain. In particular, baby boomers have spent their working years paying quite high payroll taxes, which were used mainly to support their elders, and only secondarily to help Social Security build up a financial reserve. And they expect to be supported in their turn.

Mr. Bush proposes to allow younger workers to place their payroll taxes in private accounts—in effect, to break this ongoing contract. But then what happens to older workers, who have already paid their dues?

There are only two possibilities. One is default: make room for the trillions diverted into private accounts by slashing the baby boomers' benefits. The other is to buy the baby boomers out—that is, to use money from other sources to replace the diverted funds.

Those really are the only alternatives. Last year the special commission on reform of Social Security, which was charged with producing a plan for private accounts, came to an ignominious end—it issued a deliberately confusing report, then slunk quietly out of town. But wade through its menu of options, and you'll find that in the end the commission grudgingly rediscovered the obvious: Private accounts won't ''save'' Social Security. On the contrary, they will create a financing crisis, requiring sharp benefit cuts, large infusions of money from unspecified outside sources, or both.

But nervous Republican members of Congress want to send all Social Security recipients a letter (at government expense, of course) assuring them that their benefits will never be cut. And now that the magic budget surplus has turned back into a pumpkin, the government is in no position to infuse new money into Social Security—on the contrary, the government at large is now borrowing from Social security at a furious pace.

So why is the Bush administration reviving its push for private accounts right now? Did it really learn nothing from the implosion of the reform commission? I doubt it; the administration's economists aren't fools, though loyalty often requires that they pretend otherwise.

A more likely interpretation is that this is entirely cynical. War frenzy is subsiding, the Bush domestic agenda is stalled, and early indications for the November election aren't as good as Karl Rove expected. So it's fantasy time: tantalize the public with visions of sugarplums, then blame Democrats for snatching the goodies away. And it doesn't matter that the numbers don't add up, because the plan will never be tested by reality.

SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 2002

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of preserving Social Security and protecting millions of seniors and individuals with disabilities from the dangers of privatization and from the problems of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

Today, there are approximately 45 million Americans who receive Social Security benefits in our nation. Over 4 million of these individuals reside in the state of California but Americans all over our nation depend on this benefit as a major source of retirement income.

Currently, Social Security provides guaranteed, lifelong benefits. No matter what the stock market does the day you retire or in the months leading up to your retirement, your benefits will be unaffected.

While the Bush Administration's budget proposes to raid the Social Security Trust Fund, they also believe in privatizing parts of Social Security.

Unfortunately, privatization plans and cuts to the Social Security budget will hit women the hardest. Poverty among American women over 65 is already twice as severe as among men over 65. Women are also more likely to earn less than men and are more likely to live longer. Women also lose an average of 14 years of earnings due to time out of the workforce (to raise children or to care for ailing parents or spouses) and since women generally have a higher incidence of part-time employment, they have less of an opportunity to save for retirement.

The current Social Security program recognizes this problem; however, most privatization proposals make no provision for these differences and would thus make poverty among women even worse.

Many women depend on Social Security income to survive. What will happen to these individuals when the Social Security Trust Fund is completely raided and substituted by a destructive privatization plan?

This Congress has an obligation to strengthen Social Security because working people have earned and deserve Social Security.

We must work to ensure that Social Security survives for our seniors today as well as for our future generations. We owe it to the American people who have paid into the system for so long. We must increase the flow of funds into Social Security, not divert funds from it.

The Bush Administration's budget specifically proposes to divert $1.5 trillion of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus to other programs over the next ten years, effectively raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

While the budget provides a $48 billion increase in defense spending, it calls for a $15.8 billion decrease in domestic programs. Providing for our homeland security is critical, but it cannot come at the expense of our seniors.

President Bush's proposals on Social Security directly harm our seniors' entitlement to retirement benefits.

The Bush Administration must understand that privatization does not eliminate the challenges Social Security must confront, it exacerbates them and puts millions of people at risk. If the Bush Administration continues to spend the surplus unwisely and promote privatization, our seniors will be without a retirement program. President Bush, please don't raid the Social Security Trust Fund. Our seniors are depending on you.