It is right that we remember those that fought so hard for that first contract 65 years ago, and draw strength from their perseverance, so that 65 years from now our children will look back and see the great progress made by current generations.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ''SAFE SLEEPWEAR AND BURN PREVENTION ACT OF 2002''

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 2002

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Representative ED TOWNS, in introducing the ''Safe Sleepwear and Burn Prevention Act of 2002.'' This legislation is important to thousands of children and their parents who face the dangers of sleepwear-related fires every day.

This legislation accomplishes three things. First, it repeals an ill-advised exception to our children's fire safety regulations created by the Consumer Product Safety Commission in 1996. This exception completely exempted sleepwear for infants age 0–9 months from the fire safety requirements. Second, the legislation repeals a similar regulatory exemption created for so-called ''tight-fitting'' sleepwear. Finally, our bill closes an egregious loophole in current law, which allows manufacturers of garments used by children to sleep in to avoid all fire safety requirements simply by labeling the garment as ''daywear'' rather than ''sleepwear.''

We owe a debt of gratitude to the Shriners Hospitals for Children for bringing this situation to our attention. Following the CPSC's 1996 decision, doctors at the Shriners Hospitals, which treat over 20 percent of all serious pediatric burn injuries in the United States, began to notice an alarming increase in the number of children suffering from sleepwear-related burn injuries. In the two years following the Commission's decision, the Shriners documented an alarming 157 percent increase in the number of children with fire-related injuries.

Last Congress, our subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection held a hearing on this issue and received testimony from the Shriners and the American Burn Association, which represents all the Nation's burn centers and burn health care professionals. The evidence is compelling, and Congress must act quickly to ensure a burn-safe environment for children.

This legislation will reverse the Commission's ill-considered relaxation of the fire safety regulations and require that all garments used with regularity as sleepwear by children age 0–7 years must meet fire safety requirements. Mislabeling a garment as daywear or claiming that it is not intended to be used as sleepwear will no longer be an excuse for not meeting fire safety requirements, especially for the youngest and most vulnerable of our children.

We are also fortunate that we now have the technology available to create such a fire-safe environment for just pennies per garment. These new technologies are inexpensive, safe, do not wash out and do not alter the texture of the garment. We simply have no excuse for not ensuring that all garments used as sleepwear take advantage of this new technology.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will truly create a safer environment for children. We can prevent thousands of horrific burn injuries and lessen the severity of those that do occur by adopting this legislation. The agency charged with protecting our children has failed in its duty to do so, and now Congress must act.

TRIBUTE TO GUADALUPE S. RAMIREZ

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 2002

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of Guadalupe S. Ramirez for whom Los Angeles Mission College recently dedicated a new Collaborative Studies Building. Guadalupe was an outstanding community activist who died in January of 2000 at the age of 84.

Born in El Paso, Texas, Guadalupe had to end her formal education in the seventh grade to care for her ill mother. Soon after her mother passed away, Guadalupe relocated to California in the 1930's. She later married Manuel C. Ramirez. The couple partnered in many community efforts and they worked together to establish the San Fernando Valley chapter of the League of United Latin American Citizens. Even with their deep involvement in the community, the Ramirez's dedicated themselves to family, raising and caring for more than 35 children, including their many foster children. Guadalupe's many accomplishments involved helping found both the first Head Start childcare program in the Valley, and the Chicano Studies Department at Cal State University, Northridge. She also helped develop the North Valley Occupational Center.

In the 1970s Guadalupe led the campaign to place a proposed community college in the northeast San Fernando Valley. Her tireless effort proved successful, and in 1975 Mission College was founded in San Fernando. Dubbed as ''the mother of Mission College'' for her efforts on behalf of the community and the college, Guadalupe is remembered and loved by the greater Northeast San Fernando Valley community. The dedication of the Collaborative Studies Building in Guadalupe's name serves to acknowledge her role in bringing an institution of higher learning to the northeast San Fernando Valley while at the same time advancing the goals and values she held so dear.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to ask my colleagues to Join me in saluting Guadalupe S. Ramirez, whose life is an inspiration to all.

TRAFICANT TRIAL: A RAILROAD OF JUSTICE

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 2002

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the government presented a ten-count indictment against me on May 4, 2001. And convicted me on those ten counts, Thursday, April 11, 2002.

Count Two—David Sugar.

David Sugar was indicted for backdating invoices for his company, some of which concerned me and Mr. Sugar ended up getting caught up in making false statements about these invoices.

To avoid perjury, Mr. Sugar stated he was pressured into doing quid pro quo favors at the Traficant farm.

Be advised that David Sugar testified that he received $1,400 in one payment and accepted a Steinway piano, appraised for between $6,000 and $7,000 and claimed the same on his tax records.

In my trial, the judge did not permit the testimony, or consensual taped phone call with Harry Manganaro, friend of David Sugar, in whom Sugar confided after being visited by the FBI for a second time. Clearly under the circumstances, Mr. Sugar's discussion with Mr. Manganaro should have fallen under the hearsay rule and been permitted as evidence.

On Sunday, January 27, 2002 I had the following conversation with Harry Manganaro regarding Mr. Sugar's situation:

JT: This is what, the twenty-seventh? Sunday, January twenty seventh? Okay now, Harry do you want to spell you last name?

HM: M-A-N-G-A-N-A-R-O.

JT: Manganaro. Yea. We've known each other for a lot of years, but you work for Dave Sugar right? You used to?

HM: I used to.

JT: And on or about the time that Dave ah, has gone through this ordeal with me, you were his employee?

HM: Yea, when I was there I was just a consultant on demolitions.

JT: Yea, you wanna move a little closer? And you realize we are taping this conversation?

HM: Yes.

JT: Okay. Ah, in fact, you mentioned, there, you came to me yesterday to my house at about what, 10:00? This is the first you divulged that information to me.

HM: Right.

JT: Okay. And you realize I represent myself, I'm my own attorney.

HM: I do.

JT: Now, I've asked you to meet me here today and you told me that basically Dave Sugar had made statements to you relative to this case. I want you to just in short, brief terms tell me what Dave Sugar said.

HM: Well first of all, he had people coming in, they came in two times.

JT: Who were the people?

HM: That was the FBI people. I don't know exact names.

JT: That's fine.

HM: The first time they came in they were questioning what he did for ah, you and (sounds like transport machinery) and ah, they didn't charge you for it. And Dave is bad on keeping some records and things like that. There was stuff on my desk where I didn't even bill people yet, but I got the bills. And he probably had your bill on there too. And they were aware of that, basically they left that time. Then they came back when Dave wasn't there and they went through the whole office, and ah (unintelligible).

JT: Well, what they did to him was they charged him with some offense involving me, quite frankly I'm not even up to date on his offense, but then at some point he said to you that he had to make statements.

HM: Right, basically they told him that if he doesn't cooperate with them, he was going to get his wife involved and ah, his son