

He got the state to increase its reimbursement to the county for public building projects. He expanded his office's influence over crucial development decisions, through state legislation granting the executive the right to appoint two of the five members of the independent county planning board. The county council previously had appointed all of the board's members.

The measure Gilchrist sponsored and the legislature passed also gave the county executive veto power over mast plans, the basic planning tool used to map growth.

During his tenure, the annual budget for family resources more than doubled, to about \$14 million. Programs were established for child care, and the number of shelter beds for the homeless increased dramatically.

Gilchrist's family resources director, Charles L. Short, said in an interview that the county executive's first order to him was to "keep people from freezing and starving . . . and he never wavered.

"When we were sued or took heat over a shelter, he never called me in and said, 'Well, can we find another site?'"

Short said Gilchrist's administration was distinguished by his strong feeling that all people should have an opportunity to share in the affluence of Montgomery, one of the country's wealthiest counties.

When he left office at age 50, Gilchrist had endowed the county executive job with unprecedented political powers. He left a multi-million-dollar legacy of social services and public works projects.

The man he had defeated for the job in 1978, Republican Richmond M. Keeney, said Gilchrist had operated as a lightning rod for the county.

Gilchrist said in an interview with Washington Post staff writer R.H. Melton that he had accomplished nearly all that he had hoped for.

Melton wrote, "In many ways, Gilchrist's eight-year odyssey from his time as an insecure, even fumbling first-term executive to his recent ascension as Montgomery's leading Democratic power broker is as much a story of the county's profound changes as it is about the maturing of the man."

Considered a shoo-in for re-election in 1986, Gilchrist was expected to dominate county politics for decades. He was being touted for Congress or state office when he suddenly announced in 1984 that he planned to abandon politics.

He said that when his second term was up in 1986, he would study for the priesthood.

His years at the helm of the county had taken their toll, he said. Relationships with the seven members of the County Council were frequently adversarial, so much so that both branches of government hired lobbyists to advocate before the state legislature.

"One of the clues to Charlie's personality is that he takes any criticism of the government personally," council member and Gilchrist antagonist Esther P. Gelman said at the time.

More distressing than his relationship with the council, however, was the illness of his son Donald, who spent two years battling a brain tumor. After he recovered, Gilchrist said the illness had helped him turn in a more spiritual direction.

He wasn't rejecting the political scene, he added, but substituting one form of public service for another.

Charles Waters Gilchrist, the grandson of a Baptists minister, was tall and craggy, and his biographers delighted in describing him as looking like a churchman out of Dickens.

He was raised in Washington, where he attended St. Albans School for Boys and be-

came involved in religious activities. After graduating magna cum laude from William College and receiving a law degree from Harvard University, he returned to the Washington-Baltimore area to practice tax law. He soon became involved in Democratic politics.

In the mid-1970s, he resigned as partner of a medium-sized law firm in Washington to run successfully for the state Senate.

After Gilchrist left politics, his wife, Phoebe, took a full-time job as a corporate librarian to help put him through Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria.

His first church assignment was at St. Margaret's Episcopal Church in Washington, where he worked with homeless people in the Hispanic community and helped immigrants deal with the government. He also helped raise money for St. Luke's House Inc., a mental health facility in Montgomery County that he had assisted as county executive.

His story, of a shift in career to a relatively low-paying profession, fascinated the media, and he was often interviewed about the change in his life.

In 1990, he told an interviewer: "People who have known me will see the collar and that says something to them, that I am a servant of God. They may not understand why I did it, but the fact is, I did.

"It's a very full life, I am happy and I have no regrets. I am very much doing what I should be doing, and what I want to be doing."

He and his wife sold their large Victorian home of 25 years in Rockville and moved to a grimy neighborhood on the West Side of Chicago, where he took over as manager of the Cathedral Shelter for recovering drug addicts and alcoholics.

The religious committee that picked Gilchrist regarded him as having the potential to be a bishop or head of a large parish, one member told a Chicago newspaper at the time. But Gilchrist said he was more interested in curing inner city ills.

He returned to the Washington-Baltimore region in the mid-1990s to work on housing problems in the Sandtown neighborhood of central Baltimore, where he resettled. He had lived in that city early in his law career while working for the firm of Venable, Baetjer and Howard.

He was director of operations for New Song ministry, which runs a Habitat for Humanity housing rehabilitation program and a church, school, health center and children's choir.

In 1997, Gilchrist was named to oversee a court settlement designed to move more than 2,000 black Baltimore public housing residents to mostly white, middle-class neighborhoods. U.S. District Judge Marvin J. Garbis appointed him a special master in the suit brought by the American Civil Liberties Union of Maryland against Baltimore and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In addition to his wife, of Baltimore, Gilchrist is survived by three children, Donald Gilchrist of Rockville, James Gilchrist of Pinos Altos, N.M.; a sister, Janet Dickey of Reston; and two grandchildren.

TRIBUTE TO JOE SANDOVAL

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my dear friend, Joe Sandoval, who

is leaving the city of San Fernando after 11 years to start a new business venture with his family in New Mexico. While I wish the very best for Joe, his wife, Anni, and their young son, Steven, his departure is a huge loss for the Northeast San Fernando Valley. As President of the San Fernando Chamber of Commerce, a successful businessman and outstanding leader, Joe has left an indelible mark on the community. He will be sorely missed.

In 1988, Joe arrived in San Fernando and went to work as Branch Manager for the Hartford Group. Since then, he has held many important positions, including Director of Marketing at Mission Community Hospital in Panorama City, Community Relations Liaison for Medi-Ride, and President and Chief Executive Officer for the San Fernando Chamber of Commerce.

In his 15-month tenure as Chamber President, Joe compiled a very impressive list of accomplishments. He has helped make the San Fernando Chamber of Commerce one of the most important business organizations in the Northeast San Fernando Valley. His considerable charm and business acumen enabled Joe to increase the membership of the Chamber and give it a visibility well beyond the city limits.

Joe has given unstintingly of his time and resources to the City of San Fernando, not only as Chamber President, but also as Chairperson of the Miss San Fernando Pageant, First Vice President of the Kiwanis Club of San Fernando, Vice President of the Holy Cross Medical Center Century Club and a member of the board of Directors of the San Fernando Police Advisory Council.

His distinguished service has been recognized by the presentation of many awards from the City of San Fernando, United Chambers of Commerce and the Sunland-Tujunga Chamber of Commerce. Joe was named the J. Leo Flynn citizen of the Year in San Fernando for 1991, and Business Person of the Year by the San Fernando High School Business Academy.

I ask my colleagues to help me bid a very fond farewell to Joe Sandoval, whose personality, intellect and integrity have made him much beloved by his many friends in California. I wish Joe and his family the best in their new home.

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in the name of a truly laudable cause (preventing abortions and protecting parental rights), today the Congress could potentially move our nation one step closer to a national police state by further expanding the list of federal crimes and usurping power from the states to adequately address the issue of parental rights and family law. Of course, it is much easier to ride the current wave of criminally federalizing all human malfeasance in the name of saving the world from some evil than to uphold a Constitutional oath

which prescribes a procedural structure by which the nation is protected from what is perhaps the worst evil, totalitarianism carried out by a centralized government. Who, after all, wants to be amongst those members of Congress who are portrayed as trampling parental rights or supporting the transportation of minor females across state lines for ignoble purposes.

As an obstetrician of more than thirty years, I have personally delivered more than 4,000 children. During such time, I have not performed a single abortion. On the contrary, I have spoken and written extensively and publicly condemning this "medical" procedure. At the same time, I have remained committed to upholding the Constitutional procedural protections which leave the police power decentralized and in control of the states. In the name of protecting states' rights, this bill usurps states' rights by creating yet another federal crime.

Our federal government is, constitutionally, a government of limited powers. Article one, Section eight, enumerates the legislative areas for which the U.S. Congress is allowed to act or enact legislation. For every other issue, the federal government lacks any authority or consent of the governed and only the state governments, their designees, or the people in their private market actions enjoy such rights to governance. The tenth amendment is brutally clear in stating "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Our nation's history makes clear that the U.S. Constitution is a document intended to limit the power of central government. No serious reading of historical events surrounding the creation of the Constitution could reasonably portray it differently.

Nevertheless, rather than abide by our constitutional limits, Congress today will likely pass H.R. 1218. H.R. 1218 amends title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions. Should parents be involved in decisions regarding the health of their children?? Absolutely. Should the law respect parents rights to not have their children taken across state lines for contemptible purposes?? Absolutely. Can a state pass an enforceable statute to prohibit taking minors across State lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions?? Absolutely. But when asked if there exists constitutional authority for the federal criminalizing of just such an action the answer is absolutely not.

This federalizing may have the effect of nationalizing a law with criminal penalties which may be less than those desired by some states. To the extent the federal and state laws could co-exist, the necessity for a federal law is undermined and an important bill of rights protection is virtually obliterated. Concurrent jurisdiction crimes erode the right of citizens to be free of double jeopardy. The fifth amendment to the U.S. Constitution specifies that no "person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb . . ." In other words, no person shall be tried twice for the same offense. However, in *United States v. Lanza*, the high court in 1922

sustained a ruling that being tried by both the federal government and a state government for the same offense did not offend the doctrine of double jeopardy. One danger of the unconstitutionally expanding the federal criminal justice code is that it seriously increases the danger that one will be subject to being tried twice for the same offense. Despite the various pleas for federal correction of societal wrongs, a national police force is neither prudent nor constitutional.

Most recently, we have been reminded by both Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist and former U.S. Attorney General Ed Meese that more federal crimes, while they make politicians feel good, are neither constitutionally sound nor prudent. Rehnquist stated in his year-end report "The trend to federalize crimes that traditionally have been handled in state courts . . . threatens to change entirely the nature of our federal system." Meese stated that Congress' tendency in recent decades to make federal crimes out of offenses that have historically been state matters has dangerous implications both for the fair administration of justice and for the principle that states are something more than mere administrative districts of a nation governed mainly from Washington.

The argument which springs from the criticism of a federalized criminal code and a federal police force is that states may be less effective than a centralized federal government in dealing with those who leave one state jurisdiction for another. Fortunately, the Constitution provides for the procedural means for preserving the integrity of state sovereignty over those issues delegated to it via the tenth amendment. The privilege and immunities clause as well as full faith and credit clause allow states to exact judgments from those who violate their state laws. The Constitution even allows the federal government to legislatively preserve the procedural mechanisms which allow states to enforce their substantive laws without the federal government imposing its substantive edicts on the states. Article IV, Section 2, Clause 2 makes provision for the rendition of fugitives from one state to another. While not self-enacting, in 1783 Congress passed an act which did exactly this. There is, of course, a cost imposed upon states in working with one another rather than relying on a national, unified police force. At the same time, there is a greater cost to centralization of police power.

It is important to be reminded of the benefits of federalism as well as the costs. There are sound reasons to maintain a system of smaller, independent jurisdictions. An inadequate federal law, or an "adequate" federal law improperly interpreted by the Supreme Court, preempts states' rights to adequately address public health concerns. *Roe v. Wade* should serve as a sad reminder of the danger of making matters worse in all states by federalizing an issue.

It is my erstwhile hope that parents will become more involved in vigilantly monitoring the activities of their own children rather than shifting parental responsibility further upon the federal government. There was a time when a popular bumper sticker read "It's ten o'clock; do you know where your children are?" I suppose we have devolved to point where it reads

"It's ten o'clock; does the federal government know where your children are." Further socializing and burden-shifting of the responsibilities of parenthood upon the federal government is simply not creating the proper incentive for parents to be more involved.

For each of these reasons, among others, I must oppose the further and unconstitutional centralization of police powers in the national government and, accordingly, H.R. 1218.

TAIWAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF ASSISTANCE FOR THE KOSOVAR REFUGEES

HON. OWEN B. PICKETT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 7, 1999, President Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan made the following statement regarding assistance to Kosovar refugees:

"The huge numbers of Kosovar casualties and refugees from the Kosovo area resulting from the NATO-Yugoslavia conflict in the Balkans have captured close world-wide attention. From the very outset, the government of the ROC has been deeply concerned and we are carefully monitoring the situation's development.

"We in the Republic of China were pleased to learn last week that Yugoslavia President Slobodan Milosevic has accepted the peace plan for the Kosovo crisis proposed by the Group of Eight countries, for which specific peace agreements are being worked out.

"The Republic of China wholeheartedly looks forward to the dawning of peace on the Balkans. For more than two months, we have been concerned about the plight of the hundreds of thousands of Kosovar refugees who were forced to flee to other countries, particularly from the vantage point of our emphasis on protecting human rights. We thereby organized a Republic of China aid mission to Kosovo. Carrying essential relief items, the mission made a special trip to the refugee camps in Macedonia to lend a helping hand.

"Today, as we anticipate a critical moment of forth-coming peace, I hereby make the following statement to the international community on behalf of all the nationals of the Republic of China:

"As a member of world community committed to protecting and promoting human rights, the Republic of China would like to develop further the spirit of humanitarian concern for the Kosovar refugees living in exile as well as for the war-torn areas in dire need of reconstruction. We will provide a grant aid equivalent to about US \$300 million. The aid will consist of the following:

1. Emergency support for food, shelters, medical care, and education, etc. for the Kosovar refugees, living in exile in neighboring countries.

2. Short-term accommodations for some of the refugees in Taiwan, with opportunities of job training in order for them to be better equipped for the restoration of their homeland upon their return.