

He was appointed to the Missouri Supreme Court by Governor Warren E. Hearnes in 1965, and served as chief justice from 1973 to 1975, and from 1981 to 1983. He was the first chief justice to address the General Assembly of Missouri on the State of the Judiciary in January 1974.

Judge Donnelly was active in the community. He was a member and elder at First Presbyterian Church, a member of Lebanon Masonic Lodge, A.F. & A.M. and a 50-year member of the Missouri Bar. He served on the Lebanon Board of Education from 1959 to 1965; on the board of the School of Religion, Drury College, Springfield, from 1958 to 1963; and on the board of the Missouri School of Religion, Columbia, from 1971 to 1972.

He was deputy chairman of the National Conference of Chief Justices in 1975. In 1998 he published "A Whistle in the Night," his autobiography and memoir.

Judge Robert T. Donnelly will be missed by all who had the privilege to know him. I know the Members of the House will join me in extending heartfelt condolences to his family: his wife, Susie; his two sons, Thomas and Brian; his sister, Helen; and his three grandchildren.

YOUTH VIOLENCE AND THE MEDIA

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1999

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, last week, a very insightful article appeared on the Op-Ed page of *The Washington Post*. This article was written by William B. Ruger, Sr., chairman of the board of Sturm, Ruger & Company, which is located in Prescott, Arizona. Mr. Ruger is considered one of the most respected and responsible voices in the firearms industry. His motto, and the company's motto, has always been "Arms Makers for Responsible Citizens."

The article dealt with violence as part of the ongoing debate since the tragedy of Littleton, Colorado. Bill Ruger's well thought out article would be required reading for anyone concerned about the role of the media as it relates to youth violence. I submit the article to be printed in the RECORD.

[From the *Washington Post*]

OUR DAILY DOSE OF DEATH

(By William B. Ruger Sr.)

When was the last time the media portrayed the responsible use of recreational firearms? You wouldn't know it from reading the newspaper or watching television, but according to the National Safety Council, the firearms accident rate has declined 20 percent during the past decade, plummeting to a 90-year low. In 1998, only one percent of accidental deaths were attributable to firearms accidents.

There is a subconscious anti-gun bias on the part of major media. Certainly, our society has changed since I founded Sturm, Ruger & Co., but I can assure you that my reaction to a "gang-banger" on the news is precisely the same as that of every law-abiding American—profound outrage.

The antisocial elements of our society seem to hold the rest of us hostage. The media constantly portray carnage and gore, often in agonizingly slow motion, for no dis-

cernible reason. The same goes for incredibly violent video games that some young people play for hours on end. Such portrayals have their staunch defenders, but as a firearms manufacturer, I would implore them to stop using violence to make a killing. Let's not pretend it's anything else. The incessant desensitizing of our young people to mindless violence is beyond measure and beyond comprehension.

Graphic, vicious and sadistic films, television shows, video games and music lyrics that trumpet wanton killing—often directed against the police—are outrageous. Drug and alcohol abuse, the breakdown of the family, inadequate child supervision and the lack of "a decent respect for the opinions of others" (to paraphrase Jefferson) are far more pernicious and harder to address than simply passing another "gun law." But we won't accomplish much until we stop deluding ourselves into thinking that society's violence is because of firearms and that the media bear no responsibility for this witches' brew.

More law enforcement agents were mowed down by machine guns in "Die Hard II" than have been killed on duty in the history of the nation. The impression left is that "something must be done" to get machine guns off the streets. But they have been essentially illegal since 1936. We have so-called "assault weapon" bans, which do nothing but ban guns that look like machine guns but operate just like the shotgun President Clinton takes duck hunting—one shot at a time.

When anyone protests gratuitous violence or counsels restraint in portraying violence, the media take umbrage behind their right to do so. In 1955, we placed a full-page ad, "A Symbol of Responsibility," stating "with the right and enjoyment of owning a firearm goes that constant responsibility of handling it safely and using it wisely." Would not a little self-restraint similarly apply to the right to produce a movie, print a newspaper or record a song?

We recently protested to a major newspaper about its irresponsible behavior in bringing a child to a gun show display and then deliberately taking a photograph of him brandishing a pistol in an unsafe manner. The newspaper defended the photographer. We do not sell our products to minors and deplore their unsupervised use, yet we were cast as villains "promoting violence" by this same newspaper. Similarly, television networks that show ultra-violent films with guns portrayed in the most antisocial ways piously denounce firearms on their evening editorials. Some won't even run firearms safety spots because "they show a gun."

Isn't it ironic that those who scorn the Second Amendment are cavalier in treating the First Amendment as their right but not a responsibility? Let anyone ask for any restraint of those who would abuse their First Amendment rights to incite antisocial behavior, and the purveyors hide behind that amendment, loudly decrying "censorship." While there are legitimate adult uses for firearms, nothing justifies this excessively violent "free speech" aimed at our youth in the guise of "entertainment."

Our corporate motto is "Arms Makers for Responsible Citizens." We have strongly supported more than 20,000 gun control laws and "point-of-sale" background checks for new gun purchasers. We voluntarily ship our pistols in lockable boxes as a precautionary measure. I only wish that others would also become symbols of responsibility before they desensitize another generation of youth to the horror of violence. We are all sick of it.

FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10) to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial services providers, and for other purposes:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, today I rise to voice my opposition to the structured rule to House Resolution 10, the Financial Services Competition Act of 1999. This rule stifles debate on critical issues from the modernization of the financial services industry. Forty Amendments offered by the Democrats, including my own, which addressed issues of redlining, stronger financial and medical record privacy safeguards and community lending were not made in order by the Rules Committee.

I support the idea of updating the rules that our nation's financial service institutions operate under to bring their activity in line with the realities of life in today's America. With that said, I believe that in our rush to modernize financial services, we are overlooking critical issues that the Democrats sought to address through the amendment process.

The Republicans failed to make in order Representative BARBARA LEE's anti-redlining amendment. Currently, CRA applies to only banks and thrifts. Representative LEE's proposed amendment would have required insurance companies and their affiliates to remain in compliance with the Fair Housing Act. Interestingly enough, this provision was included in the Banking Committee version of H.R. 10.

H.R. 10 allows virtually unlimited access by organizations such as insurance companies, employment agencies and credit bureaus of a patient's medical records. Under these provisions, patient information could be disclosed or even sold to the highest bidder for reasons that have nothing to do with the health of the patient. This will threaten the confidential relationship between a doctor and the patient—an essential component of high quality health care.

Similarly, the rule prohibited a discussion on creating parity between large and community banks with respect to sharing protected information. Large banks rely on sharing customer information with affiliates and subsidiaries, while smaller banks rely on the transfer of information between third parties.

The amendment offered by Representative MARKEY would have preserved the meaningful consumer financial privacy protections adopted on a bipartisan basis in the Commerce Committee. H.R. 10 will greatly accelerate mergers, creating huge money centers with access to once-confidential information about millions of customers.

The Commerce Committee, in a bipartisan manner, adopted a compromise approach to financial privacy by giving consumers an across-the-board "opt-out"—the ability to stop