

September 22, 1999

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

22297

efforts to conduct, studies of the organization, delivery, and financing of health services in order to determine the cost and quality effects of various methods of substantially increasing the number of individuals in the United States who have access to health services.

H.R. 2506

OFFERED BY: MR. TIERNEY

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 13, after line 5, insert the following subsection:

“(d) STUDIES OF METHODS TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES.—The Director shall conduct, and shall provide scientific and technical support for private and public efforts to conduct, studies of the organization, delivery, and financing of health services in order to determine the cost and qual-

ity effects of various methods of substantially increasing the number of individuals in the United States who have access to health services. Such studies shall include a study to determine the impact of a single payer insurance coverage program on health expenditures in the United States during the fiscal years 2000 through 2007 compared to the projected impact of the current system on health expenditures in the United States during such period.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY CRIME PREVENTION ACT

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1999

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Juvenile Accountability and Crime Prevention Act of 1999. This act will provide communities with the ability to take a comprehensive approach to holding first and second time non-violent offenders accountable for their actions. Additionally, the bill allows communities—in a coordinated effort—to treat offenders on an individual basis, maximizing the chances that a juvenile will not re-offend.

The bill provides funding for Juvenile Accountability Coordinators who will:

Conduct an in-depth assessment of juvenile immediately upon arrest;

Contact the offender's parents or legal guardian, provide parents and guardians information on proceedings, needed services, and programs to help turn around the offender; and

Work with the juvenile, their parents, school officials, and law enforcement officials to develop an accountability plan for the juvenile. Failure of the juvenile to adhere to the plan would result in a referral back to juvenile court. Sanctions in the plan could include restitution to the victim, victim/offender mediation, community service, drug treatment and counseling, and a commitment to remain drug free.

In many localities, the courts are unable to provide swift accountability and individual attention to offenders. Sanctions specifically targeted to the individual juvenile which reflect the crime committed will decrease the likelihood of that juvenile re-offending. Additionally, bringing certain offenders out of the court system expedites the process and allows the courts to deal with more serious offenders.

This bill will help ensure that first and second time juvenile offenders don't fall through the cracks. Unlike other juvenile diversion programs, Juvenile Accountability Coordinators are with the juvenile every step of the way—from the time of arrest to the disposition of the case. They remain the focal point between parents, DAs, judges, schools, and the offender.

Should a second offense occur, coordinators provide consistency and detailed working knowledge of the offender and his or her circumstances.

This program has proven to be extremely successful on a smaller scale in Oregon. I would like to give other communities the opportunity to provide swift accountability and intervention to troubled young people.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLES F. BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1999

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, due to mechanical difficulties with my flight from my district I missed rollcall vote 428. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 417) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment being offered by Congressmen BEREUTER and WICKER.

This amendment would bar legal permanent residents of the United States from being able to contribute to campaigns for Federal offices.

Legal permanent residents of this country are here in the United States working, paying taxes, fighting in the military, and they have even sacrificed their lives for this country. Twenty percent of Congressional Medal of Honor winners from our Nation's past wars were either legal permanent residents or naturalized citizens. In 1997, about 7,500 new recruits of the U.S. Armed Forces were legal permanent residents and currently, at least 20,000 members of the U.S. Armed Forces are legal permanent residents.

Legal permanent residents are often here in the United States to be with their close family members, to take jobs that no qualified U.S. citizens filled after the job was advertised, or to escape persecution. Unlike U.S. citizens, legal permanent residents must reside in the United States or risk having their residency status revoked. Legal permanent residents often send their children, many of whom are U.S. citizens by virtue of their birth in this country, to our Nation's public schools. They often participate in community and civic activities. As the "citizens in training" of our country, they have a stake in the future of our country and this amendment seeks to unfairly and unconstitutionally shuts them out of the political process.

This amendment restricts the right of legal permanent residents to express their political views, a right which is guaranteed to them,

and to us all, in the first amendment of our Constitution. Passage of this amendment will send a message to thousands of legal permanent residents that we as a nation want them to contribute to our economy, join our military, fight and die for our country but we do not want them to exercise their basic first amendment right.

The U.S. Supreme Court, in the landmark case *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976), ruled that campaign contributions are speech protected by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Nowhere in our Constitution does it state that the freedoms and protections provided in the Constitution apply to U.S. citizens only. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886) affirmed this sentiment by stating that, "... the Constitution is not confined to the protections of citizens." Also, in the case of *Bridges v. Wixon*, the Supreme Court held that the "freedom of speech and press is accorded aliens residing in this country." A letter sent to every Member of Congress, signed by 100 Constitutional law professors who teach all across the United States, affirms that the Bereute-Wicker amendment is unconstitutional. It would be unconscionable and beyond the scope of power of this Congress to pass this amendment and rob a whole class of people of a constitutional right.

I have tried to understand what my colleagues, Mistrs BEREUTER and WICKER, hope to achieve by introducing this amendment. Do they really believe that their amendment would keep foreign money out of Federal elections? I have read their amendment and I have analyzed what it would do the Federal election law. This amendment in no way makes it more difficult for foreign money to enter into the Federal electoral process.

Money from foreign sources is already illegal and this amendment does not change that fact. It has been expressed that we should pass this amendment to place a greater distance between foreign money and our Federal elections, that people who have not expressed a permanent allegiance to the United States should not have the opportunity to influence our Federal elections and that if permanent legal residents want a chance to express their voice in Federal elections they should just become U.S. citizens. These reasons are designed solely to be scare tactics and none of them hold any water.

If a foreign person wanted to illegally contribute money to a Federal election it is not necessary to find a legal permanent resident to be the conduit, any person, including any citizen could be used. There is no basis to assume that legal permanent residents are more likely to launder money from foreign sources than U.S. citizens. Therefore, how can the proponents of this amendment believe that it puts any greater distance between foreign money and federal elections? Permanent legal residents, by virtue of their legitimizing their

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.