Former Attorney General Dan Morales then issued a legal opinion directing Texas colleges to adopt recent policies for admissions, financial aid and scholarships.

Legislators asked new Attorney General John Corzyn for a second opinion. His office helped university officials write the appeal submitted Tuesday.

According to University of Texas System Regent William Oxford, the Hopwood ruling left Texas at a competitive disadvantage with other public universities in recruiting students.

The appeal argues that limited consideration of race in admissions is necessary to overcome the effects of past discrimination. It also says the school has a compelling interest in a racially and ethnically diverse student body.

A state Comptroller’s Office study released in January showed a drop in the number of minorities applying for, being admitted to and enrolling in some of the state’s most selective public schools.

TRACHER SUSPENDED AFTER RUDICULE OF RACIAL SLUR REASSIGNED

LORAIN, OH—A teacher suspended for repeating a student’s racial slur disapprovingly was reassigned today to observe a veteran teacher in another school.

Terence Traut, 28, a seventh-grade math teacher at Lorain Middle School, was reassigned to Whittier Middle School.

“Some of our master teachers, who have been in the district for 19 to 20 years, have been involved in difficult student situations,” school spokesman Ed Branham said.

Hopefully, he can learn through observing teachers with strong classroom management skills.”

He was assigned to his home, with pay, since April 1 and was suspended last week. It was not clear how long he would be observing another teacher.

Traut could not be reached for comment today.

Messages were left at his new school and at his home.

Traut, who is white, became upset when he heard a black and Hispanic student call each other “nigga,” slang popularized by some rap musicians but derived from the similar-sounding slur.

As the principal for the principal’s office, Traut repeated the word and told the class that it was stupid to use such language.

He repeated the comment disparagingly when one of the boys returned.

The 11,000-student district 25 miles west of Cleveland is about half white, 25 percent black and 25 percent Hispanic.

The city chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People wanted Traut’s dismissal and said any use of a racial slur by a teacher was inappropriate.

The school board said it might consider dismissing Traut, depending in part on his willingness to apologize.

We must have the courage to stand firm and take steps to avoid the continued senseless bloodshed that kills the life of children around this country. This bill and our efforts can do just that, we can protect our children and protect their future. In doing so, we are protecting ourselves.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RENTAL FAIRNESS ACT

HON. ED BRYANT
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1999

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the “Rental Fairness Act of 1999.” This measure addresses two important issues.

First, the impact of state vicarious liability laws on interstate commerce and motor vehicle renting and leasing consumers across the nation. Second, the question as to whether vehicle renting companies must be licensed to sell insurance products to their customers—insurance that is optional but very important to many car and truck rental customers who are under insured or have no insurance at all.

Title I of the Rental Fairness Act will, for a limited period of 3 years, adopt a federal presumption that companies that rent motor vehicles need not be licensed to sell insurance products to their customers for the term of the rental.

Recently, class action lawsuits have been filed in three states accusing these rental companies of selling insurance without a license—despite the fact these companies have been offering these products to their customers for almost three decades.

For many car and truck rental customers, these supplemental insurance purchases are not just a luxury—they are a necessity. For customers who carry minimal automobile insurance, or no insurance at all, the insurance products offered by car and truck rental companies are an important and inexpensive method of buying short-term, comprehensive insurance to protect themselves against accidents or theft. If this federal presumption is not adopted, these companies may cease to offer these products altogether—leaving many customers with no means of protecting themselves from potential liability during the rental of a motor vehicle.

The car and truck rental industry already has undertaken a huge effort to clarify their liability under current state’s insurance laws on a state-by-state basis. To date, twenty-four states have clarified, either through regulation or legislation, their positions on this issue. Until the other states can act on this issue, Title I will offer this industry protection from these types of class action lawsuits.

Title I in no way undermines the primacy of the states in regulatory insurance. In fact, it specifically restates the primary role of the states in insurance regulation. Title I of the Act has the support of the trade associations representing insurance agents because these groups realize the rental companies do not compete directly with insurance agents on these types of face-to-face, rental transaction-specific insurance sales.

The school shootings in Jonesboro, Edinboro, Fayetteville, Springfield, Richmond, West Pacucha, Littleton and most recently, Conyers, should be a wake up call for this body to act.

Gun related violence has plagued our nation and jeopardized the safety of our children.

The American people are demanding action by this body, and the people want a safe environment in our nation’s urban and rural areas for our children.

Each day in America, thirteen children under the age of 19 die from gunfire. In 1996, 4,643 children were killed by firearms. Firearms were cause 1 of every 4 deaths of teenagers from the ages of 15 to 19. In addition to this, firearms are the fourth leading cause of accidental death among children from the ages of 5 to 14.

The rate of gun related crimes is increasing.

From 1984 to 1994, the firearm homicide death rate for youths from the ages of 15 to 19 has increased 222%, while the non-firearm homicide death rate decreased 12.8%. It is our responsibilities as parents and leaders to protect our nation’s children.

These statistics illustrate the need for stronger measures from Congress. Yet, despite the statistics and recent developments, which clearly prove that there is a problem with firearms, many Members of Congress refuse to push forward substantive gun legislation.

To address this problem, I have re-introduced my bill, the Firearm Child Safety Lock Act of 1999. My bill, H.R. 1512, the Firearm Child Safety Lock Act of 1999, will prohibit any person from transferring or selling a firearm, in the United States, unless it is sold with a child safety lock.

In addition, this legislation will prohibit the transfer or sale of firearms by federally licensed dealers and manufacturers, unless a child safety lock is part of the firearm.

A Child Safety Lock, when properly attached to the trigger guard of a firearm, will prevent a firearm from unintentionally discharging.

Once the safety lock is properly applied, it cannot be removed unless it is unlocked.

Public support for child safety locks is strong. 75% of Americans have voiced support for mandatory trigger locks.

This legislation will protect our children and increase the safety of firearms.

However, child safety locks are not enough. We must determine why young people commit these horrible acts of violence.

We must take steps to avoid the continued senseless bloodshed that kills the life of children around this country. This bill and our efforts can do just that, we can protect our children and protect their future. In doing so, we are protecting ourselves.