

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE QUESTION OF A COVENANT
BETWEEN THE CONGRESSIONAL
BLACK CAUCUS AND THE NA-
TION OF ISLAM

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 weeks, much has been said about a so-called covenant between the Congressional Black Caucus and the Nation of Islam. This controversy has arisen as a direct result of hateful remarks made by Khalid Abdul Muhammad, the national assistant to Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan. This week, I issued a public statement about the controversy, which I ask to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MAJOR OWENS ON THE QUESTION OF THE COVENANT BETWEEN THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS AND THE NATION OF ISLAM: A CALL TO AGGRESSIVELY REAFFIRM AND REBUILD THE COALITION OF THE CARING MAJORITY WITH AFRICAN-AMERICANS AND JEWS AS THE NUCLEUS OF THE COALITION

There is a dangerous poison in the political atmosphere of America which must be confronted aggressively. A Coalition which could contribute greatly to the salvation of our nation is being bombarded and must be defended not with mere denunciations, but by a comprehensive and overwhelming counterattack.

A recent, unprecedented vile, anti-semitic, anti-human and obscene speech by a Nation of Islam spokesman, Khalid Mohammed, has triggered a chain reaction which if not halted, will sabotage our vital Coalition beyond reconstruction. No rational, decent human being can defend Mr. Mohammed's speech; however, since his immediate superior, Minister Louis Farrakhan has refused to denounce the New Jersey speech of his follower, the spotlight is appropriately focused on Minister Farrakhan. And in the chain reaction of political logic all of those who appear to be presently allied with Farrakhan have become the object of scrutiny. As a result of an announcement by its Chairman that there now existed a "Covenant" between the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) and the Nation of Islam, the CBC's position is now under scrutiny. Since it is a highly visible and very powerful national entity, the CBC's "Covenant" with Farrakhan understandably arouses widespread concern.

As a member of the CBC with a ninety-five per cent meeting attendance record I can state factually that the CBC has never adopted a position establishing a relationship with the Nation of Islam.

In the eleven years that I have been a member of Congress, at his request, the CBC has met with Minister Farrakhan three times. On each occasion the majority of the CBC members have insisted that the meetings be unpublicized and closed to outsiders. Great concern about the possibility of distorted statements and misguided messages have been expressed by the members. Prior to meeting with Mr. Farrakhan there were lengthy discussions. Always the argument that "it does not hurt for reasonable persons to participate in a dialogue" prevailed.

The CBC last met with Farrakhan in the Summer of 1993. He came with a message emphasizing his desire to be accepted in the mainstream world as a legitimate agent for positive social change. He cited impressive examples to make his case. His followers had driven out drug dealers and transformed the environments of certain neighborhoods and public housing projects. He claimed that no one had a better record of rehabilitating addicts and criminals than the Nation of Islam. He asked the CBC to help him advance a proposal to have his group take responsibility for a large percentage of the African Americans now in prisons. Not only did he want help in reaching officials responsible for the prison systems; he also wanted assistance in meeting representatives of African countries who might make land available for the establishment of rehabilitation settlements where alcohol and drug addicts could be totally removed from the corrupting home environments.

Mr. Farrakhan also proposed that the CBC serve as an intermediary between himself and the Jewish community. He did not indicate what he wanted to tell the Jewish community, but he did insist that he wanted peace, that he had been seeking a dialogue, that the CBC might be able to facilitate what had not been possible up to that time.

Farrakhan's proposals and Farrakhan the man were both impressive at that meeting. Most of the time was consumed with Farrakhan's presentation. There were few questions and very little dialogue. He did not expect an immediate response from the CBC.

The fact is that the CBC to this date has never met to discuss a response to proposals made by Minister Farrakhan at that dinner meeting. There has certainly never been a discussion of any "Covenant" with the Nation of Islam. While one can understand Chairman Mfume's personal response to the Farrakhan overtures requesting dialogue and cooperation which seemed to be reasonable and sincere, it must be emphasized that the Chairman's response was an individual one.

For the record it is important to clarify the procedure for inviting guests to appear on panels and forums during the CBC Legislative Weekend. Guests who speak at public forums other than those directly under the jurisdiction of a particular CBC member are invited by either the Chairman of the CBC Foundation, the Chairman of the Legislative

Weekend or the Chairman of the CBC. These are individual and personal decisions made without consultation with the CBC members. To date, these are not even decisions made by a Committee because there have been no committees charged with this responsibility. Certainly no votes are taken by the membership to decide these matters.

The decision to invite Minister Farrakhan was an individual decision made by Chairman Mfume who certainly had the right to make such a decision. But CBC members have a right to question the judgment involved in such an action. In view of the fact that the CBC had always insisted on holding unpublicized meetings with Minister Farrakhan, everyone was aware of the high degree of sensitivity within the CBC with respect to public identification with Minister Farrakhan. His appearance at the most highly visible and widely publicized forum of the 1993 Legislative Weekend did raise serious questions in the minds of many CBC members.

This CBC member must confess, however, that he was not in attendance at the Forum and did not learn until more than a month later that Chairman Mfume had announced a "Covenant." Uneasiness about the guest appearance of Minister Farrakhan is a matter at a different level from the involuntary inclusion in a "Covenant." But even after concern had become bewilderment and indignation it was difficult to arrange a discussion of the matter within a CBC meeting. From mid-October to the November 22nd adjournment of Congress the CBC weekly meeting agendas were cluttered. At no meetings were the agendas completed and there were no opportunities to add new business and expect a full and civil discussion.

Because of my very intense feelings about the dangerous poison presently choking the political atmosphere, I feel it is important to provide this explanation of my delayed reaction. The mad ravings of Khalid Mohammed have served to illuminate a crisis that has been escalating for some time. Presently there is an urgent need to move far beyond the denunciation of Mr. Mohammed's speech. We must openly and honestly discuss ways to combat the poison which is destroying a fragile but vitally necessary Coalition. The question must be asked: Why is the CBC constantly being baited? The answer is that the CBC is a victim of its legitimate quest for unity. A strong desire within the Black community for total unity is being exploited by a frustrated, misguided and unproductive fringe crowd. Usually strong and loud in its lunacy, this unrepresentative small percentage of the Black population commands media attention far out of proportion to its numbers and/or its capacity to deliver results.

Responsible African American leadership should cease the pursuit of total unity within the Black community. We must leave the

● 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.

ten percent who advocate hatred and violence and let them march off to their own destruction. These are copycats mouthing imitations of ancient European biases against Jews. We must also leave the five percent of Blacks who are educated, manipulative, self-serving opportunists openly toadying to racist benefactors on the right. Eighty-five percent of African Americans is enough to maintain the core of a Coalition of the Caring Majority.

This dangerous poison in the political atmosphere threatens to destroy our Coalition of the Caring Majority which could greatly expand the parameters of opportunity and justice in America. This Coalition which is presently an unorganized one is made up of people whose solidifying philosophy is the belief that while they are not their brother's keeper, they will support public policies which guarantee survival and promote opportunity for all people. Members of this Coalition do not have to pretend to love everybody but they must subscribe to the principle that every human life is sacred.

This Coalition of the Caring Majority is open to all; however, it definitely begins with a racial and ethnic mix composed of African Americans, Latinos, Whites and Asians. African Americans are pivotal in this Coalition because, in America, they have suffered the worst abuses over the longest period of time. They have suffered official abuses sanctioned by the government. They have been the victims of crimes perpetrated by local, state and federal officials. We are the only Americans who are the descendants of slaves. Among the exploited groups African Americans presently also have the largest critical mass with an escalating sense of political awareness. African American consciousness is the beneficiary of the still glowing activist heritage of Malcolm X, Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela. African Americans are at the core of the Coalition but all of the other partners are also crucial components. Among the whites in the Coalition Jews are the overwhelming majority.

When we jettison the saboteurs and end their opportunities to confuse issues, agendas and possible solutions, we greatly improve the capacity of the African American leadership to serve as the glue, the cohesive center for this Coalition of the Caring Majority. No more time should be wasted on negotiations with hatemongers and rank opportunists. Reject Mohammed and Farrakhan at one extreme. Reject Clarence Thomas, Roy Innis and their more subtle followers who strangle human and economic rights at the other extreme.

All African American energy, brainpower and organization skills must be focused toward the building of a greater Coalition of the Caring Majority.

We have a clear criteria for identifying the enemy: Regardless of the race, creed or color whoever preaches hatred, violence, and exploitation—that is the enemy.

We must denounce the enemy. We must isolate the enemy. We must ignore any future devious overtures from the enemy. All of this and more we must do to draw a line, to build a solid wall between the Coalition of the Caring Majority and the exploiters and hatemongers. And far beyond these defensive actions our Coalition must accentuate the positive. We must aggressively mount a cam-

paign for the respect, loyalty and dedicated energy of our youth. The world can easily dismiss the obscene ravings of Khalid Mohammed at Keane College but we cannot ignore the cheers and applause of the students who listened to him. Only the most disaffected and the most alienated; only students who feel that they have been deserted by all others would cheer such a heinous speech.

The challenge our Coalition faces is the challenge of offering a more reasonable but inspiring program of alternatives to bitter, frustrated and frightened youth. No student should have to anticipate a graduation followed by unemployment. At the center of a Coalition platform there must be a national program for full employment now. We must demand not only jobs to get people off welfare, but job opportunities for all who want to work. The Coalition of the Caring Majority must demonstrate to the Youth of America that it is willing to confront the present stagnation in Washington and mount an aggressive campaign for full employment.

At the state and local levels, as alternatives to group hatred and infatuation with violence, Coalitions must mount more aggressive campaigns for jobs, justice, and community rebuilding. In the big cities we have concrete evidence of the workability of our Coalition. In Chicago with Harold Washington; in Philadelphia with Wilson Goode; and in New York (1989) with David Dinkins; in all three showdowns at the ballot box, the Coalition of the Caring Majority prevailed. We won repeatedly with thirty to thirty-five percent of the white vote as part of the Coalition. And among these white voters, the overwhelming majority were Jewish voters. Jews are a vital and steadfast part of the Coalition of the Caring Majority.

There is a dangerous divisive poison in the political atmosphere currently manifested in the form of anti-semitic attacks on Jews by an African American hatemongering fringe group. The only potent antidote to this poison is to amputate the fringe limb and focus more intensely on the healthy body that remains. We must move to aggressively reaffirm and rebuild our Coalition of the Caring Majority. The nucleus at the core of this Coalition is the long-standing alliance between African and Americans and Jews.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 3425, DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1994

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues in the House, I said in a special order to the House last night that I came here a little over a year ago with some hopes and dreams, aspirations

that I brought from a campaign for Congress and from the people that I represent, to have a small opportunity in the House of Representatives to make our Government a little bit more responsive. Here we are today debating this question on the rule, and really, when we get down to the very basics of this rule in consideration, there is a very basic question. That is, does this Congress want to address the question of regulatory reform?

Now, my colleagues, we are all intelligent human beings and we can all read the legislation that is before us. If you read this legislation, H.R. 3425, you will see indeed it does create new offices and agencies, that it is not just a simple elevation bill.

Section 109 creates information resources management office; section 12 creates an office of environmental justice. Even section 113 creates an office of environmental risk. But why, why is it that we cannot address the question of regulatory reform? Why can we not address the question of risk assessment? What is the cost? What is the risk? What is the benefit to the public?

We rarely get an opportunity to elevate a department to Cabinet-level status in this body, and the stars in the constellation do not come together so that we have this rare opportunity to say that this agency has a responsibility to the public, to business, to industry, to the inner cities, to agriculture, to jobs in this country. We rarely get that opportunity. We have that opportunity at this one moment.

Now, this is not going to change all regulations, but it is going to take one agency that we are elevating—I sit on its oversight committee, and I tell you I cannot describe the horror, the tales that I've heard of mismanagement, waste, fraud, and abuse, misdirection.

I consider myself an environmentalist. But you would be shocked if you saw the way the limited resources of our Nation and this Congress are wasted by that agency. The inspector general came before our subcommittee and he came to my office and he told me, he said they will not listen, they need focus, they need direction.

Only the Congress can provide that direction because the Congress passed these dozens and dozens of laws. It is not going to be an Executive order, it is not going to be a tiny little effort by this Congress; it is going to take a law. That is why this Committee on Rules needs to pay attention to this matter. Again, we are not going to change the world. I am not going to change the world. I am just saying—maybe I am wrong, maybe all of these organizations, dozens of organizations, even

inner-city organizations where the poor, the poorest of our citizens live, are saying their resources are squandered. Billions of dollars are wasted by this Agency. They do not have the legislative direction only this Congress can provide.

If we do not stand up here now and be heard, when will we be heard? If not today, when?

I think we have a rare opportunity to address this issue today. We know what the issue is here. The issue is fairness. It is not a partisan issue. Do not make it a partisan issue. This was introduced in the other body by Senator BENNETT JOHNSTON, a Democrat. I stood with my colleagues in committee when we had the votes to pass this, and both times the effort was led by people from the other side. So here we have the question: Are we going to make a change in this body? Are we going to make a change in the way this Congress does business? Or is this business as usual?

I urge you to defeat the rule.

A UNIQUE RESPONSE TO TREATING INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT VICTIMS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, every now and then the silver lining appears. This week it showed up in my district, in the form of increased access to health care for some of my constituents.

I rise today to congratulate a number of local officials in my home of Contra Costa County, CA, along with representatives of General Chemical Corp. and local community activities, for coming up with a creative and unique solution to a long-standing environmental and health-related problem.

Last July, a chemical tank car began leaking at the General Chemical plant in Richmond, CA, creating a harmful cloud of sulfuric acid. Thousands of people sought treatment in local hospitals. Unfortunately, it was only the most recent of numerous serious industrial accidents in the bay area.

After months of negotiations among officials from the county health department, the district attorney's office, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, General Chemical, and local activists, an agreement was reached just this week that satisfies everyone—and which, most importantly, will have a very real and constructive impact in the Richmond community.

For its fault in the toxic release, General Chemical has agreed to pay \$1.18 million,

with most of that money going to build a health clinic in North Richmond and create a separate, mobile health van to provide services to people who can't make it to the clinic. This will help fill a medical gap—the closest medical care now available to north Richmond residents is more than 3 miles away at the Richmond Health Care Center, where facilities and staff labor to meet the large increase in patient volume in the past 5 years.

Last year, after the spill, my Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Natural Resources Committee investigated this toxic chemical release and one of the steps we recommended was creation of this clinic.

The investigation also concluded that too often, minority communities suffer disproportionately from exposure to toxic chemicals. And in the case of last summer's leak, many of the people who sought medical help came from the largely minority, low-income neighborhood around the plant.

Mr. Speaker, I tell this story this morning because the problems of communities living with the risk of industrial accidents is not unique to my district. We all share this problem. But the creation of the health clinic is a unique response. The agreement to build the clinic is a true victory born out of tragedy. It represents a direct benefit that north Richmond needs. Simply paying a fine to a public agency wasn't going to help the community. It's not enough simply to send money to the Treasury or to a local government. People want to see their daily lives made better and this will help do that.

THE INAUGURAL SPEECH OF CHRISTINE TODD WHITMAN, THE WAR MEMORIAL, TRENTON, NJ

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following speech for the RECORD:

Mr. Chief Justice, Governor Florio, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is with an eagerness to tackle the challenges ahead that I take office as New Jersey's 50th chief executive—and its first woman governor.

On behalf of the people of New Jersey, I would like to thank Governor Florio for his years of public service. We agreed on some issues, disagreed on others, but no one ever doubted that you cared deeply.

Some say it is a proud moment to be sworn into such a high office as governor. For me, however, this is also a humbling moment.

No one reaches this position alone. Certainly I didn't, and I want to thank all of you who made it possible.

I especially want to thank my husband John and my two children, Kate and Taylor, for standing by me during a long tough campaign.

Today's inauguration marks not a victory of partisanship, but a test of our democracy, of our ability to govern ourselves.

As a people, we face a crisis of confidence.

Many have lost faith in the ability of government to deliver services efficiently, to lend a helping hand when it is needed and to get out of the way when it is not.

We worry about the ability of our economy to generate jobs and restore prosperity.

We question the ability of our schools to deliver the quality education our children deserve at a price their parents can afford.

And we question the ability of our criminal justice system to prevent crime, and to deliver justice and safety.

Americans have lost faith in the institutions that are the foundations of our democracy. They question those they have elected to serve them.

Wherever I go, whether I'm in a shopping mall, attending a Devils or Nets game, or taking questions on a call-in show, I hear the same implicit question:

"After the oaths, after the speeches, after all the parties and festivities, will you remember your promises and will you keep them?"

As the first statement of my governorship, to every voter in New Jersey, let me answer that question: "I have just taken the oath of this office you have entrusted to me. To me, this oath means one thing: I will not hedge, I will not backtrack, I will keep my promises to you, my friends, to the best of my ability, so help me God."

But I can't do it alone.

I need your help, your wisdom and your support.

If government is to be "for the people," it must be "of" and "by the people."

For democracy to work, as Abraham Lincoln said in his first inaugural speech, we in government must have "a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people."

Government must trust and listen to the people, or it is not a democracy.

That is why I have spent the last four years listening to you.

And it is why I will keep listening for as long as I am your governor.

I believe in the people of this state. I believe in open government. I believe that the best decisions are based on consensus. And, like you, I believe deeply in the need for fundamental change.

To those who question whether I am serious about bucking the special interests who hold so much quiet power in the city, let me be clear: I did not run for governor to conduct "business as usual."

I'm not one of the boys. It is going to be different around here.

The only way government can win back your trust is to earn it.

Our principal problems are not the product of great global economic shifts or other vast,

unseen forces. They are the creation of government.

Of government that puts special interests ahead of the people's interests.

Of government that refuses to change.

You know it. I know it. And this time, together, we're going to fix it.

New Jersey should lead the nation.

In a world driven by ideas and technology, we boast some of the world's leading telecommunications, pharmaceutical, chemical and other high-tech firms.

We have first-class universities, great ports, and a prime location between America's financial and political seats of power. We have great natural resources, from the Highlands to the Shore.

New Jersey should be the engine of economic growth that leads this nation into the 21st Century. It should be a powerful engine of prosperity that gives our children the same opportunity that our parents worked so hard to give us—the chance for a better life.

Together, we will unshackle that economic engine from the restraining chains of high taxes.

Four months ago, I said I would put 1.4 billion of your tax dollars back into your pocket by cutting taxes over the next three years, with the first cut coming in July.

The skeptics groaned * * *

But here we are.

And I say, why wait until the next fiscal year starts in July?

Between now and then, families have car payments and credit card bills that will come due. Senior citizens on fixed incomes will be struggling to make ends meet.

And businesses have payrolls to make. Their plans to create new jobs are sitting on shelves, waiting for a stronger economy.

Let's not keep economic growth waiting another minute.

If President Clinton and his Congress can reach backward into time and raise your taxes retroactively, your governor and your Legislature can cut them retroactively.

That is why I am asking my partners in the Legislature, Senate President Donald DiFrancesco and Assembly Speaker Chuck Haytaian, to enact a 5 percent income tax cut for every family in New Jersey effective January 1, 1994—17 days ago.

Second, I am asking the Legislature to eliminate all income taxes on those earning less than \$7,500, again retroactively to January 1 this year. Those who are struggling the hardest need a tax cut the most.

Third, I am asking the Legislature to cut the corporate business tax to 9 percent, again effective January 1 this year.

We will be competitive. No more losing our employers to job raids by low-tax states!

New Jersey is open for business.

Crafting a budget that covers not only the cost of these tax cuts, but also makes up for more than \$1 billion in previous "one shot" revenues will not be easy.

We must do so without gutting the state services on which so many of us depend. And

we must do so without driving up property taxes.

The "shell game" of raising one tax to cut another is over.

My budget task force and the 350 citizens who served on my transition teams have been poring over every department's budget. My cabinet officials take office with a mandate to find ways to provide the same or better service for less. Hundreds of citizens have been writing in with their ideas on how we can save 5 cents on every tax dollar we spend.

Let me tell you: Once we all put our minds to it, it's amazing all the ways we can find to save money.

Take just three areas: A vast amount of uncollected "bad driver" surcharges are owed to the state, yet no attempt has been made to collect them. We're owed unclaimed federal Medicaid funds for health care services provided to poor children by their schools.

And even an inmate from Rahway state prison wrote in to the "Our Tax Dollars" program to point out that more than \$160 million in fines owed by criminals have never been collected.

Together, these three areas alone offer the potential for closing the budget gap by several hundred million dollars.

What's more, almost \$200 million has been left unspent in each of the last two budgets because programs were overfunded. I am directing my cabinet to try to save at least that much from current-year accounts.

Budget cuts are just part of the equation.

To cut taxes in each of the next three fiscal years will require sustained economic growth.

Economic growth doesn't just happen. We have to plan for it, encourage it, and court it.

That's why I have directed my secretary of state to serve as an advocate for business. And it's why the first executive order of my administration—which I am signing in front of you today—creates a New Jersey Economic Master Plan Commission to develop the long term strategy we need to make New Jersey the economic powerhouse it deserves to be.

(Peter Verniero brings the executive order to the podium. The governor signs it.)

Done!

(Governor hands executive order to Verniero, who returns to his seat.)

Make no mistake about it: We are in a battle for jobs with Pennsylvania, the Carolinas, and the Sunbelt every day. One of the main reasons we've been losing that battle is state government.

We must cut through the needless over-regulation that drives businesses out of New Jersey and discourages new firms from locating here. We can protect the environment without taking years to process a permit.

Our businesses deserve better and you deserve better.

It isn't just a question of money being wasted. It's a question of duplication, inept planning, and inadequate service.

We have 68 Department of Labor field offices, yet in some counties we require unemployed workers to sign up for unemployment benefits in one office, then drive 10 miles to another office to find out what jobs are available.

Look at how the state regulates cemeteries: If you are buried with members of your own religion, your corpse is regulated by the Attorney General's office. But if you are buried in a non-sectarian cemetery, the Department of Banking has jurisdiction over your remains. That's right * * * Banking. Do we really need two different state agencies to regulate the dead?

From cradle to grave, our state government needs reform.

We must reinvent government the way American corporations have been reinventing themselves to survive in the 1990's.

You elected me as the chief executive officer of a \$15 billion service corporation with 60,000 employees. And that's what we're going to provide: Service, Efficient, cost-effective service.

After all, we work for you.

And of all the tasks we are entrusted to perform as your state government, nothing is more sacred than our responsibility to educate your children.

The school system we have today was developed in the 19th Century to prepare children of farmers and new immigrants for an Industrial Revolution that wanted bodies to do repetitive factory work.

The world has changed and our education system must change with it.

Employers today require a highly educated work force that knows how to think and how to be creative. The state that can provide the best-educated workers is the state that will be the economic powerhouse of the 21st Century.

The states that fail will fall behind.

We must make New Jersey number one.

We—parents, teachers, students, administrators, government leaders and business executives—must work together to reinvent education.

We must make it our top priority to teach our children—all our children—to read in kindergarten, first grade and second grade when they are enthusiastic about learning. That way, we will not have to spend tens of millions of dollars in junior high school, high school and college trying to rectify the failures of the past.

We are going to inject competition and encourage innovation in our schools by developing alternatives like magnet schools and charter schools within our public school systems to give parents a choice of where to send their children.

Schools should compete for the chance to teach our children. They are our greatest treasurers.

If we are going to teach democracy in our schools, we should practice democracy in our school system.

In Jersey City, five long years of state control have not fixed schools that continue to do far too little. We should give Mayor Bret

Schundler the green light to test school vouchers and invite the top school experts in the nation to measure the results.

We will get politics out of the Department of Education by giving the education commissioner an independent five-year term.

We will push authority down to the local level, because I trust parents who love their children to get involved in school boards and PTA's. The state can give you better schools, but you must be responsible for raising your children.

We will develop a strong core curriculum that teaches every student the basics of reading, writing, arithmetic, and a respect for our nation's heritage.

We will make our schools safe, and we will demand discipline in our classrooms. The last thing children should learn about in school is violence and fear.

Personal safety is a sacred right in America. Our children, our parents, all of us, deserve to live in peace.

Yet far too many of us are imprisoned by fear of crime.

Some say we should turn our heads, give up, and just accept a violent crime-ridden society.

Some say crime is too tough a problem to solve. My answer to them? We're tougher.

We know that a small percentage of hardened criminals commit most of the violent crime. It's time to make every criminal know that he or she will serve 70 percent of the court's sentence. And for three-time violent offenders—those who make a career out of crime—it should be "three strikes and you're in" * * for life.

We also need to set up boot camps and other alternatives to teach young people who are toying with the criminal life that they want to go straight instead. Everybody deserves a second chance. But not a third.

Criminals are not the victims of society. Society is the victim of criminals. The way to make our streets safe again is to make sure criminals know they will pay dearly—and perhaps permanently—for their crimes. We will.

Our blueprint to make New Jersey first is an agenda of economic growth, good schools and safe streets. An agenda of hope, optimism and determination. Of government that is "for the people" because it is "of" and "by the people."

The hope, the vision, the strength of our people is our guarantee of success.

And what remarkable people make up this state! In the factories of Paterson and the research laboratories of Princeton, in the ethnic neighborhoods of Perth Amboy and senior citizen villages of Lakewood, in the towns of the Shore and the Pinelands, and in cities like Camden and Newark—all across our state, I have come to know so many of New Jersey's people.

We are one Family. One community. One state.

There is a phrase in Spanish that means all that: "Somos un solo pueblo."

When one of us is out of work, homeless, cannot read, or is a victim of violent crime,

we all suffer. And when we help one another succeed, we all succeed.

I remember a young writer who, I think, must have learned about America as a student in New Jersey. Over six decades ago, he wrote of "a sense of overwhelming gratitude and gladness that America was there . . . that in the heart of the . . . people the old generousities and devotions fought on . . . indomitable and undefeated."

"The best of America," F. Scott Fitzgerald concluded, is "the best of the world." And I can tell you that the best of New Jersey is the best of America.

In the people, we will place our faith. On trust in the people, we will build our agenda of opportunity and growth.

This is our state.

This is our time.

Last week, I met the children from Mrs. Reilly's second grade class at the Gables School in Neptune. Each child brought along a letter.

"We should all learn to share and be nice to each other," Claudia Grier wrote. "I know that you have a demanding job ahead of you and I will be there to help you." Claudia's here today, and Claudia, thank you for offering to help.

It will take everyone's help to meet the challenge ahead.

It won't always be easy and we won't always agree. But we must not fear change.

In 1776, this state was at the forefront of a revolution. We are there again today. Let's show the world what New Jersey can do.

Together, we will make New Jersey first.

DEFERRAL OF CONSERVATION COMPLIANCE DEADLINE

HON. PAT ROBERTS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, today, I and 11 of my colleagues are introducing legislation that would extend for 1 year the deadline for conservation compliance under the highly-erodible land [HEL] provisions of the 1985 Food Security Act [FSA] as amended.

The reason for this legislation is simple. Many producers farming in upland areas, especially across the Midwest and Plains States, are facing the rehabilitation of weather-damaged lands and conservation practices following last summer's torrential rains. In many instances, the impact of these conditions will make it difficult for producers to meet the environmental compliance mandates established in the FSA.

The law requires farmers who cultivate HEL to be actively phasing in provisions of a conservation compliance plan—approved by USDA's Soil Conservation Service [SCS]—to

substantially reduce soil erosion on HEL. The FSA also imposes a January 1, 1995, deadline for full implementation of these plans. If SCS and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [ASCS] find that a producer is not in compliance—that is, is not actively applying the plan, or is unable to meet the statutory deadline—he or she will face either a substantial reduction or a total loss of farm program benefits.

Most reports indicate that agricultural producers are working diligently to comply with the law. Unfortunately, the onslaught of this year's catastrophic weather has inhibited the ability of many farmers to keep pace with their plans' implementation schedules. SCS officials have acknowledged the situation caused by last summer's weather problems and have stated their policy is to be lenient and give producers more time to comply. It is crucial that Congress, through this legislation, ensure that SCS has the clear and necessary authority to meet their stated policy goal.

According to SCS officials here in Washington, damage to conservation structures and erosion on untreated lands are extensive. Farmers with HEL must repair and maintain their structures, clean sediment and debris from existing terraces, waterways and drainage ditches and build new erosion control practices as scheduled in their plans. Of course, the SCS workload associated with all this unexpected weather-related damage has been increased considerably. Technical assistance must be provided on the 40 million acres of HEL that SCS says has been affected by last summer's weather, which represents more than 50 percent of the workload associated with land treatments under the FSA is in those States hit hardest by the rains.

In addition, concerns have been raised regarding the availability, or in some areas the shortage, of qualified contractors to do the work necessary for farmers to complete those plans requiring construction of terraces, waterways, etc. Relative to SCS's workload relative to the FSA requirements, their responsibilities in the aftermath of last summer's catastrophe also include a massive amount of engineering and contracting work to be completed under the Emergency Watershed Program [EWP].

Thus, the definitive legal nature of the statutory deadline makes it important for Congress to amend the statute to provide SCS clear guidance and the authority to enable them to work with farmers, as well as clarifying for farmers the ground rules for such extensions.

The legislation would extend for one year, to January 1, 1996, the HEL conservation plan compliance deadline under the FSA for producers who can provide evidence of the damage to their conservation practices caused by damaging weather or who will have received Federal disaster assistance in 3 of the last 5 years ending in calendar year 1994.

The Secretary also is given discretionary authority to provide other relief in certain circumstances, including the granting of temporary variances. By recognizing the problems

producers are facing in complying with conservation plans and by providing the Secretary the clear authority to extend the HEL compliance deadline, SCS's overworked staff will not be placed in a battle between farmers and environmentalists over who should receive an extension.

This legislation has been endorsed by the Illinois Farm Bureau, the National Farmers Organization, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, as well as the many individual farmers who have contacted our offices.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues' support of this legislation.

H.R. 3759, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1994

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3759, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

This legislation, which provides immediate, critical relief to victims of last month's California earthquake, also provides much-needed relief to the victims of last year's flood in the Midwest.

H.R. 3759 includes funding for two key programs to help my constituents: \$340.5 million to help repair waterways and watersheds damaged by the floods; and \$25 million for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, to help eligible producers repair damaged farmland.

The first set of funding will allow the ASCS to make needed levee repairs and will allow for additional enrollments of croplands inundated by the 1993 floods in the Wetlands Reserve Program from willing landlords.

Mr. Speaker, these funds will continue the job Congress started 8 months ago when we passed the last emergency supplemental legislation for 1993. My only regret with this bill is that it does not include funds needed by my State—\$25 million—to complete buyouts for flooded communities. I will continue to work with my colleagues to see that these buyout funds are pursued by the Congress.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO A MODEL CITIZEN

HON. MICHAEL J. KOPETSKI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Salem's First Citizen of the Year for 1993, Mr. Larry Epping. Larry moved to Oregon in 1937 from Hope, ND, when his family lost their farm due to the Depression. Over the years he has become one of Salem's most prominent land developers, although his lifestyle remains unassuming. Larry's attorney, Dave Hilgemann, summed it up with the following words:

I think the award is richly deserved. Here is a man who gives as much or more to the community as he does to his private enterprise. I have personally watched him quietly help kids at the Boys and Girls Club here in Salem, kids who will probably never know his name or know of the substantial good he's done. Above all, he contributes his time in addition to his money for the good of the community.

Mr. Epping's impressive biography shows he graduated from college with honors, during World War II he survived a sinking aircraft carrier spending roughly 2 days on a raft in the Pacific Ocean, and in 1949 Larry married Jeanette Hoffer. Together they raised five children—Tracy, Randy, Dan, Shawn, and Gary. In addition, Larry is extremely active in the community, serving on over 35 boards, commissions, and volunteer agencies. Activities involve both career and family, from president of the Salem Home Builders Association to a founder of the Salem Catholic Schools Foundation. With all the time Larry has donated to the community, it is hard to believe he found time to develop a thriving business. Perhaps that is why his signs say, "Call Larry Epping—Anytime."

Much of Salem's development over the past 37 years can be attributed to Larry Epping. His philosophy, a home for every family, allowed for a diversified, well-balanced community. Larry built affordable homes and made them available by offering buyers personal loans when the banks would not.

On the rare opportunity when he is not working, Larry heads for the great outdoors. He travels the world searching for the ultimate challenge, and just as at home, his trips usually include a contribution to charity and a local museum.

I would like to conclude with a statement from Larry's son Gary, who said, "The best thing about this award is that dad never does anything for recognition, he just does what he thinks is right." That is why Larry Epping, as well as his family, is the epitome of a community leader. I am very proud to represent Salem's 1993 First Citizen of the Year.

THE VISIT OF IRA LEADER GERRY ADAMS: WHAT ARE THE FOREIGN POLICY IMPLICATIONS?

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit of Gerry Adams, leader of the political wing of the Irish Republican Army, breaks a longstanding policy with regard to the issuance of visas to admitted members of the IRA. While the merits of the granting of the visa can be debated, Members of this body should be aware that this marks a fundamental change in United States foreign policy, particularly with respect to the Irish Republic and the United Kingdom. With this thought in mind, this Member would call to the attention of his colleagues the following editorial from the February 3, 1994, edition of the Omaha-World Herald, entitled "Fallout From Irish Terrorist's Visit a Costly Foreign Policy Lesson."

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Feb. 3, 1994]

FALLOUT FROM IRISH TERRORIST'S VISIT A COSTLY FOREIGN POLICY LESSON

The British government is furious with President Clinton. And with good reason. Clinton provided a U.S. forum to Gerry Adams, the top spokesman for the Irish Republican Army, by allowing Adams to enter the United States for 48 hours to participate in a conference in New York City.

Adams is the leader of Sinn Fein, the political arm of the IRA. The State Department classifies him as a terrorist who, as such, is not eligible to enter the United States for any reason.

The IRA has killed more than 1,400 people in England and Northern Ireland, including 900 British troops. Adams, who condemns only the deaths of people he calls innocent civilians, implicitly endorses IRA terrorism. He denies that he has ever been an IRA member—a claim that is disputed by the British, who imprisoned him for IRA membership, and by the CIA.

The State Department urged Clinton not to let him enter the country for the conference. The American Embassy in London seconded the motion. The CIA was against it. A staff member of the National Security Council told The New York Times that "my heart is in my throat when I think about how it could all go wrong." Secretary of State Warren Christopher personally appealed to the president not to issue a visa.

But Clinton overruled them all. The White House admitted that Sens. Edward Kennedy and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, as well as other Irish members of Congress, had lobbied heavily in Adams' behalf. "The president obviously gets a political dividend by accommodating Pat and Teddy on this," a White House official said. The official said Clinton believed the gesture could help the peace process in Northern Ireland.

Here's how Bill Clinton, that irrepressible wizard of foreign policy, is helping the peace process in Northern Ireland:

People on both sides of the undeclared war said they saw Clinton's recognition as a personal victory for Adams. Some said it was a victory for terrorism. A British newspaper said Clinton's decision signified the end of the special relationship between London and Washington. Adams had more television time in two days, including an appearance on the talk show of Clinton's friend, Larry King, than he received in years of agitating in Northern Ireland, where terrorists are banned from the airwaves.

Adams finally pushed too far. He used his forum to try to steer the United States into exerting pressure on London to cave in. The pressure became so ridiculous that even Clinton was forced to distance himself.

"The people who have to settle this are the Irish and the British," Clinton said.

Clinton seemed to move back toward the hands-off position of his predecessors, who had much more foreign policy savvy. Thus proceeded another lesson in the education of a foreign-policy neophyte. One only hopes that this neophyte will be up to speed before he does too much more to alienate America's long-term friends and allies.

COACHBUILDER'S EXEMPTION ACT OF 1994

HON. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Coachbuilder's Exemption Act of 1994, legislation to redress an inequity in the Tax Code relating to the so-called gas guzzler tax exemption for small companies who lengthen automobiles into limousines.

Under section 4064 of the code, a tax is imposed if an automobile's fuel economy performance falls below the Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] fuel economy ratings for that automobile's model type. The tax, which is imposed upon the sale or initial lease of the vehicle by a manufacturer, ranges from \$1,000 to \$7,000.

The gas guzzler tax was enacted as part of the Energy Tax Act of 1978 as a conservation measure and to encourage greater automobile fuel economy, a policy goal that I strongly support. However, this policy should not be pursued without consideration for special circumstances. In this regard, Congress has recognized that certain exceptions to the tax are reasonable and necessary to prevent unfairness. For example, in 1986 Congress amended the gas guzzler tax to exempt small manufacturers, generally manufacturers of fewer than 10,000 vehicles annually, who lengthen existing automobiles into limousines. Clearly, imposition of the tax on such small producers

was inappropriate and did not generally enhance energy conservation. Regrettably, and with little explanation, the coachbuilder's exemption was repealed with the enactment of the luxury tax on automobiles in the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990, although the Reconciliation Act excluded limousines operated for commercial purposes from the new luxury tax.

The repeal of the coachbuilder's exemption in 1990 has had a devastating effect on coachbuilders and operators. Jobs have been lost and costs to operators have increased dramatically. During 1988 and 1989, prior to the repeal of the exemption, there were approximately 35 coachbuilders who lengthened 8,000 to 9,000 cars annually. Today, only 12 coachbuilders remain and less than 1,400 vehicles annually are lengthened. These vehicles bear an average tax of \$2,000 per automobile—the economic burden of which is directly borne by the operator. By and large, the limousine industry is comprised of small businesses. The typical operator owns 5 vehicles and must replace one vehicle about every 18 to 24 months.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing would reinstate the coachbuilder's exemption, and, thereby, eliminate a significant economic burden on industry and on limousine operators. Reinstatement would have a negligible revenue impact, increase jobs, and redress the inequity of imposing a tax that has essentially crippled these small businesses.

The gas guzzler tax, as it applies to coachbuilders and limousine operators does little, if anything, to further overall fuel economy. Essentially, the tax is a penalty on weddings, school proms, business gatherings, and other occasions requiring special transportation services. In addition, tax is especially burdensome for operators located in tourist centers like my city of New Orleans where limousine services are required for vacationers and conventioners.

The parallels between this matter and the automobile luxury tax are striking. In that case, as with the coachbuilders' and the gas guzzler tax, business owners and workers are the victims rather than the consumers of the service or product. It is time to fix this problem just as we did so just last year with the repeal of the automobile luxury tax.

I urge my colleagues to join me in redressing this situation by cosponsoring this bill.

ST. PAUL'S ANNIVERSARY

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, while this House stood in recess, St. Paul Church and

School in my hometown of Memphis, TN, proudly observed its 50th anniversary, and I wanted to take a moment to share that milestone with my colleagues and to urge them to join me in offering the congratulations of this body.

In November 1944 Whitehaven became a mission of St. Thomas Parish in south Memphis—10 acres of land were purchased on Shelby Drive and the Catholic families of the area were organized. Special permission was granted for Mass to be celebrated in the Gillia Home. Father Angelo Lenzi was named the first pastor in March 1945, and began an enormous building program. A crypt and then an upper church were completed over the next few years and served as the place of worship.

Construction began on the school in 1949 while students met daily in the crypt. Over the next 15 years the school expanded to some 22 classrooms and a beautiful gymnasium. This adequately met the growing enrollment that reached into the 800 range.

While the school and student body grew, so too did the Whitehaven and Catholic population. The need for a new church was a long-time dream that began to be realized when ground was broken in 1961. The present beautiful church, seating over 1,100 people, was dedicated on November 20, 1964. The pastors of St. Paul have been: Father Angelo Lenzi, 1945-53; Father Edward Cleary, 1954-68; Father Walter Bush, 1968-70; Monsignor Theron Walker, 1970-81; Father Leonard Oglesby, 1981-87; Father John McArthur, 1987-present.

St. Paul has been a stable, ongoing Catholic presence in Memphis and Whitehaven for 50 years, growing and expanding with the community. Nurtured by the commitment and energy of the Catholic community in Memphis, St. Paul has built and sustained a school of exemplary academic reputation. I am proud to join in saluting its first 50 years and in looking forward to the continuation of its proud tradition.

HAPPY 90TH BIRTHDAY, CELY MIGUEL

HON. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish one of my constituents, a very special woman, Celerina T. Miguel, a happy birthday. Today, February 3, 1994, "Cely" celebrates her 90th birthday. Cely has accomplished so much to modernize nursing practices in her native Philippines and as a citizen of the United States. More importantly, she has been a devoted wife, mother, and grandmother.

In 1904, Cely was born to Leocadio Trinos, a carpenter, and Benigna Tanyag, a housewife. She lived with her brother Domingo and father in a one floor, one room, bamboo "nipa" hut in Cabuyao, Laguna. Her mother died of complications in pregnancy when Cely was only 3 years old.

As a young adolescent, Cely was a tomboy, climbing trees and following her brother Domingo around town. In fact, she was once caught smoking a cigar. Cely was sent to study at a school in Manila. There she lived with an uncle who took care of her in exchange for a little housework after school. She took care of her cousins at a very young age. She washed their clothes and helped around the kitchen. Despite her menial chores, she excelled in school and continued on to high school.

Cely went on to graduate as the valedictorian at the Mary Johnston School of Nursing. She was encouraged to go to the United States for further studies. Cely received a prestigious scholarship from the Daughters of the American Revolution and sadly left her dear brother and father in the Philippines for a new life in the United States.

Upon her arrival to the United States, Cely was met by a representative of the D.A.R. Together they went to Chicago and Cely enrolled in the Northwestern University. After 2 months she transferred to Columbia University in New York where she received her B.A. and masters degrees in nursing. It is a little known fact that Cely invented the recipe for banana bread. In fact, she wrote her thesis for her masters on the role of nutrition and nursing. She cited many foods that were highly nutritious and included a recipe for a bread that was both high in protein, potassium, and carbohydrates that would become popular around the country. After graduation, Cely was employed by New York Hospital.

It was during the Great Depression that Cely met her husband Mauro "Mike" Miguel. She and her roommates, Maring Cortes and Luid Palting, and Mike would often go to church dinners for meals that cost between 2 and 5 cents. These friends were all fortunate to have good jobs to support them through a difficult depression.

In 1934, Mike and Cely were married in Rockville Center, NY. In 1935 she gave birth to her first child, Bob. Once Mike finished his studies in civil engineering the young couple decided to go back to the Philippines.

For the next 10 years, the Miguels lived in the Philippines. In 1938, another son, Art was born. At this time they were sent to Takloban, Leyte, where Mike was working in the engineering corp of the Philippine army. The following year, the family went back to Manila where Cely took over as the chief nurse and principal of the School of Nursing for Chinese General Hospital. She introduced the hospital to new nursing practices, modernizing the nursing care of the hospital.

During the second World War at the time of the Japanese occupation of the Philippines,

times were difficult for the Miguels. Cely persevered, caring for the many casualties—both civilian and Japanese soldiers. In 1940, her only daughter, Cecilia, was born. After the war, the Japanese surrendered and the victorious United States helped to heal the wounds of the Philippines. In 1945, Candido and Luid Palting suggested that the Miguels repatriate to the United States. Since Bob was born in New York, he was their passport to the United States. In 1945, Cely, Mike, and Bob set sail once again, this time on the U.S.S. *Noordam*. Art and Ces, both very young, were left in the care of Cely's brother, Ingo, until the family was settled in the United States. In San Francisco, the young family was met this time by the Red Cross. They were offered a little pocket money and clothing and tickets for a train to New York City.

In New York, Cely and Mike stayed with their friends, the Ligots, until they could find jobs and place to live. Fortunately, Cely was able to get her job as a nursing supervisor at New York Hospital. In 1948, Art and Ces were finally able to join their family in New York.

For the next several years, Cely remained active in the New York area. She organized and became the president of the Filipino Nurses Association and the Filipino Women's Club. In 1950, the family moved to St. Albans, Queens. In 1956, Cely became a member of the Eastern Star, becoming a matron of the club. In 1969, Cely retired from New York Hospital and in 1971 moved to Stony Brook on Long Island.

Today, Cely is still an active member of the Eastern Star and the Women's Guild of her church, the Orchid Society, and the Senior Citizens of Stony Brook. Cely is a renaissance woman who has accomplished much in the past 90 years. On behalf of her children, Bob, Art, Glo, Ces, and Clem and her grandchildren, Rina, Arthuro, Fernando, Christiaan, Erik, and Philip, I wish Cely Miguel a very happy birthday. Together with my wife Carol Ann, I am honored to join her family in the celebration of her 90th year. We wish for her continued health and great happiness.

SALUTE TO RAY GONZALES

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to honor a brave man who risked his life to save an innocent victim last December during the worst mass murder in Ventura County's history.

Ray Gonzales, an insurance and financial services specialist in Oxnard, CA was truly in the right place at the right time, and I believe his exploits deserve our recognition.

Mr. Gonzales was leaving his office on December 2, 1993, when he noticed a disturb-

ance at the nearby office of the California Employment Development Department. As he is experienced at giving CPR, he made a U-turn and headed to the EDD office. When he pulled up, he saw Irma Lopez—an EDD employee and the wife of Oxnard Mayor Manuel Lopez—under fire by a deranged gunman.

Mindless of his own safety, Mr. Gonzales jumped out of his vehicle, dragged Mrs. Lopez into it, and sped off to a nearby hospital. Although seriously wounded, I am pleased to report that Mrs. Lopez is expected to make a full recovery. Tragically, three of her coworkers were murdered in the attack.

Modestly, Mr. Gonzales later said he was not a hero for his actions. He said, and I quote,

A hero is one that goes above and beyond the line of duty, as Officer O'Brien did by giving his life. I just did what any ordinary citizen is obligated to do.

Officer Jim O'Brien, the Oxnard police officer killed by the gunman, was indeed a hero, but Mr. Speaker, so was Ray Gonzales. Next Wednesday, the Oxnard Chamber of Commerce and the Oxnard Press Courier will honor him for his heroism at the 47th annual Community Awards Night, and I ask my colleagues to join in saluting him as well.

H.R. 3790, THE RURAL CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1994

HON. JILL L. LONG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman SKELTON, Congressman GUNDERSON and I introduced legislation—the Rural Consumer Protection Act of 1994—to ensure affordable electric rates for rural consumers who are members of electric cooperatives.

Specifically, this bill would prohibit a municipal utility from forcing a cooperative to stop serving its existing territory if the municipal decides to annex that territory into its own boundaries. I must emphasize that this legislation does not prevent municipal annexation. It simply prevents a municipal system from condemning, in a hostile manner, the service territory of a rural electric cooperative, thereby depriving the rural electric system of the chance to serve a few densely settled areas in order to balance the higher cost of serving more sparsely settled rural areas.

This legislation picks up where the Congress left off last session. As my colleagues may recall, House and Senate conferees agreed to include this legislative language in the 1993 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act. However, the provision was deleted, like many other provisions, by the "Byrd Rule."

The language contained in the bill we have introduced today mirrors the language of last

year with one important change. This legislation will allow a municipal electric the option of having an independent third party determine which electric distributor would best serve the public interest.

Just like the language from last year, nothing in this legislation will prevent a State from implementing its own provision concerning the curtailment or limitation of electric service and will not apply to any action by an electric utility taken prior to enactment of this legislation. Just as last year, this bill would afford rural electric cooperatives the same treatment as rural water systems with regard to providing electric service to an area annexed by a city.

I understand that additional changes may need to be made to this or similar legislation. Certain accommodations may need to be made to move forward on this issue. In that regard, we need to undertake official hearings. In fact, some organizations impacted by last year's language were concerned about the lack of hearings on this issue. They had a good point. Hearings must be held on this issue. All parties impacted by this legislation must be heard. In this regard, I have officially requested a subcommittee hearing on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the introduction of the Rural Consumer Protection Act of 1994 marks a starting point. I look forward to working with my colleagues and all interested parties on this important matter.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1994

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1994, which contains the recommendations of the House members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

I. IN-DEPTH STUDY

Created by Congress in August of 1992, the joint committee's mandate was to conduct an in-depth examination of the internal operations of the House and Senate and provide recommendations for reform by the end of 1993. This was only the third time in the history of Congress that a joint committee was established to conduct a comprehensive review of legislative operations.

The joint committee was created for three main reasons:

First, a concern that Congress might not be adequately organized to meet the challenges of the 21st century;

Second, a general sense that it simply was time for Congress to take stock of its internal

operations—the last major overhaul of this institution took place more than two decades ago; and

Third, the widespread public concern about the effectiveness and institutional integrity of Congress.

According to the resolution that created the joint committee, the membership of the panel was equally divided between the chambers and between the two political parties. I served as co-chairman for the House, while my Senate counterpart was Senator DAVID BOREN. The House vice-chairman was first Representative Bill Gradison and then Representative DAVID DREIER, and the Senate vice-chairman was Senator PETE DOMENICI.

The joint committee's study of Congress was careful and far-reaching. As part of our year-long effort, members of the panel conducted 36 hearings, receiving a total of 144 hours of testimony from over 240 witnesses. Members of Congress and congressional staff were surveyed to get additional input about reform options. Symposia were conducted with former Members, current and former staff, academics, and other outside experts. The joint committee was assisted by independent studies conducted by the Renewing Congress project of the Brookings Institution and the American Enterprise Institute, and by the Carnegie Commission on Science, Technology, and Government. The committee benefited from regular and sustained input from private citizens across the country.

II. PROPOSALS FOR MAJOR CHANGE

Due to time constraints and the difficult nature of many reform issues, the House and Senate sides of the joint committee proceeded along separate, but parallel, tracks in finalizing specific reform recommendations. However, House and Senate Members of the panel worked in careful collaboration during most of the joint committee's deliberations. As a result, the House and Senate reform packages are very similar, providing both chambers with a common core of proposals for reforming Congress. My hope is that the bicameral nature of the reform effort will continue as our recommendations move through the legislative process.

The recommendations I am introducing today were reported by the House members of the joint committee in November of 1993. I believe that these proposals are a significant step toward comprehensive congressional reform. Included are proposals to:

Apply laws to Congress in a manner consistent with the separation of powers.

Include private citizens in the House ethics process in a meaningful way.

Fundamentally alter the Federal budget process by putting it on a 2-year, rather than an annual, cycle.

Cut congressional staff by as much as 12 percent.

Streamline the committee system by reducing assignments and cutting the number of subcommittees.

Open up Congress to more public scrutiny by, for example, publicizing special interest projects in committee reports—a reform that will provide a major disincentive to wasteful spending.

Guarantee to the Minority the right to offer a full policy alternative on all legislation considered on the House floor.

There are dozens of other worthwhile proposals included in this package.

III. IMPORTANT FIRST STEP

The recommendations of the joint committee will now move to other forums. Many issues must be resolved in the committees of jurisdiction and on the floor of the House, as well as by the party caucuses. My hope is that in the weeks and months ahead we can make a strong package even stronger. Even without further refinements, however, the reform package reported by House members of the joint committee would constitute the most sweeping reform of the House in decades.

In closing I would like to express my appreciation to DAVID DREIER, the House vice-chairman of the joint committee, and to DAVID BOREN and PETE DOMENICI, our Senate counterparts. I also thank the other members of the joint committee for their effort and their contribution, as well as the many other Members of Congress who testified at our hearings, spoke with us informally, or otherwise contributed to the important work of congressional reform. It has been a pleasure to work with all of these individuals.

WAYMON HICKMAN TRIBUTE

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, while this House stood in recess a constituent of mine, Waymon Hickman, was presented with the 1993 Lucille Queener Courtney Community Service Award by the Maury County, TN Historical Benefit Ball.

As one who counts Waymon Hickman as a friend and as one who has witnessed firsthand his many good works in Columbia and Maury County, I am pleased to congratulate him on this honor and to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

At a time when we can use more examples of principled public service, there are few whose active efforts and far-reaching civic involvement fit the bill better than Waymon.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting his achievement, and I ask that the following account, from the pages of the Columbia Daily Herald be reprinted in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Columbia Daily Herald, Jan. 23, 1994]

WAYMON HICKMAN RECIPIENT OF 1993 LUCILLE QUEENER COURTNEY COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD

(By Marvine Sugg)

If you want something done, just ask a busy person.

This is an old cliché, but one that characterizes the 1993 recipient of the Lucille Queener Courtney Community Service Award—Waymon Logan Hickman.

Hickman is president and chief executive officer of First Farmers and Merchants National Bank.

"Waymon Logan Hickman has served countless hours providing many benefits for our community and its citizens," said Randy Stevens, executive vice president of First Farmers, who nominated Hickman for the award. "He has worked extremely hard over the years to benefit our county on a local, state, and national level."

Hickman was valedictorian of his graduating class at Dixie High School in Union City. He received his B.S. degree from the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. He is also a graduate of the School of Banking of the South at Louisiana State University and Kennedy Sinclair Trust School and New York City.

He has served as chairman of the United Givers Fund, president of Mt. Pleasant Rotary and Columbia Kiwanis clubs, the Maury County Chamber of Commerce, the UT Maury County Alumni Association and has held offices in the UT National Alumni Association.

Over the years, he has been active and held several offices in Boy Scouts of America, and was the recipient of the Long Rifle Award and Silver Beaver Award. Presently, he serves on the executive board of the Middle Tennessee Chapter and the Southern Regional Board of Boy Scouts of America.

Hickman served as chairman of the board at Columbia Military Academy and Columbia Area Mental Health Clinic and member of the board of directors of King's Daughters' School. He is currently a member of the board of trustees at Maury Regional Hospital.

He was the recipient of the Jaycees Distinguished Service Award and was named a Paul Harris Fellow by the Rotary Foundation. He served as Maury County coordinator for the Saturn Task Force and was named Tennessee Industrial Development Volunteer of the Year.

At the present, he is vice chairman of the Columbia State Foundation Board and is a member of the board of trustees at Martin Methodist College.

Currently president of the Tennessee Bankers Association, Hickman said, "this job has kept me busy this year."

He is also a member of several boards and committees affiliated with the banking profession.

Hickman is a member of First United Methodist Church where he is a former Sunday School teacher. He has also served as

chairman of the finance committee, and chairman of the board.

He is married to the former Carey Busby and they are the parents of four children, Major Waymon Logan Hickman Jr. of Leavenworth, Kan., Captain William Busby Hickman of Columbus, Ga., Nancy Anne Hickman McNulty of Brentwood; and John Lee Hickman of Franklin. They have two grandchildren—Margaret Carey McNulty and Miles Logan McNulty.

His mother, 91-year-old Mrs. Lee Hickman, a retired school teacher, lives in Mt. Pleasant.

"I enjoy golf if I ever have the time," Hickman said when asked how he spent his leisure time.

He walks three miles every night which is not only good exercise but also provides an outlet from the stress of his profession.

"Both Nell (Woodard) and I feel honored to be named recipients of this award," said Hickman. "Lucille Courtney was so special to both of us."

Mrs. Woodard was the 1992 recipient of the award.

Applications for the 1994 Lucille Courtney Community Service Award, sponsored by the Maury County Historical Benefit Ball, must be received by Feb. 5. Those placing a nomination should include their name along with a resume of the nominee's civic activities. Nominees must be Maury County residents.

Mail applications to: Maury County Historical Benefit Ball, P.O. Box 1214, Columbia, TN 38402.

The recipient will be honored during the Benefit Ball, scheduled for Saturday, March 5, at the Memorial Building.

This year's beneficiaries are the APTA, Maury County Public Education Foundation, and the Maury County Animal Shelter.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE B.K. ROBERTS

HON. DOUGLAS "PETE" PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, the State of Florida is honoring one of its most prestigious public servants, as only the third individual to ever receive the Distinguished Floridian Award. When the Honorable Judge B.K. Roberts stands before the Economic Club of Florida to receive this award, he will join former Governor LeRoy Collins and former clerk of the Florida House, Allen Morris as one of the most accomplished and respected public servants in the history of the Sunshine State.

One cannot help being overwhelmed by Judge Roberts' professional record. At the age of 21, he graduated from the University of Florida with a degree in law and quickly established himself as one of the finest lawyers in

the State capital. For the next 20 years he ran one of the most successful law firms that the Second Congressional District of Florida has ever seen. Despite being blind in one eye as a result of a boyhood accident, Judge Roberts interrupted his law practice during World War II to serve as an officer in the U.S. Coast Guard. After returning from his service in the military, Judge Roberts reestablished his practice and was soon appointed by then Governor Fuller Warren to the Florida Supreme Court, where he served for the next 27 years.

It was during this time that Judge Roberts provided his most notable contributions to the public sector. Under his guidance, the Florida Supreme Court created the judicial council to facilitate court reforms and improve the judicial system of the State on every level. Judge Roberts also spearheaded the creation of a district court of appeals system for the State and implemented a public defender system that became the model for the rest of the Nation. These accomplishments combined with Judge Roberts' 17 years of service as the chairman of the judicial council led to the complete reorganization of the State's courts system and earned him the title "The Father of Florida's Modern Court System."

Even more important than his contributions to our system of justice, is the fact Judge Roberts' provides us with living proof that the human spirit can overcome any obstacle. This native of Sopchoppy, FL, is an example to every American that through hard work, courage, and determination a person can accomplish anything he or she desires. As a virtually penniless 16-year-old freshman in college, Judge Roberts was determined to earn a degree in law despite being told by student leaders that because of his worn clothing that he was a source of embarrassment to the university and should go back to the farm. Little did those students know that they were addressing a young man who would eventually become one of the finest lawyers in the land and one of the most famous justices ever to serve on the Florida Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to pay this tribute to Judge Roberts. I consider him a true friend and a mentor who has served as a source of inspiration for me as well as for all those whose lives he has touched through the years. Once again, I congratulate him on this prestigious honor and I wish him and his dear wife, Mary, the very best.

SALUTE TO CHIEF PAUL MILLER

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I served for 6 years as the mayor of my hometown of Simi Valley,

CA, before my neighbors elected me as their Representative. During my tenure as mayor, I am perhaps the proudest of the way we rebuilt our police department, and in so doing helped make Simi Valley one of the safest cities in America.

Perhaps the biggest part of that turnaround was the city council's decision in 1992 to hire Paul Miller as our city's police chief. Within months, he had reformed several poorly designed policies and begun bringing the professionalism the department was in need of. The turnaround was so impressive that the Ventura County Grand Jury—an organization notoriously difficult to impress—went out of its way to praise Paul.

Now, after 12 years of serving the people of Simi Valley—and 32 years in law enforcement, Paul has decided to retire. He can look back on a remarkably successful career.

Paul began his law enforcement career with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, starting out patrolling a beat in East Los Angeles. After a variety of assignments, he eventually rose to lieutenant, where among other things he wrote a career development manual and a 5-year plan to automate the department's recordkeeping system.

In 1982, he joined the Simi Valley police as a captain, and as problems in the department came to a boil, quickly became acting chief, and in October of that year, was named permanent chief.

He has been an innovative leader, establishing antidrug and antigang programs, establishing special weapons and hostage negotiations units, and buffed the department's professionalism to a fine gloss. He and his department showed their abilities to the world during the dedication of the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library in 1981—the only time in our history that five living presidents were together in one location—and during potentially explosive white supremacist rallies following the verdict in the Rodney King beating trial. In both these situations, Paul and the men and women of the Simi Valley Police Department showed their training and dedication to duty.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Miller will be honored for his accomplishments next Thursday at a retirement dinner in Simi Valley. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting him as well, and in wishing Paul and his wife, Connie, well in the years to come.

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD
ZAIRE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues cor-

respondence with the State Department concerning United States policy toward Zaire. On December 1, 1993, I wrote to Secretary Christopher urging a more active United States policy toward Zaire. On January 28, I received a reply from Assistant Secretary Wendy Sherman, on behalf of the Department. The text of the correspondence is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, December 1, 1993.

HON. WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I write this letter to urge a more active United States policy toward Zaire.

The U.S. continues to have significant interests at stake in Zaire because of its forty million people, vast mineral wealth, and strategic location in the center of Africa. The U.S. also has a humanitarian interest in relieving the suffering of Zaire's people. Finally, the U.S. has some responsibility for events in Zaire because of long-standing U.S. ties to Mobutu.

Since I wrote to you on this issue last February, the situation in Zaire has continued to deteriorate. Coordinated efforts by the U.S., France, and Belgium to pressure Mobutu to accept reform do not appear to have had much impact.

I believe the United States should now undertake a two-track strategy in Zaire. On a first track, the U.S. should move more aggressively to promote negotiations between Mobutu and the political opposition. Pressure should be exerted on both sides to facilitate these negotiations.

I urge you to:

First, notify Mobutu that if he blocks the current negotiations, the U.S. will increase his international isolation by: calling upon Mobutu to step down from power; downgrading diplomatic relations with Zaire; and freezing assets—however modest—held in the U.S. by Mobutu, his family and his close associates.

Second, notify Mobutu that the U.S. will act alone, if necessary, on these steps. While the U.S. should work closely wherever possible with France and Belgium on policy toward Zaire, the U.S. should not let French and Belgian domestic concerns drive U.S. policy.

Third, make clear to the opponents of the current regime, including Prime Minister Tsishekedi, that they must accept responsibility for negotiating seriously with Mobutu about Zaire's future.

A second track should explore creative ways to respond to the humanitarian, developmental and governance crises that confront Zaire. The U.S. should take a more activist approach to disaster assistance for Zaire, and develop a program in support of reconstruction in Zaire.

I urge you to:

First, provide more extensive resources to non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to reach affected and threatened people, especially in Shaba and Kivu provinces.

Second, support developmental projects of private voluntary organizations in small enterprise development, agricultural production, and social services in those parts of Zaire that today remain relatively peaceful.

Third, encourage the expansion of civil institutions and the development of new leaders who can replace those figures, both in government and opposition, who have dominated Zairean politics for the past thirty years. AID has developed similar innovative "democracy/governance" programs in other African countries.

Fourth, retain the ability of AID to provide substantial assistance to Zaire through NGOs, whether or not you close the AID mission in Kinshasa. New flexible, and creative AID efforts are needed to respond to the difficult situation in Zaire.

I realize that this approach requires more money being spent on Zaire, and a possible shift in resources from other recipient African countries to Zaire. But I believe that U.S. interests in preventing a further deterioration in Zaire, and the potential costs of such a deterioration to Zaire's neighbors, argue in favor of such a resource allocation.

I look forward to your early reply and to working with you on this issue.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, January 28, 1994.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been asked to reply to your letter of December 1, concerning U.S. policy toward Zaire. Your letter raises a number of important questions and offers some useful and timely recommendations. We are already making progress in some of the areas of your concern. I would like to discuss U.S. policy initiatives in recent months on Zaire, and to outline current thinking on how best to address the serious political, social, economic and humanitarian problems which afflict this important African country. I have attached to this letter an information sheet which reviews recent developments in Zaire.

The political paralysis in Kinshasa poses real and pressing problems for U.S. policy in Zaire. As you know, the political impasse is at the heart of the social, economic, and humanitarian crises that afflict the country. Against the background of crisis and decline in Zaire, the Administration's position has been clear: consistent pressure on President Mobutu—through bilateral measures and working within the Trilateral framework with France and Belgium—to permit the peaceful transition to democracy to proceed. At the same time, we have attempted to ameliorate the urgent humanitarian crisis by providing emergency relief through international NGO's.

In your letter, you urged the United States to increase President Mobutu's international isolation. We have already taken steps in

this direction. We have made clear to President Mobutu that we will not send a new ambassador to Zaire until he stops blocking progress toward democratic change. Downgrading relations further could involve closing our Embassy in Kinshasa. Although we have not excluded this option, such an action would deprive us of the invaluable insight of American diplomatic personnel on the ground in Zaire. It would also hinder our ability to provide consular assistance to American citizens still resident in the country. An assets freeze directed against Mobutu raises a number of complex issues, but the Administration has not excluded such an action from our discussions on U.S. policy toward Zaire. We have called on President Mobutu on many occasions to share meaningful power with his democratic opponents. He is, however, recognized as chief of state by all political entities in Zaire, including the Sovereign National Conference and its successor institution, the High Council of the Republic.

In recent meetings with the French and Belgians we have also made clear to our European partners that while the United States prefers to act in concert with Paris and Brussels, we do not rule out the possibility of unilateral actions in Zaire. We agree that U.S. policy toward Zaire should not be driven or constrained by French and Belgian domestic concerns.

President Mobutu bears overwhelming responsibility for the disastrous condition of Zaire, but the opposition has at times demonstrated considerable political immaturity and even greater political ineptitude. The December 10 Trilateral demarche to Prime Minister Tshisekedi was, in part, an effort to convey the message that the opposition must accept responsibility for negotiating seriously with President Mobutu about Zaire's future. The situation in Kinshasa remains fluid, but we hope that recent events will result in a coalition government of national unity which can begin to address the grave problems which confront Zaire. If the talks flounder once again, it may be wise to reinforce the message which the three western envoys delivered in December.

The Administration shares your view that further deterioration in the situation in Zaire could have serious consequences for the region, and we are taking all practical measures to stem the humanitarian crisis. In 1993 the U.S. provided 6.5 million dollars in emergency relief to NGOs; in 1994 our humanitarian assistance will likely approach 10 million dollars. The United States will continue to expand its work with international and appropriate local NGOs in Zaire, especially in Shaba, North Kivu, Kinshasa, and the Kasai provinces.

As appropriate within our budget and a more conducive political environment in Zaire, USAID may consider working with NGOs on development assistance programs aimed at strengthening Zaire's civil society. We are also looking for ways to obtain congressional approval for small-scale Democracy and Human Rights projects in Zaire under section 116(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act. We believe that such projects could lay a groundwork for future USAID democracy and governance programs in Zaire. Traditional non-humanitarian development assistance to Zaire has been prohibited under Brooke Amendment sanctions since 1991. De-

spite the announced closure of the USAID mission in Kinshasa, USAID remains committed to retaining a presence in Zaire. USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance will place a long-term contractor in Kinshasa to monitor and report on the status of United States Government-funded humanitarian programs in the displaced population, to monitor the humanitarian situation in Zaire, and to report on emergencies requiring a response from the United States. Additionally, a joint USAID Africa Bureau-Bureau of Humanitarian Response (BHR) Assessment team will travel to Zaire in the near future to review current humanitarian programs and identify local NGOs which might be suitable for channeling USG emergency relief funding.

I would like to thank you for your interest in the grave political, social, economic, and humanitarian problems which afflict Zaire. This Administration intends to remain engaged in Zaire. We look forward to working with you on finding creative solutions to support the establishment of democracy in Zaire, restore economic stability, and confront the humanitarian crisis.

I hope this information is helpful in responding to your concerns. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

WENDY R. SHERMAN,

Assistant Secretary,

Legislative Affairs.

Enclosure.

INFORMATION SHEET ON ZAIRE

The transition to democracy in Zaire remains at an impasse. The work of Zaire's Sovereign National Conference (convened in August 1991) and its successor institution, the High Council of the Republic (HCR), has not yet led to the establishment of a democratic government in Zaire. President Mobutu exercises firm control of the country's finances and the military, and the government of Transition Prime Minister Etienne Tshisekedi remains without effective power.

In April 1993, Mobutu named a new government, led by former opposition leader Faustin Birindwa. In an effort to resolve the chaos of this "doubling" of institutions, and to move the Transition forward, the Archbishop of Kisangani (and President of the HCR) Laurent Monsengwo Pasinya began a mediation effort to break the political impasse. In response to urging from the United States and other countries, the UN Secretary General also sent a Special Representative to Zaire to mediate between Mobutu and the opposition. Monsengwo and the UNSYG Special Representative, Lakhdar Brahimi (former Algerian Foreign Minister), brought the opposing parties to the brink of an accord on the institutional framework of the transition. When Brahimi left Zaire in October, however, the agreement remained unsigned, and a "final" meeting of the two camps was scheduled, postponed, and then rescheduled.

In early December, the opposition Holy Union and Allies (USORAL) in Kinshasa announced a unilateral suspension of participation in the negotiations. On December 10, the

U.S. Charge d'Affaires in Kinshasa, accompanied by the Ambassadors of France and Belgium, made a demarche to both Mobutu and Tshisekedi. The three western envoys urged the parties to resume negotiations on the transition, sign the accord, and then put in place an effective coalition government (without exclusions) as soon as possible. Reports indicate that Mobutu responded favorably to the demarche, but that Tshisekedi rejected it as "capitulation" to Mobutu.

On January 4, in a major address to the nation, President Mobutu called on the opposing sides to resume negotiations and to conclude an agreement by January 12. Mobutu cynically placed the blame for the chaos in Zaire on the "political class" (including his own close allies), and said that he would take unspecified unilateral action should an agreement not be reached by his deadline. Observers in Kinshasa and here in Washington are not sanguine that an agreement can be reached in this timeframe, nor that it will result in a coalition government headed by Prime Minister Tshisekedi.

While the political situation on the ground in Zaire remains confused, the economy continues its downward spiral. The Birindwa regime announced in October a "monetary reform" which included introduction of a new currency. This reform fueled hyperinflation and caused artificial shortages throughout the capital as merchants refused to accept the "new Zaire". In response, the Birindwa government instituted price controls, enforcing the measure with price police who intimidated merchants (especially expatriate businesses) into selling their stores below cost. Birindwa demonetized the old Zaire effective December 10, 1993 while hyperinflation (125 percent in November 1993, and over 8300 percent annualized) continues.

There continue to be widespread shortages in the markets of Kinshasa, and in a reminder of military pillages in September 1991 and January 1993, in November 1993 soldiers rioted in Kananga (Western Kasai) over pay issues. There are reports that an airline warehouse was looted, and the storage depot of a local Catholic PVO (filled with supplies for displaced persons from Shaba) was hit by marauding soldiers. At least three civilians, including a Zairian Catholic priest were reported killed. There have also been reports of military pillaging in Mbuji-Mayi (Eastern Kasai), where soldiers have been attempting to force recalcitrant Kasalian merchants to accept the Mobutu government's new currency.

The humanitarian situation remains bleak, although USAID's Bureau for Food and Humanitarian Assistance and Bureau for Africa has developed a strategy to meet the urgent needs on the ground in Zaire. USAID estimates that there are more than 3 million persons in Zaire at risk from malnutrition (2 million in the Kinshasa region alone). As a result of inter-ethnic violence, principally in North Kivu, the Kasais, and Shaba, more than 750,000 people have been driven from their homes and businesses.

We have had disturbing reports from Shaba that local and provincial authorities have ordered the forced removal of already displaced Kasaians living in squalid transit camps near the town of Likasi. The Deputy Chief of Mission from our Embassy in Kinshasa traveled in late December to the area to investigate

the reports, and to lodge a strong protest with the Shaban authorities. Similarly, our Charge has made a demarche to a senior Shaban political figure in Kinshasa, and to President Mobutu's security advisor, condemning the action.

At present, the United States provides only emergency humanitarian assistance in Zaire, working exclusively with international NGO's (Catholic Relief Services, World Vision, Doctors without Borders/Belgium). The bulk of these resources are being used to assist the displaced populations in Shaba and Kasai provinces. In the 1993 fiscal year, the U.S. provided approximately 7 million dollars in humanitarian assistance. It is likely that U.S. humanitarian assistance in Zaire will approach 10 million dollars this fiscal year.

The United States suspended development assistance to Zaire in 1991 due to Brooke Amendment sanctions, and the USAID mission in Kinshasa will close in early 1994. After the closure, however, humanitarian programs in Zaire will be monitored by a USAID-funded personal services contractor. USAID relief activities should not be constrained by this transition since funding is channeled primarily through NGO's.

TRIBUTE TO MARINE VICTOR C. FISHER

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fellow central New Yorker, Victor C. Fisher, who has been selected as the 1992 Marine of the Year by the National Marine Corps League.

Marine Victor Fisher has proven himself capable and dedicated to the Corps League since he began service in 1963. Throughout his career he has been an inspiration locally, to his fellow workers, and to his community as a whole.

He initiated the Star Spangled Banner project, which educates the public on proper care and display procedures for our Nation's flag. He is a constant helper with the Marine Corps Reserves annual Toys for Tots campaign, and State Children's Hospital's doll collecting drive and the American Cancer Society's annual fundraiser.

Marine Fisher has been awarded the Chapel of Four Chaplains Bronze Medallion for exemplary individual commitment to religious, cultural, and racial understanding and to the cause of world service and world peace.

He is a remarkable human being who has served his community, and our great Nation, very well indeed.

WHATEVER YOU DID UNTO ONE OF THE LEAST, YOU DID UNTO ME

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that there is no person, man or woman, on this Earth, more admired by more people than Mother Teresa of Calcutta. Inspired by God to found the Missionaries of Charity, her sisters are known for their acts of kindness, their service, and their profound love for the poorest of the poor in 105 countries throughout the world. Thousands of compassionate women have been inspired by Mother Teresa to give their lives over to serving the sick and dying.

I doubt if even Joycelyn Elders could face Mother Teresa and tell her to get over her "love affair with the fetus" and accuse her of being a "non-Christian Christian" who only cares about children before birth.

Today we were blessed to have Mother Teresa present in our Nation's Capital speaking at the National Prayer Breakfast. No one could listen to her and not feel that—in this small, frail, humble woman—there stood a powerful messenger sent from God to speak to a Nation gone astray. In particular, her remarks to Mr. Clinton hearkened back an Old Testament prophet admonishing the king, or John the Baptist before Herod. She challenged Mr. Clinton to rethink his current position in support of abortion—the destruction of unborn children—and reclaim his former position of opposition to abortion.

We can only hope and pray that, while his lips were repeating the words of Scripture, his heart had been enkindled with the love that is the essence of the Word of God, the love for the unborn about which Mother Teresa spoke.

I ask that her remarks be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

WHATEVER YOU DID UNTO ONE OF THE LEAST, YOU DID UNTO ME—MOTHER TERESA OF CALCUTTA

On the last day, Jesus will say to those on His right hand, "Come, enter the Kingdom. For I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was sick and you visited me." Then Jesus will turn to those on His left hand and say, "Depart from me because I was hungry and you did not feed me, I was thirsty and you did not give me to drink, I was sick and you did not visit me." These will ask Him, "When did we see You hungry, or thirsty or sick and did not come to Your help?" And Jesus will answer them, "Whatever you neglected to do unto one of the least of these, you neglected to do unto me!"

As we have gathered here to pray together, I think it will be beautiful if we begin with a prayer that expresses very well what Jesus wants us to do for the least. St. Francis of

Assisi understood very well these words of Jesus and His life is very well expressed by a prayer. And this prayer, which we say every day after Holy Communion, always surprises me very much, because it is very fitting for each one of us. And I always wonder whether 800 years ago when St. Francis lived, they had the same difficulties that we have today. I think that some of you already have this prayer of peace—so we will pray it together.

Let us thank God for the opportunity He has given us today to have come here to pray together. We have come here especially to pray for peace, joy and love. We are reminded that Jesus came to bring the good news to the poor. He had told us what is that good news when He said: "My peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you." He came not to give the peace of the world which is only that we don't bother each other. He came to give the peace of heart which comes from loving—from doing good to others.

And God loved the world so much that He gave His son—it was a giving. God gave His son to the Virgin Mary, and what did she do with Him? As soon as Jesus came into Mary's life, immediately she went in haste to give that good news. And as she came into the house of her cousin, Elizabeth, Scripture tells us that the unborn child—the child in the womb of Elizabeth—leapt with joy. While still in the womb of Mary—Jesus brought peace to John the Baptist who leapt for joy in the womb of Elizabeth.

And as if that were not enough, as if it were not enough that God the Son should become one of us and bring peace and joy while still in the womb of Mary, Jesus also died on the Cross to show that greater love. He died for you and for me, and for that leper and for that man dying of hunger and that naked person lying in the street, not only of Calcutta, but of Africa, and everywhere. Our Sisters serve these poor people in 105 countries throughout the world. Jesus insisted that we love one another as He loves each one of us. Jesus gave His life to love us and He tells us that we also have to give whatever it takes to do good to one another. And in the Gospel Jesus says very clearly: "Love as I have loved you."

Jesus died on the Cross because that is what it took for Him to do good to us—to save us from our selfishness in sin. He gave up everything to do the Father's will—to show us that we too must be willing to give up everything to do God's will—to love one another as He loves each of us. If we are not willing to give whatever it takes to do good to one another, sin is still in us. That is why we too must give to each other until it hurts.

It is not enough for us to say: "I love God," but I also have to love my neighbor. St. John says that you are a liar if you say you love God and you don't love your neighbor. How can you love God whom you do not see, if you do not love your neighbor whom you see, whom you touch, with whom you live? And so it is very important for us to realize that love, to be true, has to hurt. I must be willing to give whatever it takes not to harm other people and, in fact, to do good to them. This requires that I be willing to give until it hurts. Otherwise, there is no true love in me and I bring injustice, not peace, to those around me.

It hurt Jesus to love us. We have been created in His image for greater things, to love

and to be loved. We must "put on Christ" as Scripture tells us. And so, we have been created to love as He loves us. Jesus makes himself the hungry one, the naked one, the homeless one, the unwanted one, and He says, "You did it to Me." On the last day He will say to those on His right, "whatever you did to the least of these you did to Me, and He will also say to those on His left, whatever you neglected to do for the least of these, you neglected to do it for Me."

When He was dying on the Cross, Jesus said, "I thirst." Jesus is thirsting for our love, and this is the thirst of everyone, poor and rich alike. We all thirst for the love of others, that they go out of their way to avoid harming us and to do good to us. This is the meaning of true love, to give until it hurts.

I can never forget the experience I had in visiting a home where they kept all these old parents of sons and daughters who had just put them into an institution and forgotten them—maybe. I saw that in that home these old people had everything—good food, comfortable place, television, everything, but everyone was looking toward the door. And I did not see a single one with a smile on the face. I turned to Sister and I asked: "Why do these people who have every comfort here, why are they all looking toward the door? Why are they not smiling?"

I am so used to seeing the smiles on our people, even the dying ones smile. And Sister said: "This is the way it is nearly every day. They are expecting, they are hoping that a son or daughter will come to visit them. They are hurt because they are forgotten." And see, this neglect to love brings spiritual poverty. Maybe in our own family we have somebody who is feeling lonely, who is feeling sick, who is feeling worried. Are we there? Are we willing to give until it hurts in order to be with our families, or do we put our own interests first? These are the questions we must ask ourselves, especially as we begin this year of the family. We must remember that love begins at home and we must also remember that "the future of humanity passes through the family."

I was surprised in the West to see so many young boys and girls given to drugs. And I tried to find out why. Why is it like that, when those in the West have so many more things than those in the East? And the answer was: "Because there is no one in the family to receive them." Our children depend on us for everything—their health, their nutrition, their security, their coming to know and love God. For all of this, they look to us with trust, hope and expectation. But often father and mother are so busy they have no time for their children, or perhaps they are not even married or have given up on their marriage. So the children go to the streets and get involved in drugs or other things. We are talking of love of the child, which is where love and peace must begin. These are the things that break peace.

But I feel that the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion, because it is a war against the child, a direct killing of the innocent child, murder by the mother herself. And if we accept that a mother can kill even her own child, how can we tell other people not to kill one another? How do we persuade a woman not to have an abortion? As always, we must persuade her with love and we re-

mind ourselves that love means to be willing to give until it hurts. Jesus gave even His life to love us. So, the mother who is thinking of abortion, should be helped to love, that is, to give until it hurts her plans, or her free time, to respect the life of her child. The father of that child, whoever he is, must also give until it hurts.

By abortion, the mother does not learn to love, but kills even her own child to solve her problems. And, by abortion, the father is told that he does not have to take any responsibility at all for the child he has brought into the world. That father is likely to put other women into the same trouble. So abortion just leads to more abortion. Any country that accepts abortion is not teaching its people to love, but to use any violence to get what they want. This is why the greatest destroyer of love and peace is abortion.

Many people are very, very concerned with the children of India, with the children of Africa where quite a few die of hunger, and so on. Many people are also concerned about all the violence in this great country of the United States. These concerns are very good. But often these same people are not concerned with the millions who are being killed by the deliberate decision of their own mothers. And this is what is the greatest destroyer of peace today—abortion which brings people to such blindness.

And for this I appeal in India and I appeal everywhere—"Let us bring the child back." The child is God's gift to the family. Each child is created in the special image and likeness of God for greater things—to love and to be loved. In this year of the family we must bring the child back to the center of our care and concern. This is the only way that our world can survive because our children are the only hope for the future. As older people are called to God, only their children can take their places.

But what does God say to us? He says: "Even if a mother could forget her child, I will not forget you. I have carved you in the palm of my hand." We are carved in the palm of His hand; that unborn child has been carved in the hand of God from conception and is called by God to love and to be loved, not only now in this life, but forever. God can never forget us.

I will tell you something beautiful. We are fighting abortion by adoption—by care of the mother and adoption for her baby. We have saved thousands of lives. We have sent word to the clinics, to the hospitals and police stations: "Please don't destroy the child; we will take the child." So we always have someone tell the mothers in trouble: "Come, we will take care of you, we will get a home for your child." And we have a tremendous demand from couples who cannot have a child—but I never give a child to a couple who have done something not to have a child. Jesus said, "Anyone who receives a child in my name, receives me." By adopting a child, these couples receive Jesus but, by aborting a child, a couple refuses to receive Jesus.

Please don't kill the child. I want the child. Please give me the child. I am willing to accept any child who would be aborted and to give that child to a married couple who will love the child and be loved by the child. From our children's home in Calcutta

alone, we have saved over 3000 children from abortion. These children have brought such love and joy to their adopting parents and have grown up so full of love and joy.

I know that couples have to plan their family and for that there is natural family planning. The way to plan the family is natural family planning, not contraception. In destroying the power of giving life, through contraception, a husband or wife is doing something to self. This turns the attention to self and so it destroys the gift of love in him or her. In loving, the husband and wife must turn the attention to each other as happens in natural family planning, and not to self, as happens in contraception. Once that living love is destroyed by contraception, abortion follows very easily.

I also know that there are great problems in the world—that many spouses do not love each other enough to practice natural family planning. We cannot solve all the problems in the world, but let us never bring in the worst problem of all, and that is to destroy love. And this is what happens when we tell people to practice contraception and abortion.

The poor are very great people. They can teach us so many beautiful things. Once one of them came to thank us for teaching her natural family planning and said: "You people who have practiced chastity, you are the best people to teach us natural family planning because it is nothing more than self-control out of love for each other." And what this poor person said is very true. These poor people may have nothing to eat, maybe they have not a home to live in, but they can still be great people when they are spiritually rich.

When I pick up a person from the street, hungry, I give him a plate of rice, a piece of bread. But a person who is shut out, who feels unwanted, unloved, terrified, the person who has been thrown out of society—that spiritual poverty is much harder to overcome. And abortion, which often follows from contraception, brings a people to be spiritually poor, and that is the worst poverty and the most difficult to overcome.

Those who are materially poor can be very wonderful people. One evening we went out and we picked up four people from the street. And one of them was in a most terrible condition. I told the Sisters: "You take care of the other three; I will take care of the one who looks worse." So I did for her all that my love can do. I put her in bed, and there was such a beautiful smile on her face. She took hold of my hand, as she said one word only: "thank you"—and she died.

I could not help but examine my conscience before her. And I asked: "What would I say if I were in her place?" And my answer was very simple. I would have tried to draw a little attention to myself. I would have said: "I am dying, I am cold, I am in pain," or something. But she gave me much more—she gave me her grateful love. And she died with a smile on her face. Then there was the man we picked up from the drain, half eaten by worms and, after we had brought him to the home, he only said, "I have lived like an animal in the street, but I am going to die as an angel, loved and cared for." Then, after we had removed all the worms from his body, all he said, with a big smile, was: "Sister, I am going home to God"—and he died. It was

so wonderful to see the greatness of that man who could speak like that without blaming anybody, without comparing anything. Like an angel—this is the greatness of people who are spiritually rich even when they are materially poor.

We are not social workers. We may be doing social work in the eyes of some people, but we must be contemplatives in the heart of the world. For we must bring that presence of God into your family, for the family that prays together, stays together. There is so much hatred, so much misery, and we with our prayer, with our sacrifice, are beginning at home. Love begins at home, and it is not how much we do, but how much love we put into what we do.

If we are contemplatives in the heart of the world with all its problems, these problems can never discourage us. We must always remember what God tells us in Scripture. "Even if a mother could forget the child in her womb—something impossible, but even if she could forget—I will never forget you.

And so here I am talking with you. I want you to find the poor here, right in your own home first. And begin love there. Begin that good news to your own people first. And find out about your next-door neighbors. Do you know who they are?

I had the most extraordinary experience of love of neighbor with a Hindu family. A gentleman came to our house and said: "Mother Teresa, there is a family who have not eaten for so long. Do something." So I took some rice and went there immediately. And I saw the children—their eyes shining with hunger. I don't know if you have ever seen hunger. But I have seen it very often. And the mother of the family took the rice I gave her and went out. When she came back, I asked her. "Where did you go? What did you do?" And she gave me a very simple answer: "They are hungry also." What struck me was that she knew—and who are they? A Muslim family—and she knew. I didn't bring any more rice that evening because I wanted them, Hindus and Muslims, to enjoy the joy of sharing.

But there were those children, radiating joy, sharing the joy and peace with their mother because she had the love to give until it hurts. And you see this is where love begins—at home in the family.

So, as the example of this family shows, God will never forget us and there is something you and I can always do. We can keep the joy of loving Jesus in our hearts, and share that joy with all we come in contact with. Let us make that one point—that no child will be unwanted, unloved, uncared for, or killed and thrown away. And give until it hurts—with a smile.

Because I talk so much of giving with a smile, once a professor from the United States asked me: "Are you married?" And I said: "Yes, and I find it sometimes very difficult to smile at my spouse, Jesus, because He can be very demanding—sometimes." This is really something true. And there is where love comes in—when it is demanding, and yet we can give it with joy.

One of the most demanding things for me is travelling everywhere—and with publicity. I have said to Jesus that if I don't go to heaven for anything else, I will be going to heaven for all the travelling with all the

publicity, because it has purified me and sacrificed me and made me really ready to go to heaven.

If we remember that God loves us, and that we can love others as He loves us, then America can become a sign of peace for the world. From here, a sign of care for the weakest of the weak—the unborn child—must go out to the world. If you become a burning light of justice and peace in the world, then really you will be true to what the founders of this country stood for. God bless you!

TRIBUTE TO THE LIMA-ALLEN COUNTY NAACP

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, my best wishes and support go to the Lima-Allen County, OH, branch of the NAACP, as its members are making their final preparations for a radiothon, planned for February 12. The Lima-Allen County branch will on that day join with other branches of the NAACP from across the Nation in an effort to attract new members from the Lima-Allen County community, as well as to inspire old members to renew their commitment. In Lima, the broadcast will take place from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

As part of the effort, NAACP membership Sunday will be held in 26 area churches this coming Sunday. The group has received sponsorship from a number of prominent companies and organizations, including Bank One, Value City, and the Troy-Lima CAP Council.

Alice M. Turner is president of the branch, and my friend Malcolm McCoy, deserves recognition for his work with the organization. I wish them success in their upcoming radiothon and particularly commend their positive influence on young people in Lima and Allen County.

OLD BOSTON THEATER

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, it has been said, "All the world's a stage." This can certainly be said of the Federal Street Theater, known as Old Boston, which made Boston a permanent home for theatrical performances.

Prior to 1793, much of New England was encompassed by Federal and State acts prohibiting stage-play and their attendance. At-

tempts to have the Massachusetts ban of 1750 repealed were met with stiff opposition, including that of Samuel Adams. In 1792, a makeshift exhibition room, later called the board alley was opened for several weeks despite the ban. However, it was not until after the ban was lifted in 1793 that many consider the beginning of Boston's dramatic history to have properly begun with the opening productions of "Gustavus Vasa" and "Modern Antiques" on February 3, 1794, at the theater on Federal Street, later called Old Boston, this country's first playhouse designed by a native born professional architect.

The trustees selected Charles Stuart Powell as the sole manager of the theater and contracted with a young aspiring professional architect named Charles Bulfinch to design the playhouse at the corner of Federal and Franklin Streets.

Mr. Speaker, it is at this time that I would like to recognize the contribution of Charles Bulfinch, not only for the Old Boston and its reconstruction after the fire of 1798, but also because this is the 175th anniversary of his being appointed by President James Monroe as the 3d Architect of the Capitol. It was Charles Bulfinch who was responsible for constructing the wooden and lower walls of the Capitol which we now know as the Rotunda.

Mr. Bulfinch, in his plans for the Old Boston introduced an important feature not found even in English playhouses of that time. He used the cantilever principle, which made it possible for those in the pit to see the stage instead of the columns which would otherwise obstruct their view.

To encourage attendance the trustees set a high standard for music by selecting the respected Alexander Reingale as musical director. Col. John S. Tyler, brother of Royall Tyler, served as master of ceremonies and personally escorted patrons to their seats.

An early chronicler of the Boston stage wrote:

Over the columns a cornice and a balustrade were carried across the opening; above was painted a flow of crimson drapery and the arms blended with emblems tragic and comic. A ribbon descending from the arms bore the motto "All the world's a stage."

Mr. Speaker, it is this likeness with the arms, blended images and motto that the Committee for National Theater Week has had approved by the U.S. Postal Service in Boston to use as a pictorial cancellation in recognition of the bicentennial of this historic theater.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3785, THE VIDEO GAME RATING ACT OF 1994

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Video Game Rating Act of 1994, which would establish a video game rating system to help parents differentiate between simple action oriented video games and gratuitously violent and sexually explicit games. This legislation would set up an independent agency to work with the video game industry to create a system for providing parents and other purchasers with information about graphic violence or sexually explicit material contained in some video games. After 1 year, if the video manufacturers refuse to establish a ratings system, or act inadequately, the Commission will set up its own rating system or warning label and require video games to carry the information.

In the wake of strong congressional criticism and the American public's anger over increasingly violent and sexually explicit video games, the video game industry is trying to develop its own rating system. This legislation is being introduced in case the industry fails to act in a quick and credible way by providing important consumer information to help parents monitor their children's games.

Video games can be more violent than television or film because they can make players feel as if they are actually participating in the action. Experts can debate whether violence in entertainment causes brutality in society or merely reflects it. But there is a no dispute that graphic images of mayhem, mutilation, and murder encourage children to view violent activity as a normal part of life, and that interactive video violence desensitizes children to the real thing.

Games such as "Mortal Kombat," which allows a victor to kill the loser by tearing out his heart, by electrocuting him, by pulling his spine out or by decapitating him, and "Night Trap," where three men in black masks burst into the bedroom of a woman in a flimsy negligee, then drag her off and hold her down while a fourth attacker plunges an electric drill in her neck, are not appropriate for young children. The Video Game Rating Act would require video games to carry an informative and easily read rating or warning label so that parents can immediately tell whether a game is appropriate for their children. Consumers can send manufacturers a strong message about violent video game content through their buying choices, but parents need to know what they're buying. Prominent warning labels will help them get that information.

This legislation is not a substitute for other important efforts to reduce the epidemic levels of violence in society. There are many com-

plex factors that contribute to violence. But violence in the entertainment industry is part of the problem—and it can be part of the solution. Just this week, the broadcast and cable industries took steps to curb violence on television and provide viewers with warning ratings. The bill I am introducing today—the Video Game Ratings Act for 1994—will ensure that the video game industry will also act to provide parents with more consumer information.

Other steps are needed, however. For instance, a voluntary ratings system is not a complete solution if retailers continue to sell games meant for an older audience to a younger child. And parents must use the information provided in warning labels to set their own standards and pay closer attention to what games children are playing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift consideration and enactment of this important legislation so that parents will be able to easily determine whether video games they buy are appropriate for their young children. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the text of this bill be introduced into the RECORD in its entirety.

H.R. 3785

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND PURPOSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Video Game Rating Act of 1994".

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide parents with information about the nature of video games which are used in homes or public areas, including arcades or family entertainment centers.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the terms "video games" and "video devices" mean any interactive computer game, including all software, framework and hardware necessary to operate a game, placed in interstate commerce; and

(2) the term "video game industry" means all manufacturers of video games and related products.

SEC. 3. THE INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT RATING COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Interactive Entertainment Rating Commission (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission") which shall be an independent establishment in the executive branch as defined under section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION.—(1)(A) The Commission shall be composed of 5 members. No more than 3 members shall be affiliated with any 1 political party.

(B) The members shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate 1 member as the Chairman of the Commission.

(2) All members shall be appointed within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TERMS.—Each member shall serve until the termination of the Commission.

(d) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—(1) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Chairman, Interactive Entertainment Rating Commission."

(2) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Members, Interactive Entertainment Rating Commission."

(3) The amendments made by this subsection are repealed effective on the date of termination of the Commission.

(f) STAFF.—(1) The Chairman of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(2) The Chairman of the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(g) CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure by contract, to the extent funds are available, the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code. The Commission shall give public notice of any such contract before entering into such contract.

(h) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as are necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties under this Act, such sums to remain available until December 31, 1996.

(i) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate on the earlier of—

(1) December 31, 1996; or

(2) 90 days after the Commission submits a written determination to the President that voluntary standards are established that are adequate to warn purchasers of the violent or sexually explicitly content of video games.

SEC. 4. AUTHORITY AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) VOLUNTARY STANDARDS.—(1) The Commission shall—

(A) during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and to the greatest extent practicable, coordinate with the video game industry in the development of a voluntary system for providing information concerning the contents of video games to purchasers and users; and

(B) 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act—

(i) evaluate whether any voluntary standards proposed by the video game industry are adequate to warn purchasers and users about the violence or sexually explicit content of video games; and

(ii) determine whether the voluntary industry response is sufficient to adequately warn parents and users of the violence or sex content of video games.

(2) If before the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission makes a determination of adequate industry response under paragraph (1)(B)(i) and a determination that sufficient voluntary standards are established, the Commission shall—

(A) submit a report of such determinations and the reasons therefor to the President and the Congress; and

(B) terminate in accordance with section 3(1)(2).

(b) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Effective on and after the date occurring 1 year after the date of the enactment to this Act the Commission may promulgate regulations requiring manufacturers and sellers of video games to provide adequate information relating to violence or sexually explicit content of such video games to purchasers and users.

SEC. 5. ANTITRUST EXEMPTION.

The antitrust laws as defined in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 45) and the law of unfair competition under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) shall not apply to any joint discussion, consideration, review, action, or agreement by or among persons in the video game industry for the purpose of, and limited to, developing and disseminating voluntary guidelines designed to provide appropriate information regarding the sex or violence content of video games to purchasers of video games at the point of sale or initial use or other users of such video games. The exemption provided for in this subsection shall not apply to any joint discussion, consideration, review, action, or agreement which results in a boycott of any person.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH O. MORRISSEY

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on Nov. 17, 1993, my dear friend Joseph (Joe) O. Morrissey, Jr., completed his life's journey. Although my heart was deeply saddened by his death, I felt fortunate to have had the opportunity to know him because he was a great humanitarian and teacher.

Joe Morrissey believed in academic excellence and was committed to helping those

less fortunate than himself. He was dedicated to scholarship and service and constantly brainstormed for new and better ways to open the doors of opportunity for the future leaders of America. One of the products of this dedication was his commitment to the William L. Clay Scholarship and Research Fund.

I can remember the day when Joe and I were discussing the problems many academically promising students face when confronted with the costs of higher education. I shared with him some of my experiences as a member of the Education and Labor Committee and he told me stories about young people that he had met during his many years as president of the Broadmoor Group in St. Louis. The William L. Clay Scholarship and Research Fund was born that day. Joe's leadership as chairman of the board of directors and his generous financial support assisted 56 students in securing access to higher education.

Many people including myself, were touched by Joe Morrissey's worldly experiences and his brilliant mind. One of my treasured collections contains the many notes of wisdom he frequently sent to me and the wonderful anecdotes he shared with me during our visits.

Joe Morrissey indeed lived a wonderful life. He was a successful businessman and community activists. However, as he stated numerous times, his greatest success was his family. I would like to share with my colleagues the love he had for his family as recounted by his son, John F. Morrissey.

EULOGY

I knew my father for 36 years, having been born on his 27th birthday. He was not only my father, but also my mentor, my boss and my friend. Like all good fathers, he loved his family and was always there when we needed him. He loved us all—my mother, my brothers, Joe & Jordan and myself, my sisters, Mickey and Becky, and the grandchildren, John, Katie, Julie, Joseph, Christopher and Jamie. He was like the Rock of Gibraltar—big, strong, dependable, and we will miss him.

Many people envisioned him as some sort of gun-blazing maverick who rode in from the Wild West shooting first and asking questions later. But the people who thought that didn't really know him. In truth, he was an optimist, a visionary with a dream and the confidence and diligence to achieve his dream. He always knew that somehow, somehow, no matter what the obstacles, he would succeed. But he was also a man of high morals, always striving to do the right thing.

Having been around him all these years, I must say that he was a tremendous salesman—without peer. He was well read and well traveled. He had the ability to go into a room of strangers to talk about a real estate deal and expound on a wide range of topics, from the Pacific Rim to Russian art to black opals in the Australian Outback. Somehow he managed to tie it together, somehow he managed to seal the deal. Certainly, one would have to say he had a good track record.

One particular story he liked to tell was in the early days, 30 plus years ago, when he de-

cid to get into the business of importing Haitian artwork, convinced that he was going to make a fortune. He brought over a whole boatload of "unusual" art and, to his dismay, couldn't give it away. He ended up storing it in my grandparent's basement. Months went by. Finally, my grandfather, who was a very patient man, said he was going on vacation and if that "junk" wasn't gone by the time he returned, he was going to burn it. That meant my father had two weeks to move it. So, as soon as my grandparents left town, he ran an ad in the paper: "Liquidation Sale. Griesedieck Estate. Everything Must Go." The next day, there was a mob scene at 71 Lake Forest. People wanted to buy the furniture, the chandeliers, you name it. "Oh, well that sale is next week" said my father, "this week, we're selling their rare art collection downstairs". Sure enough, he sold every piece.

One of the most endearing qualities of my father was his generosity—to his friends, to family, to schools, to charity and, yes, to politicians. He was generous to a fault. He was always wanting to share his good fortune with others; always willing to lend a helping hand; always giving back to the community.

He had his share of eccentricities. He was the type of person who would don a \$1,000 tailored suit, wear exotic rings with stones measured by the pound rather than the carat, and top it off with—a Superfly Hat! But that was he. He was his own man. He did it his way.

He felt very comfortable with people from all walks of life. I remember in 1982, when the Cardinals won the World Series and we were tailgating out of the trunk of the limousine in front of Busch Stadium with Stan-The-Man and friends, drinking beer, whooping it up, having a good time. Out of the blue, some guy wanders up who looked like he'd been dealt a tough hand in life, probably homeless, and asked if he could join our party. To my surprise, my Dad put his arm around him, shook his hand and said, "Sure friend, have a beer".

In his lifetime, my father touched many people. It's hard to imagine this world without him; but his spirit, I believe, lives on.

A LETTER FROM AMYMAE FOSSER

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, we all receive scores of letters a week from our constituents. Although every one of them is important, every once and awhile a letter comes across my desk that I find to be especially moving. I recently received a letter from a young constituent of mine, AmyMae Fossier, regarding her older brother in Somalia. AmyMae's letter symbolizes the frustration that so many people feel when a loved one is called away to duty. I would like to share it with my colleagues in

the hope that it will serve as a reminder to all of us of the demands not only on each American service man or woman overseas, but on their families as well. With the permission of AmyMae, this exceptional letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OLVER: Hello. My name is AmyMae Fosser of Pittsfield, MA. Can I come to Washington, D.C.? I recently wrote a letter to you from my state senator Jane M. Swift concerning my only older brother SPE Cobra Crew Chief Aaron C. Fosser who is stationed in Somalia and hasn't returned since August. He missed Thanksgiving and Christmas. As a member of the Fort Drumme blah-blah-blah infantry, who had several troops return, he was not among those several. I can't deal with this much longer. I'm so afraid and very worried. I hate feeling this way. I'm happy for Clinton's plan of all troops returning for January of the 2nd week or so but sadly to say my brother won't be among them either.

They want to send him to Korea afterwards. It isn't right, he wants to come home. He's so upset that we went over there and got killed in the first place. We all feel this way. Please understand the awareness I have towards the time and certain rules to follow about all of the safe returns, but not too long ago Aaron was working at hi station (an airforce base) and he'd just stepped off the base when it was shelled. God has been with him and I thank him everyday for that, but you wouldn't believe my mom's reaction. She almost threw a fit. I just wanted to scream at the world, but who's out there to listen? Clinton? Gore?

Just the other day I had this kid say to me, "What's the big deal about Somalia? You could get killed just walking across the street and getting hit by a bus." I turned around and said to him, "No. You can get hit by a bus but that would be tragedy. But when you go to a foreign country and get shot at that is an intentional risk." It didn't make me feel better when I said that—I left and cried. School is getting worse. Half the students don't know why we're in Somalia. Imagine that! I feel like no one's listening. Did you ever get this bad cold where you couldn't talk loud enough but you needed to say something of importance and feel no one can hear you? That's the way I feel.

I just want to make everyone aware of my situation as a junior at Taconic High School in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, having a brother in battles in a foreign country and to explain the extra pressure I receive from this part of my life. I just want people to live up to their name: Americans. And to support our military forces for saving our behinds and risking their own! Please help me and my family.

With much gratitude,

AMYMAE FOSSER.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to report that AmyMae's brother has now come home safely from Somalia, but that he is scheduled for a tour of duty in Korea. I know my colleagues join me in expressing gratitude to Aaron Fosser and to all Americans in uniform for their service. And I would like to thank AmyMae Fosser for reminding us again of the importance of supporting our military forces and their families.

REMEMBERING DR. BARKLEY MOORE

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Kentucky and the Nation lost one of its most revered educators and servants when Dr. Barkley Moore, of Clay County, passed away on Tuesday, January 25.

For nearly 22 years, Dr. Barkley earned numerous accolades for his leadership of the Oneida Baptist Institute, where he served as president and chief booster. Dr. Barkley's roots at Oneida go back many, many years, to the days of Barkley Moore the student, a Michigan native whose love for our mountain community led him to make it his home, and to many years of dedicated service. Upon becoming its president some 14 years later, Dr. Moore worked tirelessly to make the Oneida Baptist Institute a model school, with unquestioned success.

I first knew Barkley Moore while we both attended the University of Kentucky School of Law. It was shortly after that period when Barkley embarked to provide many years of inspirational service in the U.S. Peace Corps. His 8 years in the Peace Corps is the longest of any other volunteer. Clearly, Barkley Moore's strength and humanity extended well beyond the boundaries of eastern Kentucky.

But Barkley Moore's greatest contributions have been to our children. Teaching by example, Dr. Moore has shown generations of young people that hard work, devotion to community, and service to God are the most honorable and everlasting pursuits.

Those of us who knew Barkley, and marveled at his work, can be thankful for his fellowship, intellectual strength, and faithful leadership. For all these reasons, he will be sorely missed.

INTRODUCTION OF CONGRESSIONAL REFORM BILL

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today the House chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress introduced legislation incorporating our panel's reform recommendations. Regrettably, for two reasons, I cannot join Mr. HAMILTON as a sponsor of the bill at this time.

First, the bill falls far short of what can reasonably be considered comprehensive reform.

Second, there is every indication that the Democrat leadership is planning to deny every member an opportunity to vote on comprehensive reform.

Given these circumstances, it is important that the Democrat leadership provide assurances that the bill will be considered under a bipartisan process that, at a minimum, allows amendments on all of the major reform areas. Should such an assurance be forthcoming, I will happily join as a cosponsor of the legislation. It is essential that we move the reform process forward in a bipartisan fashion.

Despite the partisan turn-of-events by House Democrat leaders, LEE HAMILTON has my admiration for the exceptional job he did in bringing the Joint Committee's work to completion under difficult circumstances. From beginning to end, Chairman HAMILTON has been steadfastly committed to the reform process, and it has been a pleasure working with him.

I particularly appreciate the assurances he gave last year that he would push for a generous rule so that all of the major reform proposals can be fully debated in the House. If successful, these efforts will lead to the approval of the first major restructuring of Congress in nearly 50 years. I look forward to working with Chairman HAMILTON to achieve that goal.

At this time, the bill does not reflect the consensus of the House of Representatives. In testimony and in surveys, the demand for comprehensive reform among Democrats and Republicans has been overwhelming. Every Member has the right to vote on each of the reform questions left unanswered by this legislation.

The following is my evaluation of the positive and negative aspects of the reform plan. As the legislation moves through the Rules Committee and on to the House floor in the coming months, I look forward to working with my colleagues on amendments to make the plan bipartisan and comprehensive.

TALKING POINTS ON HOUSE RECOMMENDATIONS JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

A. POSITIVE REFORMS

1. Committee and Subcommittee Assignments

Member assignments would be limited to no more than two standing committees and four subcommittees. Waivers would require approval of the House upon the recommendation of the respective party caucus. This addresses the concern that too many assignments undermine the ability of Members to fully deliberate issues in committee.

2. Subcommittee Restrictions

Except the Appropriations Committee, all exclusive and major committees shall have no more than five subcommittees, and all minor committees shall have no more than four subcommittees. This will reduce scheduling conflicts, policy fragmentation, and decentralization of authority.

3. Ethics Committee Fact-Finders

The Ethics Committee would have discretionary authority to use a panel of private

citizens to investigate charges of ethics violations and report recommendations to the full Committee. This will enhance public confidence and alleviate Committee members of the time burdens and conflicts that occur in a self-disciplinary system.

4. Committee Attendance and Voting Records

Each committee would be required to: publish in committee reports rollcall votes on reporting a matter and, in the case of a voice vote, the names of those Members present; and publish in the Record its attendance and voting records at least twice a year. This will create an incentive for Members to attend meetings and formal mark-ups, and will improve deliberation.

5. Biennial Budget

The budget process would be on a two-year cycle, beginning with the 104th Congress. The budget resolution and appropriations bills would be considered in the first session, and authorization bills would be considered in the second session. This will improve committee oversight and planning, and reduce the amount of time devoted to budgeting.

6. Congressional Compliance With Federal Laws

Congress would have to comply with: the Fair Labor Standards Act; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act; Sections 102 through 104 of the Americans with Disabilities Act; Section 15 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act; and the Family and Medical Leave Act. A House-Senate Office of compliance would study whether additional laws should apply, and issue regulations, subject to House and Senate approval, for enforcement. This provision is different than H.R. 349, the Swett-Shays Congressional Accountability Act, primarily in that it excludes mandatory compliance with OSHA. It is a *step in the right direction*. However, it excludes de novo review by courts and punitive damages.

B. ILLUSORY "REFORMS"

1. Multiple Referrals

The committee report does not require the Speaker to take any action to eliminate multiple referrals. The Speaker is simply urged, "if Speaker is simply urged, "if practicable," to initially designate a primary committee whenever a matter is referred to two or more committees, and subsequently place time limits on other committees after the primary committee reports. This does little to end ambiguous and confusing jurisdictional problems, and is little different than current Rule X.

2. Elimination of Committees

The report does not establish a process to eliminate committees. It requires the Rules Committee to reconsider a resolution to eliminate a committee if its membership falls below 50 percent of the number of members serving on that committee at the end of the 103rd Congress. The Rules Committee should be required to report such a resolution for consideration.

3. Earmarks in Committee Reports

The current requirement (Clause 3 of Rule XXI) that specific earmarks contained in appropriations legislation be listed in the appropriate committee report is extended to

authorization and tax bills. This would cover provisions that distribute funds below the appropriations account level, authorization expenditures for items below the appropriations account level, and tax expenditures which reduce the tax burden on particular businesses or individuals. By not identifying earmarks in the bill, this is merely an informational tool, and does not reduce the ability to use earmarks or reduce the obstacles to removing them from a bill.

4. Motion to Recommit

The Minority would be guaranteed the right to offer a motion to recommit with amendatory instructions if offered by the minority or his designee. While many Democrats contend that this is a major expansion of Minority rights, it is not. The change simply reaffirms the original intent of the rule as adopted in 1909 to guarantee the minority a final amendment to a bill prior to passage.

5. Staff Reductions

The report does not mandate any legislative branch staff reductions. Instead a task force would be created to recommend legislative branch streamlining and restructuring from a base of the total number of full-time equivalent positions in the legislative branch on September 30, 1993, a base-line which, according to the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, would require no additional cuts in any case.

6. Entitlement Spending Control

Nothing in the report involves any meaningful entitlement spending reform. There is a provision similar to the toothless entitlement spending target provision included in the original House-passed Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (subsequently deleted in conference), which the President eventually issued as an executive order.

7. Miscellaneous Sense of the House Language

The report contains sense of the House language on a 4-day legislative week, exclusive periods for committee meetings and floor proceedings, staff training and salaries, the availability of reports and information, and alternative debate formats. This language is little more than an admittance by the Joint Committee of their inability provide recommendations on important reform issues.

C. KEY MISSING REFORMS

1. Committee Realignment

There is no committee realignment reform at all. Considering that the Joint Committee devoted more of its time and resources to this issue than any other, it is the most noteworthy failure. Problems with the committee structure, such as duplication, too many assignments, micromanagement of the executive branch and the inability to deal with contemporary problems, were also most often cited by committee witnesses and colleagues. As Norm Ornstein of AEI states: "The committee system is the linchpin of the deliberative process." Committee reform is Congressional reform, yet the House Subcommittee rejected, on a 6-6 party-line vote, an amendment to address this issue.

2. Ban On Proxy Voting

Three proposals to reform proxy voting were rejected on a 6-6 party-line vote: (1) a

complete ban on proxies, (2) a ban only at the full committee, and (3) a ban on the use of proxies when they affect the outcome of a vote. 19 out of 23 committees in the House permit Members to vote without being present. It's not unusual for the chairman to cast 60 percent of the votes on amendments and legislation reported by these committees. This undermines consensus, the integrity of the committee system, accountability and public confidence in Congress.

3. Committee Staff Ratio

The 1970 Legislative Reorganization Act guaranteed the minority in each committee one-third of statutory committee staff. In 1989, the House Administrative Committee agreed to increase the minority's share of investigative staff funds to one-third. The Democratic Caucus rescinded that directive in 1990, insisting that the minority receive no more than 20 percent of investigative funds, arguing that the minority could rely on the Republican staff resources of the executive branch. In the Senate, there is no distinction between statutory and investigative staff, and a committee's staff reflects the relative number of its majority and minority members. Republicans represent 40 percent of the House membership, which is reflected in most committee ratios. The House Subcommittee rejected, on a 6-6 vote, an amendment to address this inequity.

4. Open Meetings

Current House rules permit committees to close House committee meetings for any reason by majority vote, but close committee hearings only for national security or personal privacy reasons. A majority vote is required to open meetings or hearings to photographic or radio and television coverage. A sunshine amendment to bar closing committee meetings except for national defense or privacy reasons, and to guarantee photographic and broadcast media access to any meeting or hearing open to the public was rejected on a 6-6 party-line vote.

5. Restrictive Rules

On a 6-6 party-line vote, the House Subcommittee rejected an amendment to inhibit procedural abuses by allowing the minority to offer a substitute rule whenever the Rules Committee reports a rule that restricts the offering of amendments. In the first session of the 103rd Congress (1993), 77 percent of the bills that the Rules Committee sent to the House floor were accompanied by a restrictive rule prohibiting the offering of amendments, gagging Republicans and Democrats (the Rules Committee blocked floor consideration of 160 of 286 Democrat amendments brought before the committee last year). As Ornstein and Mann also note in their "Renewing Congress" report: Restrictive rules "constitute a disregard for minority rights, the rights of individual members, and a dismissal of the constructive role the minority and other dissenters can play in offering alternatives and pointing out flaws in a pending measure."

6. Points of Order Waivers

The Rules of the House were, according to Jefferson's manual, created as a means to

"check and control the actions of the majority" and to protect the minority against abuses of power. In 1993, at least one of the rules of the House was waived on 81 out of 97 rules reported by the Rules Committee. All of the rules of the House were waived on 45 of those rules. On a 6-6 party-line vote, the House Subcommittee rejected an amendment to require a three-fifths vote to waive certain points or order. The majority should be permitted to adopt or alter rules and procedures with a simple majority vote. But once the rules are made, they should not be ignored unless extraordinary circumstances warrant otherwise.

7. Legislative Branch Spending

Between 1968 and 1994, federal government expenditures grew 569%. In contrast, legislative branch spending grew 965%, almost twice the rate. When making tough spending decisions to reduce the deficit, Congress should lead by example. However, the House Subcommittee rejected, on a 6-6 vote, an amendment to reduce legislative branch spending by 25 percent over five years.

8. Abolish Legislative Service Organizations (LSOs)

Currently, 26 caucuses are certified by the House Administration Committee as LSOs. Over the past 10 years, LSOs have spent \$34 million in funds provided from members' accounts, of which \$7.7 million (22 percent) is unaccounted for. Many argue that LSOs maintain dubious relationships with outside organizations where the line between public money and special interest groups become blurred. Unfortunately, an amendment to eliminate LSOs (except the DSG and the Republican Study Committee) but permit them to exist as unofficial organizations was rejected by the House Subcommittee on a 5-7 vote.

THE HEAD START ENHANCED PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND FAMILY LITERACY ACT OF 1994

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce, along with SUSAN MOLINARI and other colleagues, the Head Start Enhanced Parental Involvement and Family Literacy Act of 1994.

This bill is a continuation of our efforts to improve the quality of Head Start services, which recently have been shown to be lacking in many ways. When it comes to Head Start, I have always been a firm believer in the cliché: Quality over quantity. And I think that this legislation which we are introducing today will go a long way toward improving the quality of the program, which has suffered as a result of the push to continually increase the numbers of children served.

I am confident that this bill will improve quality, because it is directed at the resource that

is limitless with regard to furthering a child's education, and which will continue on once the child has left Head Start. I am talking about parents.

I know the parental involvement component of Head Start is one of the pillars upon which the program was founded, and that parents that take advantage of it are positively affected by it. But we must do more, because for every parent that does get involved there is one who doesn't. And so, this bill will require Head Start programs to take measures to increase the level of parental involvement so that Head Start will become a truly intergenerational program.

Mr. Speaker, I originally wanted to place the requirement to get involved upon the individual parent, instead of on the program. I still feel that this is the way to go, because it is time that we make these parents, who receive the benefit of enrolling their children in Head Start, step-up and take responsibility for rearing and educating their children.

This is, however, a reauthorization year for Head Start, and we are currently negotiating with the administration on the possibility of a bipartisan reauthorization bill and we want to make sure that some provisions regarding enhancing parental involvement are included in that reauthorization bill. Requiring programs to seek parental involvement is the common ground upon which everyone can agree, and so we have incorporated that concept into this bill. I want to make it clear, however, that I, or perhaps one of my colleagues, may attempt to amend the reauthorization package at a later stage to shift the requirement to the parents.

Beyond enhancing parental involvement, this bill also injects the notion of family literacy into the Head Start statute for the first time. As the primary congressional supporter of Even Start, the Federal family literacy program, I am convinced that this type of service would further improve the quality of Head Start programs.

Family literacy is an approach to breaking the pattern of undereducation and poverty in the nation that is passed on within the families from one generation to the next. It integrates adult literacy instruction and early childhood education to address the needs of the entire family, rather than isolated individuals within it. Family literacy is based on the premise that parents and children can learn together and enhance each other's lives. It restores the family as the center for learning.

When parents and children learn together, an attitude of appreciation and respect for education are modeled for the children that paves the way for school success. At the same time, parents acquire new skills for work and home and a new appreciation of their role as the first teacher of their children. The family is strengthened by supporting the parents as the first and most important teachers of their children, and by developing positive and supportive attitudes about schooling, the work and joy of learning, and the connection between education and the quality of life.

One other aspect of this bill that I want to mention is that, in addition to family literacy, Head Start programs would be required to provide parenting skills training and other activities designed to help parents become full partners in the education of their children. Parenting skills training goes hand-in-hand with the concept of enhanced parental involvement. All parents must cope with the stress of everyday life, and often that stress is greater for low-income parents. Parenting skills training would help these parents look past other problems and concentrate on effective techniques for interacting with their children.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to express my appreciation to Representative MOLINARI for working with me on this important piece of legislation, and to Representatives BARRETT, FAWELL, CASTLE, and MILLER for being original cosponsors.

EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, my first job in Government was on the staff of Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois. This legendary legislator served the people of Illinois and left a grand legacy to our Nation. Those of us who were fortunate to have known and worked for Senator Douglas come to realize that his strength was enhanced by his wife, Emily Taft Douglas.

Mrs. Douglas was an extraordinary public servant in her own right. She identified closely with the problems faced by common people and she was at home in every corner of our diverse State.

I am sorry to report to the House that Emily Taft Douglas passed away last week. It is fitting that we pause and reflect on the great personal contribution which she made to this House of Representatives and our Nation.

Elected Congresswoman-at-Large in 1944, Mrs. Douglas was the first woman to precede a husband in Congress. She served on the Foreign Affairs Committee and was an active proponent of post-war United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency programs. She introduced legislation for library bookmobiles for rural areas, which was ultimately passed as the Hill-Douglas bill following her husband's election to the U.S. Senate in 1948.

Prior to her election to Congress, Mrs. Douglas was active in the fight against international fascism and was a strong opponent of American isolationism. She served as Illinois Secretary for the League of Women Voters, chaired the League's foreign policy department, and later was executive secretary of the International Relations Center in Chicago.

Mrs. Douglas also enjoyed a part-time career as an author. She wrote "Appleseed

Farm," 1948, a children's book, "Remember the Ladies," 1966, an account of the lives of American women, and "Margaret Sanger," 1970, a pioneer in family planning.

The daughter of sculptor, Lorado Taft, and Ada Bartlett Taft, she also had an interest in the arts. After graduating from the University of Chicago, she studied acting and starred in the Broadway and road company productions of "The Cat and the Canary."

Emily Taft Douglas was truly a pioneer in women's rights and an articulate spokesperson for the less fortunate. Her contribution will be long remembered.

COMMENDING MELLON BANK

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss the important issue of the Community Reinvestment Act [CRA]. As chairman of the House Banking Subcommittee on Consumer Credit and Insurance, I am responsible for overseeing compliance with consumer protection laws, including CRA. CRA requires lenders to serve the credit needs of all communities in which they are chartered to do business. This law requires lenders to provide credit and deposit services to local communities, including low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, consistent with safe and sound practices. It imposes this responsibility in recognition that banks enjoy significant benefits from the Federal Government, including deposit insurance and access to the discount window of Federal Reserve System. A number of institutions have taken steps to further meet their obligations to communities. One of these institutions is Mellon Bank. I would like to submit for the RECORD an editorial, which appeared in the January 25, 1994 edition of the Boston Globe, that describes Mellon Bank's recently announced initiative to provide low-income housing loans in Boston, MA. Mellon Bank is to be commended for this action. Such programs should serve as the rule, not the exception, for banks operating in communities across our country. I look forward to working with Mellon Bank and others to assure that community credit needs are being met in a manner that proves profitable to lenders, and helpful to community residents.

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 25, 1994]

LENDING STRENGTH TO NEIGHBORHOODS

Even harsh critics of urban banking policies should consider the richness of this contrast:

In the 1950s, members of "the Vault"—Boston's corporate elite—met in secrecy in the boardroom of Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co. to determine how to protect themselves

while the city's job base dwindled and neighborhoods crumbled. Yesterday in Jamaica Plain, officials of the Boston Co. and its leading bank affiliate, Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co., joined with tenants to unveil a \$10 million below-market loan agreement to rehabilitate housing in poor urban neighborhoods.

A mixture of external pressures, business sense and social responsibility is behind the dramatic shift, which will create excellent credit opportunities for low-income families and community development corporations. The loans are part of a \$74.3 million agreement between the Pittsburgh-based Mellon Bank Corp. and the Massachusetts Housing Partnership Fund.

Under the state's Community Reinvestment Act, Mellon was required to make the sum available based on its recent acquisition of the Boston Co. But it was the bank's commitment to Greater Boston that created the impetus for the \$10 million set aside immediately for community-based nonprofit groups at rock-bottom rates.

The Mellon initiative is especially attractive because it targets existing housing for rehabilitation. As many as 5,000 units across the state will be fitted with new windows, updated heating systems, new roofs and other improvements. Benefits will ripple out to nearby commercial districts when dilapidated or foreclosed residential properties, the haunts of drug dealers and prostitutes, are repopulated with stable families.

Mellon is banking on a winner by targeting affordable housing and teaming up with community activists. Cities await similar initiatives by major banks to stimulate small-business development. When that is accomplished, the corporate elephant will have learned not only to dance but to lead.

THE HEAD START ENHANCED PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND FAMILY LITERACY ACT OF 1994

HON. SUSAN MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, " * * * governments don't raise children; parents do."

Mr. Speaker, these words were spoken last week by President Bill Clinton during his State of the Union Address—and I couldn't agree more. In fact, I'd like to give you the full quote:

We can't renew our country until we realize that governments don't raise children; parents do. Parents who know their children's teachers and turn off the television and help with the homework and teach their kids right from wrong—those kind of parents can make all the difference.

These are very profound words, indeed. I think we all agree that there has been a breakdown in the family structure in this country over the past few decades, and that it's the children that are suffering the most from a lack

of parental guidance and nurturing. Well, today we are taking the first step toward reversing this alarming trend by introducing the Head Start Enhanced Parental Involvement and Family Literacy Act of 1994.

Head Start is the largest and most popular Federal early childhood program, and parental involvement has always been an integral and valuable part of the program. But more can be done, and more should be done in order to give these children the greatest benefit of all—a parent who is able and wants to be a full partner in the child's education.

Many parents are already involved in Head Start, and they have numerous success stories. That is great, and it should be continued, but for every Head Start parent who is now involved there is one who is not. And that is what we want to change by introducing this legislation.

This bill would require Head Start programs to develop a plan to seek the participation of Head Start parents, or guardians, in such a way that helps the parents become full partners in the education of their children. This is one way to improve the quality of the overall Head Start program, both in the short-term while the children are in Head Start, and in the long-term after the children move on to school, because the parents will continue to provide the necessary support for their children to succeed academically.

This bill would further require Head Start programs to provide an array of activities for parents which are designed to assist the parents in becoming their children's first teacher. Examples of these activities include: family literacy programs, parenting skills training, volunteering as a teacher's aid, social self-sufficiency training, etc.

The bill would require the Department of Health and Human Services to support these enhanced parental involvement efforts by providing the necessary training and technical assistance to the local Head Start programs.

Finally, the bill would make a Head Start program's success, or lack of success, a measure in determining whether to increase or continue funding that program. The high quality programs will be successful at attracting parental involvement, and it's this type of high quality that we are trying to replicate throughout Head Start.

Mr. Speaker, Head Start is up for reauthorization this year, and as the ranking Republican on the subcommittee with jurisdiction over Head Start I will work to include this and other quality improvement measures into the statute, because we must ensure that Head Start provides the highest quality services available, instead of just throwing large sums of money at expanding the program.

In conclusion, I want to thank my colleague, BILL GOODLING, for his dedication and leadership on the issue of Head Start quality. It is an honor to have worked closely with him on this, and other, legislation that will provide better services for our country's low-income families, both the children and the parents.

PROHIBITING HIGHWAY METRIC
REQUIREMENTS

HON. PAT ROBERTS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks my constituents throughout rural Kansas have become increasingly aware and concerned with a minor provision of the previously enacted 1988 Omnibus Trade and Global Competitiveness Act of 1988. This law and the accompanying Presidential Executive Order 12770 are intended to improve the U.S. trade position worldwide by conforming weights and measurements to international standards. However, a certain provision of this act allows the Federal Highway Administration the authority to require State governments to convert highway signs to metric. The FHWA is preparing to enact such requirements that would be implemented on January 1, 1996.

I strongly support efforts to make the United States more competitive in global trade. However, I believe this proposal has little or nothing to do with U.S. trade and should not be pursued. For that reason, I have introduced H.R. 3766, a bill to prevent any Federal agency or department from requiring the conversion of highway signs to metric units.

I do not oppose industrial conversion to metric. I am keenly aware of the importance of global economics and the future of the United States. However, we must ask ourselves, "Are our constituents demanding such a change in highway measurements that would cost millions of dollars?"

In addition, I would call to my colleagues' attention that is this proposal is allowed to be put into effect, the multimillion dollar price tag for conversion would be forced upon their State and local governments—yet another Federal unfunded mandate. Existing Federal law prohibits the use of Federal funds to pay for such sign conversions. If local and State governments wish to implement such a metric program with their revenues, they already have the authority without the proposed FHWA requirement.

I urge my colleagues to support my bill, H.R. 3766, and avoid implementation of this unfunded mandate.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF THE RECREATIONAL BOATING SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994

HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 3786, a bill to improve recreational boating safety. This comprehensive, bipartisan bill is the result of a concerted effort by many organizations involved in boating safety to recommend improved Federal laws and funding. H.R. 3786 combines the most important provisions from two bills that Representative JACK FIELDS of Texas and I introduced last session, H.R. 2812 and H.R. 3168, respectively.

I want to thank the Coast Guard, National Transportation Safety Board, National Association of State Boating Law Administrators, Boat Owners Association of the United States, Marine Retailers Association of America, American League of Anglers and Boaters and the National Marine Manufacturers Association for all of their help and comments during the development of this legislation.

Like the legislation introduced last session, H.R. 3786 will create a Federal requirement for the mandatory wearing of lifejackets for children, encourage States to adopt important boating-while-intoxicated laws, require the Secretary of Transportation to submit a plan to increase reporting of vessel accidents to State law enforcement officials, and require boating safety violators to take a boating safety course.

First, H.R. 3786 establishes a Federal requirement for children 12 years of age and under to wear Coast Guard approved personal flotation devices on recreational vessels under 26 feet on an open deck. Boating is an inherently dangerous activity even for experienced, qualified and mature individuals. Children who are often less-skilled, physically and emotionally immature, and generally unable to care for themselves require protection. In July of 1993 a boating accident occurred in Arkansas which tragically illustrated the problem. Five of the seven victims were children ranging in age from 18 months to 10 years, none of whom were wearing lifejackets. Lifejackets could have saved these innocent lives.

Second, H.R. 3786 encourages States to adopt uniform boating-while-intoxicated [BWI] laws beginning in fiscal year 1998 by providing incentive funding to those States with adequate BWI laws. In 1998, the State boating safety program will receive an additional \$10 million dollars of new funding from the Clean Vessel Act of 1992. As introduced, the \$10 million would be divided into two pools. The first \$5 million would be available to States that have either a blood alcohol concentration [BAC] standard of .10 or less, or have a be-

havioral standard for evidence of intoxication. The second \$5 million would be distributed to States that have enacted implied consent laws.

Third, H.R. 3786 requires the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with appropriate State agencies, to submit to the Congress a plan to increase reporting of vessel accidents to appropriate State law enforcement officials. Since accident data analysis is incomplete due to a lack of properly submitted accident reports, this legislation establishes a \$1,000 Federal civil penalty for failing to submit a vessel accident report to State authorities.

Finally, H.R. 3786 requires that individuals found to be operating a vessel in a negligent manner or under the influence of drugs or alcohol to complete a boating safety course. Additionally, this legislation provides Coast Guard hearing officers with the authority to require boating safety courses in lieu of or in addition to a civil penalty where a person has been found to be in violation of less serious Federal boating safety laws. The Secretary will be given the responsibility to develop regulations that identify approved boating safety courses.

H.R. 3786 will greatly improve the ability of States and the Coast Guard to protect the safety of thousands of Americans who enjoy boating on our Nation's waterways. As a strong supporter of boating safety, I am confident that passage of this new legislation will save countless children's lives, take drunk boaters off the water, provide for better accident reporting, and educate those who violate our boating safety laws.

DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.—A HERO

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to acknowledge a heroic deed of one of my closest constituents, my son Donald, Jr. On Wednesday, January 19, 1994, Donald prevented what could have been the tragic injury or death of a young child. At about 10 a.m. a woman pulled up to an exact change toll machine on the New Jersey Garden State Parkway. As she tossed her coins toward the machine they bounced and missed the machine. She then got out of the car to retrieve the money and the car began to roll along without a driver—and with a young girl inside. Donald, Jr. saw the car and a woman trotting along after it. It frightened him, but he hit the door of the toll booth where he was stationed, hopped the wall and started running after the car. After sprinting about 250 feet Donald, Jr. hopped inside the car, hit the brake and put the car in park. The woman ran up a moment later and asked her daughter if she was frightened and she said no. It was if

she had been on a ride at an amusement park. She was not hurt at all.

Mr. Speaker, it is every parent's pride and joy to see their child for the first time. When you first glimpse at that face, so many thoughts and emotions flood your very being. You're grateful that the child is healthy, you pray that you do a good job as a parent, you hope that the values you instill in this child will follow him throughout life, and you wish you are there for all of the important times in the life of this being.

I am a fortunate father. I have witnessed time and time again, the caring, compassionate, and unbiased spirit that is embodied in my son. It did not take this recent action for me to realize what a wonderful man Donald M. Payne, Jr. is, but it gives me an opportunity to let others know how important the parent-child relationship is and that the seeds sown early in life will sprout someday.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me as I congratulate my son, Donald J. Payne, Jr. for being a caring human being.

MARTI, INDEPENDENCE LEADER

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, Cubans celebrated another anniversary of the birth of Jose Marti, the father of Cuban independence.

Marti fought for the independence of his motherland and for the freedom of his fellow Cubans, giving his life at Dos Rios for both.

A writer and a poet, Marti left a profound impression not only on history but on literature, as he was also one of the leaders of literature's Modernist movement.

For all his great virtues, we pay tribute to Jose Marti in this, the 140th anniversary of his birth.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS TO
TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRA-
STRUCTURE LEGISLATION

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, on November 23, 1993, I along with Representative JACK FIELDS, ranking Republican, of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, and

13 of my subcommittee colleagues introduced H.R. 3636, the National Communications Competition and Information Infrastructure Act of 1994. Representatives RICK BOUCHER, OXLEY, BRYANT, MOORHEAD, HALL, BARTON, RICHARDSON, HASTERT, LEHMAN, GILLMOR, and SCHENK joined us as original cosponsors—representing a majority of the subcommittee members from both sides of the aisle in support of this landmark communications legislation. This bill also has been endorsed by Vice President GORE and the representatives of the Clinton administration.

Today, I am pleased to announce that Representatives JOSEPH MOAKLEY, BARNEY FRANK of Massachusetts, GERRY STUDDS, DAVID LEVY, GARY FRANKS of Connecticut, RONALD MACHTLEY, JOHN OLVER, MARTY MEEHAN, PETER BLUTE, and JOHN MCHUGH will join us in cosponsoring H.R. 3636. I commend my colleagues for their vision in recognizing the importance this legislation has in bringing home the advanced digital communications age.

The National Communications Competition and Information Infrastructure Act of 1993 helps deliver the promise of the information superhighway, a seamless network of networks capable of transporting vast amounts of information. This promise is quickly becoming a reality, with all segments of society willing to contribute to the building of the information superhighway. In addition, President Clinton set forth this goal in his State of the Union Address, "I call on Congress to pass legislation to establish that information superhighway this year."

This legislation promotes a national communications infrastructure by encouraging the deployment of advanced communications services and technologies through competition, while also safeguarding ratepayers and competitors from anticompetitive abuses. H.R. 3636 will permit the telephone companies into the cable industry thus creating competition in the multichannel video environment. Second, this bill will provide competition in the local telephone market by requiring that the local exchange carriers provide interconnection and equal access to their telephone networks to any competitors, including cable companies, seeking to provide telephone service. Finally, H.R. 3636 preserves and enhances the fundamental principle of universal service which has been the cornerstone of our communications policy since 1934, when the first comprehensive piece of communications policy was crafted. Universal service is the widespread availability of affordable telephone service to all Americans. We need to embrace this principle in the advanced information age in order to ensure that one consumer is not limited to party line phone service while another consumer is enjoying the luxury of video teleconferencing.

It is important to note that this bill delivers more than just the latest Arnold Schwarzenegger movie or the latest U2 video. It promises the construction of seamless digital network, whereby any book in the Library

of Congress can be called up on a computer to be read by someone in Albuquerque, NM; and where students in Los Angeles can converse with their peers in Louisiana; and where a doctor at the Massachusetts General Hospital can diagnose a patient living in the Berkshire Mountains, unable to get in town because of another Nor'easter snow storm.

The Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance has begun a marathon of hearings examining the various components of this legislation, as well as H.R. 3626, the Antitrust Reform Act of 1993, introduced by Representatives DINGELL and BROOKS. Last week we welcomed endorsements by representatives of the Clinton administration. This week, in three separate hearings, we examined the issues of interoperability in set-top boxes, telephone entry into cable, and universal service. Next week, we will continue those hearings: on Tuesday, February 8, we will examine Bell Co. entry into the manufacturing and information services markets; on Wednesday, February 9, we will discuss opening the local exchange marketplace to competition; and on Thursday we will examine Bell Co. entry into the long-distance market. Our hope is to have these two pieces of legislation passed favorably out of the full Committee on Energy and Commerce by early March.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring H.R. 3636, and to bring the information superhighway home to their districts.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TERRI-
TORIAL ADMINISTRATION CES-
SATION ACT

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1994

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the significant development of self-governance in the United States' territories, I am introducing the Territorial Administration Cessation Act. It is time to recognize the territories' ability to govern and eliminate an unnecessary Federal office.

There is no longer a need for the bureaucracy which once directly administered the territories and trust territories with appointed Governors for the former and a high commissioner for the latter. The local administrative functions of Government have been assumed by the territories, which now deal directly with Federal agencies and departments like States. The world's last remaining trusteeship is about to end, the United States having met its obligations under the U.N. Charter.

The President of the United States once appointed Governors as heads of territorial governments. These were generally individuals who were not from the islands to be governed.

The appointed Governors worked with the Department of Interior to manage, at varying levels over the years, government operations and the delivery of services. During the past five decades, the territories have assumed the responsibilities of self-governance in the islands. All of the territories now have Governors and legislatures elected by their residents, local court systems, and have developed or have been authorized to develop constitutions. With the exception of the Northern Mariana Islands, the newest member of the American family, each territory is represented in the U.S. Congress by an elected delegate.

The United States has been the administering authority for the U.N. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands since World War II. For over three decades, the Department of Interior managed the development of infrastructure, the operation of basic services like schools and hospitals, and exercised local government and political control. Slowly these responsibilities were transferred to the peoples of the islands as locally elected constitutional governments emerged. Three-fourths of the Trust Territory was terminated in 1986, relieving the Department of Interior of a substantial portion of their responsibilities.

The last segment of the Trust Territory is Palau in the far Western Pacific. As the people of Palau recently voted to approve the Compact of Free Association with the United States, the trusteeship responsibilities of the United States as administering authority are expected to end.

The Territorial Administration Cessation Act would transfer the remaining residual administrative responsibilities of the Office of Territorial and International Affairs of the Department of the Interior to other Federal agencies. All responsibilities relating to the administration and termination of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the implementation of the Compact of Free Association would be transferred to the Office of Pacific Island Affairs of the Department of State. Relations

with two other former members of the Trust Territory, also governed by Compacts of Free Association with the United States are already within the purview of the Office of Pacific Island Affairs.

All responsibilities of the Office of Territorial and International Affairs relating to technical assistance and operations and management assistance would be transferred to the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce. The EDA has the resources and experience in managing technical assistance and grant programs including assistance to the territories. The current grant level of assistance administered by OTIA is quite small by comparison to that of EDA.

The legislation would reduce the number of Department of Interior Assistant Secretaries authorized by law from six to five. There would no longer be a need for an Assistant Secretary of the Office of Territorial and International Affairs and most other positions associated with that office.

The Territorial Administration Cessation Act would eliminate unnecessary costs, produce savings, and recognize the progressive levels of self-government in the territories. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R.—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Territorial Administrative Cessation Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the people of Palau in the United Nations Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, known as the Japanese Mandated Islands, have voted to approve the Compact of Free Association with the United States, thereby leading to the end of the trusteeship responsibilities of the United States as administer-

ing authority for Palau under the United Nations Charter;

(2) the Secretary of State is responsible for government-to-government relations with the freely associated states of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands;

(3) the United States territories have developed progressively increased local self-government over the past 5 decades;

(4) the territories predominantly deal directly with Federal agencies and departments like a State;

(5) the Department of the Interior's administering responsibilities for the insular areas has declined substantially during the past 5 decades; and

(6) Federal-territorial relations can be enhanced and Federal fiscal conditions improved by the elimination of unnecessary Federal bureaucracy.

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS.—All responsibilities of the Office of Territorial and International Affairs of the Department of the Interior relating to the administration and termination of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the implementation of the Compact of Free Association are hereby transferred to the Office of Pacific Island Affairs of the Department of State.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE.—All responsibilities of the Office of Territorial and International Affairs of the Department of the Interior relating to technical assistance and operations and management assistance is hereby transferred to the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce.

(c) TERMINATION OF POSITION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—Effective 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "Assistant Secretaries of the Interior (6)" and inserting "Assistant Secretaries of the Interior (5)".