

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## LET'S LOOK TO THE FUTURE

## HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, from time to time a letter comes across my desk that speaks directly to the core of a problem. Recently we received just such a letter.

The debate over balancing the Federal budget and finding ways to also reduce taxes inspired an east Texan to write to my office. This letter is so in tune with both present reality and historic precedent that I wanted to share it with all of you:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I would much prefer deficit reduction to a middle class tax cut. Although I would qualify, the tax cut would make very little difference in my well-being. But a reduction in the Federal deficit will improve my well-being and that of my child in the long run.

Please work to identify spending cuts that can be applied to deficit reduction rather than a tax cut.

Sincerely,

E.L. WRIGHT.

I expect this letter expresses the views of many people, especially those with children. It asks that we look to their future.

This means getting the Federal ledger in the black first. It means when we do turn to tax relief, the emphasis should be on deductions for education and career training, use of IRA's for college tuition, and other long-term investments.

Fourteen years ago I was one of a handful of Members who voted for President Reagan's spending cuts, and against his tax cuts. We took some flak and received bags of hate mail for this. But I felt then, as I know now, that any tax cuts must come after we achieve a balanced budget, not before. Trying to do both in the early 1980's snowballed us into the most rapid increase in deficit spending in history.

A strong, solvent America is in everyone's interest. Reaching a balanced budget should be our priority now, just as it should have been 14 years ago.

CONCERNING THE RULE TO HOUSE  
JOINT RESOLUTION 1

## HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in reluctant support of House Resolution 44, the rule for the balanced budget amendment. Although I will be voting for this rule, I am disappointed that the Franks-Conditt-Gillmor substitute amendment adding un-

funded mandates language to the balanced budget amendment was not made in order by the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, our amendment was substantially similar to the Barton balanced budget amendment (H.J. Res. 1), but with two crucial differences. First, our amendment struck the three-fifths provision to raise taxes contained in section 2 of House Joint Resolution 1. While I am steadfastly opposed to raising taxes, the controversy surrounding this provision could hamper passage in the Senate and make it more difficult to achieve the requisite two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives.

Second, our amendment includes a provision prohibiting new unfunded Federal mandates. I strongly believe that a ban on unfunded mandates is essential to prevent a future Congress from balancing the Federal budget merely by shifting costs and responsibilities to State and local governments.

The supporters of other versions of the balanced budget amendment contend that there are only two ways to balance the budget—either by cutting spending or increasing taxes. But the truth is there's a third, more insidious option where the Congress would mandate expensive Federal programs onto State and local governments and require local taxpayers to pick up the tab. Judging from the past, it is clear that Congress will use any means available to avoid hard budget choices. I believe that closing the unfunded mandates loophole is imperative to preserve the integrity of the balanced budget amendment and ensure protection for local taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, including an unfunded Federal mandates provision as part of the balanced budget amendment is the only ironclad way to protect local taxpayers. Although I welcome and support efforts to solve the unfunded mandates issue by passing a statute, the sorry fact is that Congress is adept at finding ways to circumvent statutory law in order to escape from fiscal accountability.

Additionally, it is important to note that Republican and Democratic Governors have rightly expressed their reluctance to encourage their State legislatures to ratify a balanced budget amendment without a provision specifically prohibiting new unfunded Federal mandates. The inclusion of a provision to ban unfunded Federal mandates would have, in my opinion, markedly improved the chance of ratification by the States.

Mr. Speaker, our substitute amendment has the support of the National League of Cities and the National Conference of State Legislatures [NCSL]. The support of NCSL is especially noteworthy, as it is their members who will ultimately be deciding the fate of the balanced budget amendment. And since this rule precludes me from offering my substitute amendment that would have protected the States, I am skeptical whether this version of the balanced budget amendment will ever be ratified by the requisite 38 States.

Mr. Speaker, consideration of the balanced budget amendment presents Congress with a unique and historic opportunity to permanently resolve the issue of unfunded Federal mandates. Our substitute amendment would have provided the assurance that Congress would not have met its obligations under the balanced budget amendment by imposing unfunded mandates on State and local governments. Although I am disheartened that Congress will not act on my amendment today, I expect that we will be revisiting this issue should the States refuse to ratify the balanced budget amendment because of an absence of a unfunded mandate provision.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PA-  
CIFIC DAILY NEWS: 25 YEARS OF  
EXCELLENCE

## HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, shortly after the gateways to Guam were opened to the world, the Guam Daily News published its first edition on my home district of Guam. The paper quickly evolved into a solid business entity, which is important to our island and to the Pacific region.

Now affiliated with the Gannett News Service, the Guam Daily News is better known as the Pacific Daily News. It is our only daily paper, and a tremendous source of current events.

Over the years, the P.D.N. has changed its format, its editors, its reporters, but not its high quality. The paper may not be as thick as the New York Times or the Washington Post, but "all the news that's fit to print," manages to get on its pages.

Truly part of the Guam family, the P.D.N. currently reaches a wider audience than any other island media. It overcame obstacles and outlasted a competing paper. Throughout the years, in typhoons and other natural disasters, I have always found an edition of the P.D.N. at my doorstep. Yet, the paper means so much more to Guahan.

On important occasions, the managers and employees of the P.D.N. constantly prove their keen interest in civic matters. As a member of the Guam Chamber of Commerce, the Guam Olympic Committee, other nonprofit boards and commissions, President Lee Webber leads his staff by example. As the company grew, it shared its success with the island.

Happy 25th birthday, Pacific Daily News.

● 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.

## CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 25, 1995*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 11, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

## APPLYING LAWS TO CONGRESS

As much as Hoosiers complain to me about excessive government regulations, they complain even more about congressional exemptions from laws that are applied to private citizens and businesses. They believe Congress should follow the same laws as private citizens, and I agree. To address such concerns, on the opening day of the 104th Congress the House passed unanimously the Congressional Accountability Act, which will ensure that Congress lives under the same laws applied to private citizens.

## BACKGROUND

Many Members of Congress from both political parties and both chambers have worked for years to develop a process for applying laws to Congress that is consistent with the constitutional requirement of the separation of powers. For example, a proposal similar to the Congressional Accountability Act was included among the recommendations of the bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which I co-chaired. In August 1994, legislation almost identical to the Congressional Accountability Act passed the House by a margin of 437 to 4. Unfortunately, that proposal was blocked in the Senate in the closing days of the 103rd Congress. The House responded in October 1994 by applying laws to itself via a change in House rules.

This rules change was a worthwhile accomplishment. But private sector laws should be applied as fully as possible to both the House and Senate, and this is best accomplished by legislation rather than a rules change in one chamber. Moreover, the internal House rules change could not allow for court appeals of employee grievances. As a result, Congress is again considering legislation to end the long history of congressional exemptions.

## IMPORTANCE

There are three key reasons why it is important for Members of Congress to follow the same laws that cover private citizens.

First, the widespread perception that Members have exempted themselves from many laws significantly undermines public confidence in Congress. This institution loses credibility and legitimacy when people believe that Members are somehow "above the law."

Second, more fully applying laws to Congress will improve the quality of the legislation we pass. It can be difficult for Members to understand completely the practical implications of legislation when we are not forced to confront these implications in our own place of work.

And third, it is simply unfair not to extend to congressional employees the same rights and protections available to those who work elsewhere.

## COMPLEXITIES

As with many congressional reform issues, the issue of applying laws to Congress is complex, and often misunderstood. For example, many laws such as the Social Security Act have long been applied to Congress

in exactly the same manner that they are applied to the private sector. Other key labor laws also are currently applied to Congress, although the methods of enforcement differ somewhat from those adopted for private sector employees. Among these laws are the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Family and Medical Leave Act. Some laws have not been applied to Congress simply because they have no bearing on the internal operations of this institution, such as Title IX of the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972, which deals with women's athletics programs. And in certain areas Members are actually subject to more stringent statutory limitations than those applied to people in the private sector: examples include full public financial disclosure, post-employment restrictions, and strict limitations on outside income.

Constitutional questions have also complicated the effort to bring the legislative branch into compliance. There would be considerable potential for mischief if a President of one party were allowed to use his regulatory enforcement powers to harass or unduly influence Members of Congress of another party. The internal operations of Congress cannot be subject to regulation—and possible political manipulation—by the President.

However, even with these common misunderstandings and difficulties, the underlying problem has remained: Congress has not been subject to certain laws to the maximum extent feasible, and the institution must be brought into full compliance in a manner consistent with the Constitution.

## PROVISIONS

My view is that the Congressional Accountability Act will accomplish these goals without undermining the separation of powers. As passed by the House, it contains a number of important provisions. It will: require the direct application of private sector laws, including OSHA, to Congress; create a bicameral Office of Compliance to issue the regulations necessary to implement these laws; provide that such regulations will go into effect within a certain period unless Congress explicitly votes otherwise; and allow congressional employees to take their complaints to court and receive compensation.

House passage of the Congressional Accountability Act is not the final hurdle in the process of applying laws to Congress. The Senate also has pledged quick consideration of a bill to apply laws to Congress. But the Senate bill likely will differ from the House-passed version in important ways, and the two chambers will have to agree on a single consensus package. Still, my hope is that Congress will settle the issue of congressional compliance early this year.

## CONCLUSION

The application of laws to Congress is one key component of the overall reform agenda advanced by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress and other reform-minded Members during recent years. But reform is an ongoing process, and much work still needs to be done. Members should continue to work in a bipartisan fashion for meaningful congressional reform throughout the 104th Congress. The passage of a strong reform agenda will help demonstrate that Members are serious about enhancing the openness, effectiveness, and public credibility of Congress.

TRIBUTE TO JONATHAN COHEN,  
SUBWAY HERO**HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 25, 1995*

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Jonathan Cohen, a brave young African American whose quick and selfless action prevented a fleeing suspect from escaping a tragic subway murder early this month.

Jonathan Cohen lived in the Bronx until he was 10 and attended P.S. 48 in my Congressional District. He was descending the escalator to the platform at the 34th Street station on January 4 when he saw a man push an elderly woman into the path of an oncoming subway train. While the other onlookers froze, Mr. Cohen had the presence of mind to follow the man he saw commit the crime, call out to others to call the police, and then grab and hold the suspect when he reached the token booth.

Mr. Speaker, when teachers at P.S. 48 read about this incident, they recalled the young boy named Jonathan Cohen who had attended their school 20 years ago. After doing some checking, they were able to ascertain that the hero of January 4 was a grown-up version of the boy they remembered.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 17, P.S. 48 will hold a Black History Month program. The annual theme of this year's celebration, which had been established well in advance of the events of January 4, is "Growing Better Citizens." How fitting it is, Mr. Speaker, that Jonathan Cohen, who has grown into such an outstanding citizen, will speak at this event.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and the P.S. 48 community in praise of Jonathan Cohen for the shining example he sets for all Americans.

## INTRODUCTION OF TAX LEGISLATION TO REPEAL THE \$15 MILLION LIMITATION ON TAX EXEMPT PUBLIC OUTPUT BONDS

**HON. RICHARD E. NEAL**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 25, 1995*

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the special \$15,000,000 limitation on the amount of a tax-exempt bond issue which may be used to provide an output facility. The intent of this legislation is to treat public power in the same manner as other public facilities.

Traditionally, States and local governments and other public entities have relied on the issuance of municipal tax-free bonds to finance construction of a wide range of essential public facilities, including schools, roads, water and waste water treatment systems, electric and gas utilities, hospitals, health centers, prisons, and public transit. The Tax Reform Act of 1986 included numerous provisions restricting the use of tax exempt bonds. These provisions were enacted in order to curb

abuses in the bond community and to increase revenue to reduce the Federal budget deficit.

One of the changes made in 1986 was the extent to which private parties could benefit from the use of facilities financed by tax-exempt bonds. Pre-1986, up to 25 percent of facilities constructed through the issuance of tax-exempt bonds could benefit from the use of facilities financed by tax-exempt bonds. The Tax Reform Act of 1986 reduced this restriction to 10 percent for all Government bonds. However, a further limitation was imposed on public power and public natural gas transmission facilities. The private use test for public power is the lesser of 10 percent of \$15 million. No other entities are subject to the \$15 million private-use test.

The removal of the \$15 million cap would place public power on equal footing with other public facilities. The additional restriction on public power hampers the ability of these entities to buy and sell power in the open market. In addition, the restriction constrains public power entities from building units of a size which allow them to gain economies of scale.

In 1989, the Anthony Commission on Public Finance, chaired by former Rep. Beryl Anthony issued a report entitled "Preserving the Federal-State-Local Partnership: The Role of Tax-Exempt Financing." The Commission recommended the elimination of the \$15 million public power limit. The bottom line is that this restriction is not only discriminatory, but it drives up the cost of power to consumers of public systems.

On June 23, 1993, the U.S. Department of Treasury testified before the Subcommittee on Select Revenue of the Ways and Means Committee and addressed this legislation. Leslie B. Samuels, Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy said, "There does not appear to be a reason to treat (these) output facilities more harshly than other output facilities. As a practical matter, the \$15 million output limit of current law may have little effect other than to create an incentive for public power issues to operate inefficiently."

The legislation will remove the \$15 million cap and treat public power like other public facilities and I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

**JOHN M. RANDOLPH, JR., HONORED WITH COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD**

**HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 25, 1995*

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to have the opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of a highly respected leader and my personal friend, John M. Randolph, Jr. Mr. Randolph will be honored by the Wilkes-Barre community on February 19 at the prestigious Lincoln Day Dinner sponsored by the B'nai B'rith S.J. Strauss Lodge.

Mr. Randolph, a graduate of King's College, is a senior partner in the accounting firm of Parente, Randolph, Orlando, Carey and Associates, which is the 25th largest CPA firm in

the United States. It has 10 offices in Pennsylvania, and employs a professional staff of more than 300 employees.

A frequent speaker for professional and community service groups, John has often shared his financial expertise with the community. The list of his personal and professional affiliations and memberships is long and impressive. It includes a seat on the board of trustees of College Misericordia where he served as the vice-chairman of the board and chairman of the finance committee. Currently he is serving as trustee emeritus. He has served from 1989 to 1990 as a trustee for Keystone Junior College; he is a current trustee of King's College and sits on the Wilkes University Presidents Council.

John came to Wilkes-Barre in 1959 to attend King's College and made the Wyoming Valley his home. He and his wife, Sharon, are the proud parents of two sons, John III, a second-year law student, and Scott, who attends Wilkes University.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the Strauss Lodge in honoring John Randolph, Jr., for his dedication to his profession and to his community. I applaud the lodge's choice of John Randolph as this year's recipient of this prestigious award.

**SALUTE TO THE PARLATOS FOR THEIR SERVICE IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE**

**HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 25, 1995*

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Julie and Alan Parlato from Rochester, NY for their accredited service in the U.S. Air Force on the occasion of their retirement at the Offutt AFB on November 18, 1994.

In SMSgt. Alan A. Parlato's 24 years in the Air Force he earned a SAC master technician patch and a SAC master aircraft and munitions maintenance badge. His decorations and awards include the Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Air Force Achievement Medal, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with one oak leaf cluster, Air Force Organizational Excellence Award with one oak leaf cluster, Air Force Good Conduct Medal with seven oak leaf clusters, National Defense Service Medal with bronze star, Air Force Overseas Long Tour Ribbon with one oak leaf cluster, Air Force Longevity Service Award with five oak leaf clusters, NCO PME Graduation Ribbon with one oak leaf cluster, Small Arms Expert Marksmanship Ribbon, and the Air Force training ribbon. He enlisted in the Air Force in 1971 as a grand radio repairman and left as a maintenance operations superintendent and logistics group resource advisor.

In Master Sergeant Julie A. Parlato's 20 years in the Air Force her decorations and awards include the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, Air Force Organizational

Excellence Award, Combat Readiness Medal, Air Force Overseas Long Tour Ribbon, Air Force Longevity Service Award with four oak leaf clusters, NCO PME Graduation Ribbon with one oak leaf cluster, and the Air Force Training Ribbon. She enlisted in the Air Force in 1974 as a plumber, retrained first as a teletype operator and later to go into the training career field. She left as chief, education and training section responsible for developing and evaluating unit training programs.

Alan A. Parlato and the former Julia A. Reitano met in 1969 and were married in August 1971 in Rochester, NY. They have one son, Christopher, a daughter-in-law, Heather, and two grandsons, Zakk and Storm. Alan's proud parents are Russell and June Parlato of Irondequoit, NY. Julia's equally proud parents are Joe and Theresa Reitano of Greece, NY.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and their family in thanking the Parlato family for their allegiance to and brave service for our Nation.

**AGREE TO DISAGREE IN BIPARTISAN EFFORT TO GET THE PEOPLE'S WORK DONE**

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 25, 1995*

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States addressed this body last night during his annual remarks on the State of the Union, he expressed his desire to put partisan politics aside and to work with this new Congress in accomplishing the goals of the Nation. We should hasten to accept this challenge.

The President's message was a forthright affirmation of America's working men and women. He acknowledges that despite economic recovery, too many families are still working harder for less. President Clinton outlined his strategy for preparing the American people to face the demands of today's economy by raising family incomes. In an effort to reach parity in wages, he proposed raising the minimum wage. He further outlined the proposals of his Middle-Class Bill of Rights—a proposal which will help middle-class families meet the costs of raising and educating their children, obtaining training for higher paying jobs, purchasing a first home, or for the care of an elderly parent. Let us use the President's words and ideas as a framework for legislative action. We cannot afford to allow his passionate directives to simply pass through these halls as wishful rhetoric. We must act now.

President Clinton's new covenant of rights and responsibilities between the Federal Government and the American people is a prescription for new hope. I agree that the Government must help people obtain the necessary tools to improve the quality of their lives. But I further believe that people must play a role in building not only their own lives, but in building and strengthening their communities and their country. To do this, we need to reform our welfare state into a system that rewards work and responsibility; we must continue the fight against crime; and we should

build upon the principles of the AmeriCorps national service program.

We are a nation of people—united to work for many of the same causes. But when we disagree, it does not mean that we are fundamentally different creatures. We simply disagree. It's that simple. For this Nation to move forward, we must learn to agree to disagree and move beyond party lines to work toward the health and well being of all. Thank you, Mr. President, for your inspiring words of encouragement.

#### TRIBUTE TO NEWPORT HARBOR HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

### HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Newport Harbor High School football team, which completed its first undefeated season in 64 years by winning the California Interscholastic Federation championship title.

Led by Head Coach Jeff Brinkley, the Sailors' triumphant season was the culmination of an extraordinary year for these young men. It was a year that was marked not only by notable individual accomplishments and exemplary team play but also by a tremendous sense of courage and determination rarely seen in prep football. The coaching staff, the players, the fans all made their dream a reality.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting the Newport High School football team and to congratulate their championship year.

#### GOVERNOR WHITMAN'S SPEECH TO THE NATION

### HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last night New Jersey Gov. Christine Todd Whitman delivered the Republican response to the President's State of the Union Address from the historic assembly chamber in Trenton.

As my colleagues are aware, Governor Whitman has a growing national reputation for cutting taxes, slashing onerous regulations, and eliminating unnecessary spending. She has demonstrated the leadership, determination, and guts to govern effectively. She has proven that government can be smaller and less costly and still be responsive to the people it serves.

Mr. Speaker, many political pundits are touting Governor Whitman as a possible Vice Presidential nominee, and rightly so. Governor Whitman's successful policies are a model that should be adopted nationally.

I commend Mrs. Whitman on her excellent speech last night. Below is the text of the Governor's speech for my colleagues' review.

#### STATE OF THE UNION RESPONSE

Good evening. I'm Christie Whitman, Governor of New Jersey, and I am addressing you

tonight from the historic legislative chamber in Trenton, one of the oldest in the nation. Speaking to you this evening is a tremendous honor for all of us here in New Jersey.

It is appropriate that we have come together tonight in Trenton. On Christmas morning in 1776, George Washington crossed the icy Delaware River and surprised King George's mercenaries in their barracks here—on these grounds. The Battle of Trenton was a turning point in the American Revolution.

Just as that revolution two centuries ago began in the colonies, there is a revolution sweeping America today, begun not in Washington, D.C., but in the states. In Wisconsin, in Ohio, in Massachusetts, in South Carolina, in California. The American people are seeking freedom in a new revolution that began before I ever came to office.

It is a revolution of ideas, one in which the voters are given a clear choice between bigger or smaller government, higher or lower taxes, more or less spending.

It is a revolution about a free and sovereign people saying they want power to return to them from their state houses, their county governments, their city halls.

In elections all across America, the voters have chosen smaller government, lower taxes and less spending.

They rejected the tyranny of expanding welfare-state policies, the arrogance of bigger and bigger government. The frustration of one size-fits-all answers.

In a word, they have chosen freedom.

They elected leaders like Governor Bill Weld of Massachusetts—who, in his first month in office, cut state spending by 1.7 billion dollars. Since then, he's cut taxes five times and brought Massachusetts the third-lowest unemployment rate in the nation.

And Governor Pete Wilson, who has already reformed health care in California—using market forces to guarantee access for millions of uninsured and made health care more affordable for small businesses.

They elected governors who said we should have a smaller, more efficient government—and they meant it. Like Governor Tommy Thompson in Wisconsin—he's cut spending, cut taxes, and led the most comprehensive welfare reform movement in the country.

And Governor Fife Symington, who became one of several Republican governors to cut tax every year they were in office and see their economies boom.

In state after state, the revolution of ideas took hold.

By 1994, Governor George Allen reformed the criminal justice system and abolished parole in Virginia.

And the same month Bill Clinton signed the largest tax increases in American history, Governor John Engler signed the largest tax cut in Michigan history, helping bring the lowest unemployment rate to the state in twenty years.

Here in New Jersey—like so many other governors—I was told my tax-cutting policies were a "gimmick." I heard we couldn't do it—that it was "impossible"—that it would "hurt the economy."

But I had given my word to the people of New Jersey that we would cut their taxes. And we did.

In the first year, with the help of the New Jersey legislature, we cut business taxes.

We reduced income taxes not once but twice. We lowered state spending—not recklessly—but carefully and fairly.

Just yesterday, I announced a third wave of income tax cuts—another 15 percent, tak-

ing us to a 30 percent reduction, to put more money in the hands of families like yours.

The results have been solid: State revenues are up even from the income tax—and 60 thousand more New Jerseyans are at work today than were a year ago—making this year our best year for job creation since 1988. And we did it all under a balanced budget amendment to our state's constitution.

In November, the revolution came to Washington.

Now people want less government, lower taxes, and less spending from the federal government.

People want results.

In both houses of Congress, the Republican party has been elected, like many of us in the states were on an agenda of change:

We're committed to reforming welfare—to encourage people to work, and to stop children from having children.

We want to force the government to live within its means by stopping runaway spending and balancing the federal budget.

We want to lower taxes for families and make it easier to achieve the American Dream—to save money, buy a home and send the kids to college.

We're going to stop violent criminals in the tracks—with real prison time for repeat offenders and a workable death penalty.

We must send a message to our young people that crime doesn't pay.

And we're going to slash those unnecessary regulations that strangle small business in America, to make it easier to create more jobs and pay better wages and become more competitive in the global marketplace.

We intend to create a new era of hope and opportunity for all Americans.

Many of these ideas are the same ones Governors have been enacting here in the states.

Time after time, Republicans and Democrats—have found that things work better when states and communities set their own priorities, rather than being bossed around by bureaucrats in Washington.

Our colleagues on Capitol Hill are facing the same opposition we did—the same cries of "it can't be done" from the Washington-knows-best crowd. People who think government can't be too big and that there is virtue in raising taxes.

Well, there's nothing virtuous about raising taxes. There's nothing heroic about preserving a welfare system that entraps people. And there's nothing high-minded about wasting other people's money on Big Government spending sprees.

We overcame the same objections, the same stalling and distortion, the same footdragging. We've heard it all. And in the end, we have won the battle of ideas in our states.

Now it's time to win the battle of ideas in Washington.

If the people's agenda is to succeed in Congress, everyone needs to work together.

And while at times tonight some of the President's ideas sounded pretty Republican, the fact remains that he has been opposed to the Balanced Budget Amendment—he proposed even more government spending—and he imposed the biggest tax increase in American history.

It's clear that your votes in November sounded a warning to the President. If he has changed his big government agenda, we say great—join us as we change America.

Republicans welcome your ideas for making government not bigger but smaller.

As we move forward in the next two years, the President and Congress should be reminded that success is not measured in the number of laws passed, but in the results.

Is government serving the people better?  
 Are neighborhoods safer?  
 Are families stronger?  
 Are children learning more?  
 Are we better prepared to meet the future?  
 Do we have more freedom?

The election in November was a beginning, not an end—and we are committed to fulfilling the verdict of the voters and enacting our agenda of hope for the families of America. Change is hard. But we're going to work hard.

We will keep faith with America.  
 We will keep our word.  
 We will do what you elected us to do.  
 We will give you results.

On election day you gave us your trust. We accept your mandate.

President Clinton, you must accept it as well.

Put the principles of smaller, more effective government into action. Reduce spending and cut taxes.

Two weeks ago, in my State of the State address to the people of New Jersey, I made them a pledge which, in closing, I would now like to make to the American people on behalf of the Republican Party. By the time President Clinton makes his next State of the Union address:

We will have lower taxes.  
 We will have more efficient government.  
 We will have a stronger America.

We will have more faith in our politics, more pride in our states and communities, and more confidence in ourselves.

We will go forward together, as one family with many faces, building a future with opportunity.

A future with security.

A future based on mutual respect and responsibility.

And most of all, a future filled with hope—for our children and our children's children.

Thank you very much and God bless America.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO SORENSON BROADCASTING FOR 13 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE AND 10 YEARS OF GREAT TALK RADIO

#### HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in my home district of Guam, we have many fine radio personalities and journalists. One of the island's communications corporations has been around for the last 13 years, and has been the only all talk radio station on our island for the last 10 years. The company is known as Sorenson Broadcasting, and its all talk radio station is NEWSTALK: K-57. Since there is only one all talk station on our local radio dial, K-57 is more like an electronic village meeting which convenes every day.

The mornings are very alive with one of Guam's solid citizens, Jon Anderson. This is morning talk radio at its finest. For 4 hours beginning at 6 a.m., Anderson engages, encourages, stimulates, and informs. Jon Anderson is the most well-known voice throughout all segments of Guam's varied communities. He has been concerned with island issues for many years now, and Guam is enhanced by his show and his concern.

Then, in the afternoon when things seem to be slowing down, Myk Powell hits the air waves. If you need a little humor, albeit tongue-in-cheek, to keep going, Myk, gives you exactly that, a little humor. He'd be proud of me for stealing that joke. But seriously folks. . . .

Myk carries on the same important role of channeling emotion, conveying information, and encouraging debate. He has that rare gift of being able to intelligently sprinkle humor throughout his show. From his Uncle Myk-ie alter ego to his hilarious commercials. Myk can tease an audience immediately after causing them to question their stance on important issues.

Beyond all the talk, NEWSTALK K-57 features the Island's only radio news team guided by news pro, Patty Arroyo, the island's only on-the-go Shakespearian traffic reporter, Jefferson Cronin, and knowledgeable news anchors and reporters.

Yes, we the radio listeners on Guam are fortunate indeed. The naysayers said you'd run out of things to talk about. Ten years later, we continue to enjoy the fine programs which K-57 radio offers today and, we hope, for many years to come.

#### FEDERAL MANDATES

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 25, 1995 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### FEDERAL MANDATES

Local officials and small business owners in Indiana often tell me of the difficulty they have paying for unfunded federal mandates. One of their top priorities is to limit the ability of Congress to shift costs to businesses or state and local governments by requiring them to meet certain federal standards. I agree. Congress is responding to these concerns by considering a bill this week in both the Senate and the House to limit the practice of imposing unfunded federal mandates. This bill is similar to legislation I co-sponsored in 1993.

In the past, state and local governments have been told they must do things such as provide safe drinking water, reduce asbestos hazards, or impose tough criminal penalties. Businesses were required to improve workplace standards, protect their customers from fraud or abuse, and comply with numerous environmental regulations. The objectives of these federal requirements are almost always worthy: clean water, safer roads, trustworthy banks, or consumer protection. But collectively they often drain funds from local governments and discourage business growth. For example, compliance with the Clean Water Act is expected to cost state and local governments \$32 billion this year. By one estimate, compliance with twelve other federal mandates will cost \$33.7 billion over the next five years. In all, federal mandates consume an average of 12.3% of local revenue. In the private sector, an EPA study found that environmental compliance costs can at times exceed profits for some small businesses, including many dry

cleaners, truckers, farmers, and wood finishers.

Unfunded mandates have imposed costs and inflexible rules on governments and business. They often dictate priorities to those who must comply without considering their views. But since many of the laws and regulations in question prevent discrimination, promote worker safety, and protect health, safety, and the environment, the proposals to reduce unfunded mandates must be approached with great care. The challenge is to alleviate the financial burden of unfunded mandates without letting the worthy objectives slip away.

#### FEDERAL BUDGET CUTS

The major impetus behind growing federal mandates is the federal budget deficit. In the 1960s and 1970s, federal money to state and local governments grew steadily as a percentage of state and local outlays, peaking at 27% in 1978. More recently, the federal government's response to budget deficits has been to reduce its share of state and local aid to about 18% of their budgets. But mandates did not decrease, and local costs escalated.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

There is broad support in Congress to curb unfunded mandates. At a minimum, the House and Senate should be required to take a separate vote on any measure that would place costs on state or local governments.

Without such a vote, the House bill's "no money, no mandate" provision would require the federal government to provide funds for new mandates. Before Congress takes action on a bill, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) would have to determine if the costs of the proposed legislation would exceed \$50 million for states and localities, or \$100 million for the much larger private sector. For bills that exceed these thresholds, any one Member of Congress could demand a separate vote on whether or not to impose an unfunded mandate.

In addition, federal agencies would be prohibited from imposing unauthorized costs on states and localities when issuing new regulations. There would also be reports to Congress on the costs incurred by state and local governments and the private sector in meeting existing mandates.

#### DRAWBACKS

There are, however, several drawbacks to any blanket prohibition on federal mandates. First, civil rights advocates fear restrictions on mandates could gut constitutional rights and anti-discrimination laws. Thus, the measure should not apply to laws protecting constitutional rights. It should also exempt laws to protect against fraud, provide emergency assistance, and protect national security. Second, eliminating mandates may make it more difficult to apply worthy existing health and safety standards. Third, protection from mandates should apply equally to the public and private sector. For example, local governments should not be exempt from labor safety laws just because the federal government does not subsidize their implementation. Fourth, the analysis of mandates should include potential benefits as well as costs. It would be shortsighted to abolish public health requirements that pay for themselves many times over in long-term health care savings. Fifth, estimating the effect of complex legislation is extremely difficult. Calculating direct and indirect costs of a mandate is so exacting that analysts will be hard-pressed to present accurate figures.

While this bill is not perfect, it is a good start in dealing with the complex problem of

unfunded mandates. It can and will be improved over time. A major flaw in the bill is that it delays taking effect until October. We should curb unfunded mandates now, not later.

#### CONCLUSION

The unfunded mandates bill will cause Congress to think twice before shifting costs to local governments and businesses. It will shift power from the federal government to the states, and provide businesses and local officials a forum to discuss the cost-effectiveness of rules with federal regulators before rules take effect. These costs will now be considered as an integral part of the legislative process. Members who approve legislation without funding will be required to explain their actions to those faced with the costs of compliance.

Government that works better and costs less must consider all costs, including those incurred by the private sector, and encourage cooperation among all levels of government. We accomplish little if we balance the federal budget with unfunded mandates on the backs of others. Enactment of unfunded mandate legislation will be an important step in improving the performance of government.

#### INTRODUCTION OF SUPER IRA LEGISLATION

**HON. RICHARD E. NEAL**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. Thomas and I are introducing the Savings and Investment Act of 1995, commonly referred to as the Super IRA bill. Since I have been a Member of Congress, I have been very concerned about our low national savings rate. I share the belief of chairman Alan Greenspan of the Federal Reserve that our low national savings rate is our number one economic problem.

The savings rate has declined significantly since the 1950s. In 1993, U.S. net national saving was only 2.7 percent of net national product, compared to 12.3 percent in 1950. In a recent study, Professors R. Glenn Hubbard and Jonathan Skinner concluded raising the Individual Retirement Account (IRA) contribution limit would increase net national savings by \$4 for every dollar lost in government tax revenue. Professors Hubbard and Skinner believe the decline in the national savings rate is a cause for serious concern because of the links between saving, capital formation, productivity, and American living standards.

I believe the purpose of this legislation is to increase our national savings rate. IRAs are a proven tool to boost our savings. Most contributions to IRAs are made by middle income families. All Americans should be able to contribute to IRAs. We need to provide individuals with an incentive to save for their retirement. The U.S. personal saving rate dropped from 5.2 percent of GDP in 1960-1980 to 3.4 percent in 1991-1994.

Under this legislation, all Americans would be eligible for fully deductible IRAs. Current law only allows those taxpayers who are not covered by any other pension arrangement, and whose income does not exceed \$40,000 (\$25,000 singles) to be eligible for a fully de-

ductible IRA. These limits would be gradually lifted over time. The \$2,000 contribution limit will be indexed for inflation in \$500 increments in the year in which the indexed amount exceeds the next \$500 increase.

The legislation creates a new kind of IRA option. Taxpayers will be offered a new choice of IRA. Under this new type of IRA, contributions will not be deductible, but if the assets remain in the account for at least 5 years, all income will be tax free when it is withdrawn. A 10 percent penalty will apply to early withdrawals, unless one of the five exceptions is met.

The legislation includes a provision which I believe is very important. The bill allows spouses who work at home to contribute up to \$2,000 to their own IRA to the extent of their own income. In addition, the legislation waives the 10 percent penalty on early withdrawals if the funds are used to buy a first home, to pay educational expenses, to cover catastrophic health care costs, during long periods of unemployment, or to purchase of long-term care insurance. Similar penalty withdrawal rules will apply to 401(k) and 403(b) employer-sponsored plans.

We have to encourage individuals to save for their retirement. I believe this legislation is a step in the right direction. I urge you to support this legislation.

#### SOUTH BRONX MENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL, INC. PATIENT RECOGNITION AND EMPOWERMENT DAY

**HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the South Bronx Mental Health Council, Inc., which this Friday will celebrate its fourth annual "Patient Recognition and Empowerment Day."

The South Bronx Mental Health Council is a community based organization which provides treatment and mental health services to the local population and to area schools and senior centers.

While it is important, and appropriate, to recognize the care givers who provide these services, it is even more important that those individuals who have made special efforts to overcome their challenges also receive our attention and support.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting our friends at the South Bronx Mental Health Council, who on Friday, January 27 will celebrate the fourth annual Patient Recognition and Empowerment Day.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MARCELINO SERNA

**HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to posthumously honor

Mr. Marcelino Serna of El Paso, TX. My bill would make the late Mr. Serna eligible for the award from the Army of the Congressional Medal of Honor by stipulation that the regulation which says that a nomination for that award must be filed within 2 years of the acts above and beyond the call of duty should be waived in this case. In my judgment, Mr. Serna deserves that medal just as surely as anyone who has ever been so honored.

Marcelino Serna served in the U.S. Army from 1917 to 1919. He was born in Chihuahua City, in the Mexican State of Chihuahua in 1896. He died February 29, 1992 at the age of 95. He had held his U.S. citizenship since 1924. Seventy-one years ago, Mr. Serna was awarded the Army's second highest award for valor in combat, the Distinguished Service Cross. He was decorated with the highest military medals of Italy and France. The descriptions of his exploits on the battlefields of Belgium and France read like casebooks of heroism. In recovering from wounds suffered toward the end of the war, he was personally decorated by General John "Black Jack" Pershing.

Some have speculated that Mr. Serna was not awarded the Medal of Honor because he was a buck private for most of the war, because he was not a citizen of this country at the time or because he could not speak English well. I hope that none of these reasons were ever given by anyone in a position of authority in these matters. They are insulting and they have no basis in law.

This bill, once enacted, would begin to right a wrong, and to correct an oversight. I urge the committee of jurisdiction to take up the legislation as rapidly as possible so that the Army may look at the merits of this case.

H.R. —

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the time limitations specified in section 3744(b) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor under section 3741 of such title to the late Marcelino Serna of El Paso, Texas, for acts of heroism performed while serving as a private in the United States Army during World War I.*

#### THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND PLAN

**HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, for much of the 103d Congress we were occupied with concerns over the Federal budget deficit; we debated numerous and varied ideas to limit spending or raise revenue or accept some combinations of the two. The common goal has been to reduce the deficit—a deficit that both liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, see as a threat to our national economic health and long-term stability. We grappled with constitutional amendments to gain a mandatory balanced budget and each appropriation bill seems to bring new attempts to impose generic limits. We saw bills to cut spending across the board, to target programs

ranging from the tea tasters to the B1 bomber, all in an effort to get the deficit under control.

Through all this, Mr. Speaker, we have not utilized the most effective resource this Nation has to accomplish this critical task. We have not given the American voter a tangible stake in this Country's financial progress. The National Dividend Plan [NDP], an idea born in the fifties in the mind and heart of John J. Perry, Jr., and which I have introduced as H.R. 430, does just that.

The NDP doesn't just encourage citizen involvement—involvement is guaranteed through the sharing of the Federal profits of corporate enterprise. This profit sharing is achieved by redirecting revenue collected from the corporate income tax from Federal coffers directly back to those who generated it: The American labor force. This would be done only in years when the budget is balanced or in surplus, giving all voting citizens a direct stake in the outcome of the Federal budgeting process.

John Perry is a successful businessman and philanthropist. He recently wrote of the NDP and I want to share his thoughts with my colleagues. I hope it will help persuade each of you to join me in this effort.

THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND PLAN: IT'S TIME  
(By John H. Perry, Jr.)

"It's spending, stupid!"

For Fiscal Year 1996, the President's budget proposes spending of \$1.518 trillion—that's \$2,880,000 every minute of every day. And we will pile up an additional \$176 billion of debt even while we are paying net interest of \$198.8 billion on our existing national debt of \$4.6 trillion. Think of it, how would you spend \$48,000 a second next year? More importantly, how could you do that knowing that it adds \$335,000 a minute to your debt even while you pay \$378,000 a minute in interest on existing debt.

If, resorting to the sport metaphor which dominates much political discussion these days, it's "Three strikes and you're out!" why is the hottest debate topic on Capitol Hill these days the Balanced Budget Constitutional Amendment? We're already out of the box.

Congress swung—and missed—with the Budget Impoundment and Control Act, it swung and missed again with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and then, called strike three—the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, not only did spending continue, but taxes were increased.

Members of the Congress, House and Senate, are again earnestly discussing the need for discipline in spending, but build accounting devices into a proposed Constitutional Amendment which will also provide loopholes for minorities who would on the one hand expand revenue and on the other limit spending.

Instead of recognizing the futility of 535 Members of Congress trying to restrain themselves from doing what 260 million Americans want them to do, it's time that we create an environment in which 260 million people demand that the 535 do what needs to be done.

The National Dividend Plan provides not only the opportunity, but also the demand. After forty years "in the wilderness," it is an idea whose time has surely come. In 1952, having found some success for myself as I pursued the American dream, I proposed a program by which the public revenue from the profits of the industrial might of Amer-

ica—Federal corporate income tax revenues—be returned directly to the people of America, the source of that might. It was, for its day, a radical national "employee stock ownership plan." In a simpler time, a time of only marginal deficits, and occasional surpluses, it was just a way to "invest" each voting citizen with a stake in increasing the economic might of the nation—emphasizing American industry—and by participating in the political process—registered voters would become actors in "growing" America.

The National Dividend Plan is majestic in its simplicity:

1. Create a National Dividend Trust Fund, financed primarily by Federal income taxes on corporate profits and capital gains taxes; distribute the revenues from the Fund, quarterly, equally to all registered voters, tax-free

2. Impose a five-year spending freeze on the Federal government as the Fund is established and adjustments are made in Federal budgeting.

3. To eliminate, and restrain, Federal deficits, provide that no distributions from the Trust Fund be made to individuals until the Federal budget is in surplus—because each registered citizen-voter is equally entitled to Fund distributions, each citizen, rich or poor, becomes equally vested with an interest in critically weighing Federal programming.

4. Eliminate the double taxation of corporate dividends for stockholders.

5. Freeze the corporate tax at current rates to provide economic stability.

Polls have consistently shown results which indicate that the American public recognizes the need to limit spending and to balance our national budget. Individuals know that they must balance their checkbooks or face declining living standards and limited options for future activity. At the same time, political realities have encouraged legislators to respond to special interest constituencies rather than to make the tough choices necessary to live within our means.

The National Dividend Plan, by giving every registered voter a stake in controlling Federal spending, will enforce discipline where it belongs: in the relationship between voters and their voices in Washington. Without a meaningful incentive for voters to demand discipline in Federal spending on the part of legislators, legislators have no incentive to practice meaningful discipline.

More to the point, since a properly established National Dividend Plan would eliminate deficit spending within a few years, a five year period is built into the legislation, the American voter becomes a stakeholder in the economic success of America's business enterprise.

Buying American becomes not only a statement of faith in America's businesses and industry, it also gives each voter a return on his or her investment of time and energy to the success of our nation's productive enterprise. And, because America will become more productive it will continue to be the most successful exporter of national goods and services in the world.

Finally, of course, it is important to understand that, while the proceeds of the National Dividend are not taxable, the earned income of citizens is. A vibrant economy will continue to generate Federal funds to meet truly national needs—and the growth of business and industry generated by increases in productivity and the competitiveness of American goods and services will mean that

America's Federal enterprise can grow as the nation grows, and even meet important new needs. But the practice of responding to special interests, "oiling" the hundreds of squeaky wheels that now make up not only our Federal programs but the way that we legislate, will have to pass the "means" test: Is it worth it if it means that my dividend is reduced? Some demands will meet that test: certainly challenges to our national sovereignty or national interests around the world which may demand defense expenditures, unusual events such as the disasters which have occasionally resulted in our people demonstrating that we are the most compassionate nation on earth, and other events which may call on our enlightened self-interest to meet our national interest.

America is a nation built on a free economy, but its economy is no longer free—it is captive to the 35 years of deficits since the last balanced budget. Only the people of America, whose self-interest and generosity generated the budgetary nightmare we now face wake up and bring a bright new day.

The National Dividend Plan gives America's voters not only the opportunity to continue to generously meet national needs, but the self-interest to demand that those needs meet the test of being measured by the light of day. And legislators, who now seek shelter in the "discipline" of a hazy Constitutional Amendment will find the glow of a new day of enlightened voter participation in the budget process. H.R. 430, legislation implementing a National Dividend Plan, is before the 104th Congress. It's time that we as voters demand of our legislators that they not only return to the citizenry a means by which to measure their economic management of America, but also a share of the means which measures the economic strength of America.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE RECONCILIATION OF NORTH AND SOUTH KOREA

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, the Administration has in recent months claimed several foreign policy victories. However, American taxpayers should recognize that one of these victories, the recent accord between the United States and Communist North Korea, may prove extremely costly.

The Administration has hailed the agreement as the beginning of the end of a perilous nuclear crisis. But, the nuclear crisis appears far from over since North Korea is not required to dismantle all its nuclear facilities for at least 10 years. The Administration has played down the concessions the United States must provide to North Korea within this "gentlemen's agreement". Additionally, the Administration appears to have slighted the traditionally close United States coordination with our democratic and reliable ally, South Korea.

Under the agreement, which was signed on October 21, the United States will organize a consortium including South Korea and Japan to supply North Korea with two light-water reactors. These reactors are less useful for bomb-making than the North's existing technology. In return, North Korea will freeze its

nuclear program and promise to open its nuclear sites eventually to inspection.

A serious flaw is that the accord allows North Korea to postpone United Nation's "special inspections" of its nuclear sites until one of the light-water reactors is nearly in place, a process that will take at least 5 years—and probably longer.

These inspections are necessary to determine whether Pyongyang has extracted weapons-grade plutonium for its spent-fuel stock. We should take into account, though, that in the last two years, Pyongyang has concluded nuclear agreements with both the United Nations International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and Seoul that it has failed to fulfill. The Administration offered North Korea economic and political benefits and granted the North up to 10 years, or longer, to fulfill pledges it has already refused to honor.

While these light-water reactors are being assembled, a process that will take a decade or more, the United States-led consortium will provide North Korea with free crude oil as an alternative energy source, gradually reduce trade barriers, work toward exchanging diplomatic missions and provide a negative security assurance.

Both Tokyo and Seoul officially welcomed the agreement. However, the accord is drawing fire from South Korea's opposition Democratic party (DP) as well as from conservatives with the majority party, the Democratic Liberal Party (DLP). The DP is decrying the cost to Seoul of two light-water reactors, estimated as high as \$4 billion, and the requirement to pay for the crude oil that is supposed to serve as North Korea's alternative energy supply. Conservative members of the DLP similarly oppose the high price tag and the generous delays offered to the North. There is growing popular South Korean sentiment that North Korea has outmaneuvered Washington and marginalized the South's input into this issue. This agreement may jeopardize an alliance that has been very close and productive for many years. I believe we must move to reaffirm the importance of close United States coordination with the South Korean Government.

The Administration should take steps to guarantee that the implementation of the agreement is linked to substantive progress in the reconciliation of North and South Korea. To that end, the Administration should develop specific timetables for achieving measures which will reduce tensions between North and South Korea. For example, specific timetables should be developed for the prompt dismantlement of North Korea's nuclear processing facility. Timetables for the establishment of liaison offices between North and South Korea should be developed. Mutual nuclear facility inspections between North and South Korea should be initiated. Furthermore, the Administration should develop timetables for the establishment of a North-South joint military commission to discuss steps to reduce tensions between North and South Korea.

The Administration should immediately appoint a presidential envoy to deal directly with the real leadership in Pyongyang. This presidential envoy should be respected and experienced in negotiating with Koreans. One of the envoy's first actions should be to call on the North to resume substantive, high-level talks with Seoul immediately

Today, I, along with my colleagues Representatives KIM (CA) and SOLOMON (NY), have introduced a concurrent resolution which outlines several steps I think the Administration should take to strengthen the United States-North Korea Agreed Framework. Likewise, Senators MURKOWSKI, SIMON, ROBB and HELMS have introduced identical legislation in the other body.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me by cosponsoring this very important concurrent resolution. By taking these steps, the agreement between the United States and the heavily armed North Korean regime may ultimately be a success.

#### UNDERSTANDING CONGRESS

### HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, "Oh what gift to give us to see ourselves as others see us."—Robert Burns.

Following is an article from the Indianapolis Star.

#### PARTISAN SPATS HAVE LITTLE TO DO WITH REAL WORK OF THE HOUSE (By George Stuteville)

WASHINGTON.—Republicans and Democrats in Congress had been handling each other with kid gloves until last week. Then they dragged out the old battle-scarred partisan boxing gloves left over from the last session, laced them up and started duking it out.

But a brawl had been brewing for a few days.

Since the start of the session, Democrats had been using their morning speeches on the floor to attack the Republicans' *Contract With America* or complain about Republicans cutting them out of legislation. It sounded like old times—except Democrats are the chief winners now.

Then on Wednesday, Rep. Carrie Meek, D-Fla., ignited the melee with an innocuous comment about House Speaker Newt Gingrich, R-Ga., and his potentially lucrative book deal. Said Meek: "Exactly who does this speaker really work for? Is it the American people or his New York publishing house?"

Wham! Rep. Bob Walker, R-Pa., one of the most incendiary House members when his party was in the minority, demanded that Meek's comment be stricken from the record. In Walker's corner, acting Speaker Cliff Stearns, R-Fla., ruled Meek was out of order.

In minutes, representatives of both stripes cleared out of their offices and committee meetings like baseball players emptying the dugouts for a donnybrook over an umpire's call. Then they put the issue to a vote and, on strict party lines, 217-178, the Republican majority prevailed.

It was a nasty moment. It got plenty of play in newspapers and on radio and TV.

But it wasn't indicative of what really happened in Congress.

To understand Congress, you must see the House chambers as political theater. Removed from political reality, the floor is where actor/politicians deliver ideological soliloquies; where actor/politicians engage in witty and well-planned dialogue; where actor/politicians play for hometown audi-

ences with homespun stories; where actor/politicians put their egos on display.

The floor's voting consoles are its only practical use. Almost no work is done there.

#### WHERE BUSINESS IS DONE

To understand Congress, you must look at the subcommittee politics.

There weren't too many stories Wednesday about Rep. John Myers' first day as chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on energy and water.

Here, courtesy, congeniality and collegiality prevailed on a panel that controls about \$20 billion in federal spending. That's \$20 BILLION for water control and energy programs.

Instead of the contentiousness that spilled on the House floor, you saw Myers receive a gracious introduction from the former chairman, Rep. Tom Bevill, D-Ala.

Handing Myers the gavel, Bevill joked that he would have to get used to sitting in the smaller chair instead of the high-backed chairman's seat he had used for 18 years.

Myers jokingly replied that he had sold the chair, which got a laugh from Bevill.

The truth is that Myers, out of respect for Bevill, had the chair removed from the room altogether. Bevill had previously mentioned to Myers that he would miss the comfort of the big chair during interminable hearings.

So Myers got rid of it and took a small chair himself.

Myers' act carried deep symbolism, and it didn't go unnoticed by Bevill.

In subcommittees, members of Congress get to know each other. It's where most of the unglamorous legislative work gets done. Subcommittee politics are local, and a member's standing with his or her subcommittee is far more important than the bluster of the floor.

And in Myers' subcommittee, bipartisan-ship occupies the biggest chair.

#### TEEN PREGNANCY

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, January 18, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### TEEN PREGNANCY

There is no doubt that all of us should be concerned about the number of teenagers having babies. These young people must overcome formidable obstacles in order to become independent adults capable of supporting themselves and their families. All too often they fail, with dire consequences not only for parents and children but for society.

#### TRENDS

The U.S. has one of the highest teen pregnancy rates of any western industrialized nation. Before the end of their teenage years, 43% of girls become pregnant.

While the birth rate for adolescents has generally declined in the last 30 years, births to unmarried adolescents have steadily risen. In 1992, over half a million teens gave birth, and 71% of them were unmarried. In 1991, 10% of all births in Indiana were to single teens, compared to nine percent of all births nationally.

While the number of unmarried teens giving birth has increased, the likelihood that they will place their children for adoption

has decreased. Furthermore, in most cases, the fathers of children born to teen mothers are adults.

#### CONSEQUENCES

The escalating rate of out-of-wedlock teen pregnancies has disturbing consequences. First, teen mothers are more likely to be economically disadvantaged before child-birth, and usually remain poor after bearing a child. Two-thirds of never-married mothers now raise their children in poverty. Many teens who become pregnant do not finish high school, and lack the skills necessary to find secure employment. Unmarried teens are also less likely to receive financial support from the father.

Second, the human costs of teen pregnancy are substantial. Teen mothers are likely to have another child, usually within two years. These parents are even less likely to finish high school or to marry. In addition, their children tend to fare worse than those from two-parent families on measures of health, education, and emotional and behavioral adjustment.

The strain of too-early childbearing on adolescent mothers is significant. They are more likely to describe their children as "difficult," and are less likely than older mothers to provide adequate intellectual stimulation and emotional support. And teen mothers also receive good prenatal care less frequently than their older counterparts. Consequently, they have a higher rate of premature birth and low-birthweight babies. Lastly, children of teen parents are much more likely to become teen parents themselves—creating a cycle of poverty that is difficult to break.

Not surprisingly, the costs to the public of teenage childbearing are substantial. Three-quarters of single teenage mothers begin receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) within five years of the birth of their first child. Nearly half of long-term welfare recipients are women who gave birth before age 17. One study has concluded that over half of the total costs of AFDC, Medicaid, and food stamps is attributable to households begun by teen births, totaling \$34 billion in 1992.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE?

There is no question that teenage parents bear daunting responsibilities, and many of them try very hard to be good parents. But there is also no question that we must do more to lessen the toll of teenage childbearing.

First, we must bring down the rate of teenage pregnancy. We need to make teens better understand that their actions have very serious consequences for which they are ultimately responsible. Many people say that it is futile to try to persuade teens to abstain from sex. But in my view, we have no other choice. Teens receive a lot of pressure to engage in sex, and we need to create some pressure in the other direction. National leaders, the entertainment industry, and sports figures should all be part of such an effort, as should churches, schools, and most of all, parents. Teens need to know about the risks of premature sexual activity—not just pregnancy, but also AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. This message must be coupled with efforts to provide teens with the information, confidence and skills they need to make good decisions. Parents must teach their children about responsible decision-making and sex. The message should be clear: becoming a parent as a teen is a bad deal for their children.

More difficult, but equally important, is to give disadvantaged teens some hope for a

better future. Those who feel that their future goals would be jeopardized by becoming a parent too early have real incentives to delay parenting. Those who feel that they have no future do not. A number of private programs aimed at encouraging young people to stay in school and pursue postsecondary education have shown promise.

Second, we should develop ways to support families of teenage parents without creating incentives for out-of-wedlock births. The challenge is to help the children of teen parents without making out-of-wedlock childbearing an attractive alternative. Fathers must be held responsible for the support of their children. We must strengthen efforts to establish paternity at birth and collect child support.

Some have suggested cutting off government assistance to teen parents. But what happens to the children? I believe we should require teen parents to live at home and stay in school in order to receive government assistance. Some teen parents, of course, come from abusive or unstable households and will not be able to live at home. For these children, we should establish community-based facilities to house and support young families while the mother completes school or job training.

Raising children is not easy, even for mature adults. It is extraordinarily difficult for young people who are still growing up themselves. I believe that we must emphasize to teenagers that youthfulness does not absolve them from responsibility for their actions. At the same time, we have an obligation to help young parents who are struggling to raise their children.

#### TRIBUTE TO HOWARD STERN

### HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, on December 7 of last year a truly remarkable event took place in New York City. A young man from the Bronx climbed over the guard rail of the George Washington Bridge with the intention of jumping to his death. He had brought with him a cellular telephone to place one last, desperate telephone call.

Mr. Speaker, that telephone call—to New York radio personality Howard Stern—saved the young man's life. In one of his most important performances, Howard Stern talked to the young man and kept him smiling and engaged until help could arrive.

Mr. Speaker, such is the popularity of Mr. Stern's radio program, that it was Stern's audience which came to the rescue. A listener named Helen Trimble, who heard the event unfold on her radio while driving on the bridge, pulled her car over at the sight of Prince and enveloped him in a bear hug. Port Authority police Lt. Stanley Bleeker, hearing the exchange between Howard Stern and the jumper on his radio, immediately sent officers to the scene. The young man was soon brought to safety.

Mr. Speaker, it is rare that an individual has this great an impact upon another's life. On this occasion, Howard Stern came face to face with a situation for which no one can prepare. Mr. Stern's humanity showed through at this

crucial moment, and as a result a human life was saved.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in congratulations and thanks to Mr. Howard Stern for his wonderful humanitarian achievement.

#### PREMIER LIEN CHAN

### HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the attached paper entitled "Premier Lien Chan: His Views and Ideals" was sent to me by Winston L. Yang of Seton Hall University, my alma mater.

I feel it is a most impressive paper and would like to share it with my colleagues.

PREMIER LIEN CHAN: HIS VIEWS AND IDEALS

(By Winston L. Yang)

Lien Chan has served as Premier of the Republic of China (ROC) for almost two years. During the past two years he has made significant contributions to Taiwan's modernization, democratization, and reform.

As a determined, formidable leader, Lien Chan meets challenges well. Noteworthy academic accomplishments, broad administrative experience and a pragmatic approach to governance are the foundation of his open-mindedness and tolerance, which are so sorely needed in a democratic and pluralistic society. These traits are vital to the fulfillment of constitutional democracy in the Republic of China. Lien defines his Cabinet as a "multifaceted government," and holds the view that all administrative organs must maintain political neutrality and act in accordance with the law, so that a fair environment for competition among political parties can be ensured and a model of political pluralism upheld within a constitutional framework.

As a champion of free-market economics, Lien believes that the market should be the primary force in determining the direction of economic growth. But he also believes the government is duty-bound to assist and encourage Taiwan's businesses. Government support, he argues, helps entrepreneurs to create wealth and earn profits that can be shared with society.

The Premier is committed to improving the welfare of the island's disadvantaged groups, including persons of low-income, the disabled, laborers and farmers, aborigines, and retired servicemen. He has established programs to solve the social problems arising from the widening gap between Taiwan's rich and poor.

As a statesman, the scholarly Premier represents the progressive, moderate, reform-minded native forces and exhibits a sense of pragmatism and flexibility so necessary to prudent governance. Idealistic, visionary, and broad-minded, he nevertheless detests empty talk and demands concrete actions and realistic programs. Lien is personally involved in policy-making and major decision-making, but he promotes the democratization of authority. He continues to delegate more powers and responsibilities to his ministers that previous premiers. Inefficiency, factionalism, corruption, selfishness, rejection of criticisms, and bureaucratic snobbery are the very problems he intends to reduce. Rejecting the Government's internal division and confrontation, the democratic-

mindful Lien stresses the need for coordination, cooperation, and consensus (the three C's). With a strong sense of responsibility, he scorns personal dictatorship in the post of premier, and advocates coordinated team work. As a scholarly statesman, he expects thorough investigations and research to be the foundation of decisions. Fearless of obstacles, setbacks, and difficulties, Lien accepts challenges and rejects a defeatist attitude. His primary concern is the prosperous future of the ROC. Idealist yet pragmatic, flexible yet firm on principles, he is strongly attached to the soil of Taiwan. But though profoundly rooted in Taiwan and committed to the "Taiwanization" of the island, he is nevertheless deeply concerned with the future of China and the ultimate reunification of Taiwan and the mainland. His forthright leadership style does not hinder his consideration or acceptance of different views and ideas that will enhance the lives of the Taiwan people.

A champion of reform, democratization, Taiwanization, and native rule, Lien Chan represents a new generation of moderate, dedicated, pragmatic, well-educated, highly-experienced, and internationally-minded native leaders in the dawn of a new era. He is the very kind of leader who will be able to lead Taiwan through its very difficult transition to a highly developed, thoroughly modernized, and fully democratized society—indeed, this is Lien's historic task and chosen mission.

SALUTE TO DORILL B. WRIGHT,  
KEN HESS, AND JAMES DANIELS

**HON. ELTON GALLEGLY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of three selfless and tireless public servants who, for many years, have made it their business to make life better for the people of Port Hueneme.

Dorill B. Wright, Ken Hess, and James Daniels have spent a combined total of 44 years on the Port Hueneme City Council and, as anyone who has held locally elected office knows, these years were filled with countless meetings, weekend obligations and late night phone calls.

But the commitment of these three officials to their friends and neighbors in Port Hueneme hardly ended with their official city duties. All three took additional steps to even further involve themselves in a variety of county and statewide activities that benefitted a much larger constituency.

Dorill Wright, for whom the city named its cultural center in 1988, served on the council for 24 years, 16 as mayor.

A past director and president of the Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce, he has served on the Ventura County grand jury, the California Coastal Commission, local hospital boards and a wide variety of civic and governmental groups far too numerous to list individually.

Ken Hess, who served on the council for 12 years, has also been an active and involved member of his community. He has been a member and chairman of the Ventura County Association of Governments, a member of the

county's Drunk Driving Task Force and a past president of the Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce.

Jim Daniels, a Port Hueneme resident for more than 40 years, spent 8 of those years on the city council and has more than lived up to the designation he earned back in 1963, Port Hueneme Citizen of the Year.

With Dorill and Ken, he helped the council develop the city's cultural center and the Ray Prueter Library, helped supervise the renovation of the Orvene Carpenter Community Center and the badly needed widening of Pleasant Valley Road. In addition to his council duties, Jim has played a leadership role in many community groups and advisory boards.

Mr. Speaker, these three men have made a difference in their community, the county and their State through their hard work and dedication. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting their efforts today and wishing them all the best in the future.

THE "SUPER IRA" PROPOSAL

**HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that a consensus is finally emerging in favor of restoring the utility of Individual Retirement Accounts. President Clinton wants them back and so do many Members of this body.

As the sponsor of the House super IRA proposal being introduced today and the cosponsor of prior bills, I have long felt we need to give ordinary Americans more reasons to save for their own retirement. The Individual Retirement Account is one of the best savings incentives we have ever developed.

The need to expand savings is clear. Americans typically save less than people in other countries and the effect of their habit is clear. A Merrill Lynch survey shows half of American families have less than \$1,000 in net financial assets. Even those within 10 years of retirement (ages 55 to 64) only have \$6,880 in net financial assets such as checking, savings, IRAs or 401(k) savings.

Another survey shows that the 76 million Americans in the Baby Boomer group are saving at rates far below what they need to maintain their standard of living after retirement. When we consider the prospect that Social Security may run out of funds early in the next century, the security of the Baby Boomers looks poor indeed. We need to develop savings incentives that will make them more secure. I strongly support the use of the Individual Retirement Account for that purpose.

A 1991 Money Magazine reader survey shows how popular the super IRA truly is with the people we want to serve. 97 percent said they would contribute to IRAs if IRAs were restored; the remaining 3 percent were largely already retired. People made it clear they would contribute new savings to their IRA. IRA popularity cut across all income groups.

The Super IRA gives Americans an opportunity to have deductible IRAs or an IRA Plus account in which earnings would be tax-free.

The super IRA, with its elimination of the 10 percent early withdrawal penalty for withdrawals for education, medical costs, buying homes, long-term care and times of unemployment, provides a savings vehicle which gives working families the liquidity they want and may need. With both parties now endorsing the IRA as a means of helping middle income Americans, I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring the Super IRA.

REPUBLICAN MANDATE WITH THE PEOPLE

**HON. RON PACKARD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the President covered a lot of ground last night. The President indicated that he heard the voters' message for change and seemed to try to bridge the gap between where his agenda was going and where Congress is now headed. However, the American people know that the devil is in the details. The American people are tired of empty promises and unrealistic rhetoric. They want results. Our Republican Contract With America Delivers just that—an aggressive agenda for change.

The people rejected liberal, big government "business as usual" in November. They overwhelmingly endorsed our Contract With America. We welcome the President to join us in passing that contract.

Republicans have a specific, positive mandate with America—less spending, less regulation, and less government. On the very first day of the new Congress, we changed the way Congress does business. This week we continue to change the business Congress does.

Republicans will continue to keep their promise with the people by passing a balanced budget amendment and unfunded mandates legislation. We are going to stay focused on our mandate with the American people. We are committed to moving forward with the contract we made with the voters of America.

UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as the House continues to debate H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, I think it is important that we consider some of the insights discussed in an article which appeared in the Washington Post on January 22.

I commend this article to my colleagues and hope that reflection on the facts will yield a more common sense mandates relief bill.

[From the Washington Post, January 22, 1995]

**GOVERNORS BITE HELPING HAND IN MANDATES FIGHT—FEDERAL PAYMENTS, BREAKS ON TAXES SUBSIDIZE STATES**

(By Dan Morgan)

California Gov. Pete Wilson (R) has scored political points with voters and fellow governors by blasting the federal government for making his state pay the medical, educational and correctional costs of illegal immigrants—who he says are in California only because of the failure of federal immigration policy.

Wilson contends, Washington should pick up the bill.

But when it comes to paying California's 10 percent share of the costs of rebuilding public facilities after the 1994 Los Angeles earthquake, Wilson is the deadbeat. California voters in June defeated a ballot initiative to raise the money. Wilson, who promised to cut state taxes despite a budget deficit, owes Washington \$90 million and has yet to say how he will come up with the money.

The federal government, by contrast, has shelled out or obligated nearly \$1.2 billion of \$2.8 billion promised for repairs of facilities from buildings to sewer lines, and Wilson is seeking another \$500 million in federal relief as a result of the recent mudslides and floods in the state.

Such broad-based federal assistance to every state represents the other side of the debate about the financial burdens the federal government places on states, counties and cities. While governors and the Republican majority in Congress press for legislation that will make it more difficult for Congress to impose rules and regulations that cost local jurisdictions money, local governments continue to take for granted enormous federal subsidies and benefits.

Federal grants to state and local government this year will total \$230 billion, and will account for nearly a fifth of state budgets. The payments include the \$5 million allocated to the "distance learning and medical link program" benefiting rural communities and the \$89 billion it pays out under Medicaid for the medical care, rehabilitation and nursing home bills of poor or, elderly state residents.

The tax exemption of state and municipal bonds, and the deductibility of most state and local taxes under federal income tax law will be worth another \$68.9 billion in 1995, according to the Office of Management and Budget.

By issuing bonds on which interest payments are exempt from federal taxes, local jurisdictions can pay less interest to borrowers than if the income were taxed. Allowing taxpayers to deduct local income and property taxes make it easier for cities, states and counties to raise revenues.

In addition, the federal government subsidizes local governments in dozens of hidden ways, such as allowing states to shift parts of existing health programs into Medicaid, qualifying them for federal matching funds.

This is the part of the story that Democrats and some Republicans in Congress say is not getting through in the debate over unfunded mandates, which are federal requirements that states take certain actions but for which the federal government provides no money.

"The issue of unfunded mandates is very legitimate," said Rep. David R. Obey (D-Wis.), ranking member of the House appropriations Committee. "But you have to distinguish between what's legitimate and what isn't."

Obey said it was proper for states such as California, Florida, Texas and New York to demand the federal government do more to defray the financial impact of refugees and illegal immigrants.

In fact, the Justice Department has begun expediting payments of \$33.4 million to California, and smaller amounts to six other states, to help cover costs of imprisoning illegal immigrants, the Los Angeles Times reported in October.

But Obey said Wilson "ought to be ashamed of himself coming here with his hand out for federal aid because [flood victims] in his state are suffering the consequences of decisions by local zoning and building authorities."

Obey, who said he was fighting mad about California's slowness in coming up with its share of earthquake money, said this week he will introduce legislation that would replace the current practice of direct federal aid for disasters with a private insurance plan into which states would contribute their own money, with premiums based on a risk assessment.

Some legislators say the implications for local jurisdictions of the GOP-backed constitutional amendment to require a balanced federal budget by 2002 are far more dire than whatever relief a reduction in unfunded mandates might provide.

"To think, as many Republicans do, that the federal government can just get out of all of this—nothing in health care, nothing in welfare, nothing in highways and let the states and locals go off on their own—that's crazy. You pass a balanced budget amendment, let me tell you, there won't be any flood aid anymore and there won't be any earthquake aid. Maybe that's what we want to do," House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt (D-Mo.) said recently.

If Congress does pass a balanced budget amendment and begins implementing it with deep spending cuts, states would be hard pressed to maintain the same level of services without increasing taxes substantially, according to data published in the current issue of Newsweek.

Louisiana, home state of Rep. Bob Livingston (R), chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, would have to raise its taxes by 27.8 percent to keep up.

Other poor states such as Mississippi and Tennessee would not be far behind. Richer states, including Maryland and Virginia, would feel relatively little effect.

"We as a nation collectively decide to achieve a certain objective, which can be paid for at the national level or in some combination of the state and local level," said Robert D. Reischauer, director of the Congressional Budget Office.

The real issue, he added, is whether the federal government is imposing obligations on local jurisdictions which they would choose not to provide on their own.

In the case of laws requiring local jurisdictions to meet certain environmental, safety or health standards, the federal government has often backed up its mandates with large sums of money covering most, if not all, of the costs.

Since passage of the Clean Water Act of 1972, the federal government has spent more than \$60 billion on local water and sewer projects. More recently, the federal crime bill passed last year calls for the federal government to spend billions over six years to pay for hiring 100,000 new police officers and building more prisons.

Although governors have been complaining about rising costs of the Medicaid health

program for the poor, the federal government pays nearly 60 percent of the overall costs and, in the cases of poor states, as much as 79 percent.

Beginning in the late 1980s, states were confronted by slackening tax revenues and recession-driven demands on social services. Many responded not by tightening belts but by using a loophole in Medicaid rules to extract billions of additional federal Medicaid dollars from Washington.

Federal Medicaid payments to states under an obscure program that subsidizes hospitals treating large numbers of low-income patients went from \$300 million in 1989 to \$10.8 billion in 1992, while there was little increase in state money going into health care.

New Hampshire, for example, used the no-strings-attached federal money to prop up the state budget and avoid imposing new taxes.

An August General Accounting Office report concluded some states "used illusory approaches to shift the costs of the Medicaid program to the federal government."

Many other benefits the states receive from the federal government are not readily apparent, but are well known to governors and county executives.

For example, the federal government returns half of the revenues it receives from the sale of minerals, timber and other commodities on public lands—a total of \$1.3 billion a year—to states, counties and local road and school districts. Portions of what is left is allocated to fighting fires, killing predators and eradicating troublesome weeds such as the creosote bush.

People should not be "slapping [Washington] with one hand while they have the other hand out," a House Democratic congressional aide said.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE SECURITIES LITIGATION EQUITY ACT OF 1995**

**HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Securities Litigation Equity Act of 1995 for myself and my colleague, ANNA ESHOO.

We do so with the understanding the importance of a securities litigation system that allows private citizens to bring suit for securities fraud. The securities suit, when used properly, protects the integrity of the market and guards individuals against reckless and criminal behavior by people who invest their money. Those investments could be a retirement fund or a child's education fund or a down payment on a home. In any case, the investor deserves the right to legally challenge fraudulent behavior where it truly exists.

However, Mr. Speaker, the system has strayed from that honorable intent. Knee-jerk reaction suits filed by attorneys working with professional plaintiffs have severely constricted the flow of information emerging from technology industry leaders. More importantly, the costs incurred by high-risk industries have gone up. This is extremely disturbing when you consider the high costs these companies face naturally because of the types of services they provide. These costs, in the form of higher insurance premiums, legal fees and out of

court settlements, result in less capital for the R&D investments U.S. high-tech companies use to maintain their position at the cutting edge of the world market.

For these reasons, securities litigation reform is a top priority for our Nation's high technology community. Since 1988, 19 of Silicon Valley's 30 largest companies have been hit with securities suits. Even the most hardened cynics cannot believe that nearly two-thirds of Northern California's largest high tech companies are guilty of fraud. Rather, we support the contention of companies in our districts that there exist fundamental flaws in our securities litigation system. These flaws reward abusive and frivolous suits, and cost our Nation's most competitive industries millions of dollars in legal fees and forced settlements every year.

It is for these reasons that we introduce this legislation. The reforms we are proposing include a moderate but substantive package of reforms that will address the systematic incentives for abuse and retain the rights of individuals to bring legal action where appropriate.

Our legislation would address the major problems that currently exist in the system by: Eliminating liability for companies when a stock broker or analyst distributes inaccurate information not attributed to the company.

Reforming the pleading, burden of proof and discovery processes;

Giving greater control of the litigation to the plaintiffs over the attorneys; and

Eliminating many of the abusive practices currently used by the plaintiff's bar.

It is my hope that as the Commerce Committee marks up legislation for consideration by the whole House, it will accept a substantial number of the provisions in our bill—some of which are new, and many of which have received the benefits of close public scrutiny. Recognizing that a gap currently exists between offered legislative proposals, we carefully crafted this legislation so that it can be supported by Members from both parties, both bodies of Congress, and the key industries and associations affected by these practices.

#### TRIBUTE TO CASEY HEADRICK WILLIAMS

#### HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Casey Headrick Williams, Sr., born on January 1, 1910, to the late Jim and Betty Williams in Cerro Gardo, NC. As a young teen, Casey gained a reputation for being an excellent baseball player and traveled throughout the State competing in baseball.

In 1925, the Williams family moved to Chadbourn, NC where they immediately became members of the Mount Moriah Baptist Church. Shortly after moving to Chadbourn, Casey, met Lella Lewis, the oldest daughter of Arch and Princess (Pennie) Lewis; and, on March 5, 1929, Casey and Lella were united in holy matrimony. This union was blessed with 16 children.

Mr. Williams is completely dedicated to his family. The family always had breakfast to-

gether on Sunday morning at which there was a family prayer and each family member recited a Bible verse. Mr. Williams has always been a dedicated breadwinner for his family—at times holding multiple jobs simultaneously and commuting over 100 miles daily to work. For several years, he successfully managed the local candy store. Mr. Williams also worked as a manager in the manufacturing field. After this schedule became too strenuous, Mr. Williams decided to become a sharecropper and lived in various parts of Columbus County. In addition to love for God, Mr. Williams has always stressed the importance of hard work, discipline, and education, although his formal education did not extend beyond the sixth grade.

Mr. Williams recently celebrated his 85th birthday. In these, his sunset years, he is now able to spend more time with his family and enjoying his hobbies, which include gardening and freezing the vegetables he grows. Recently, Mr. Williams has become a very good fisherman under the tutelage of his nephew, Paul. Mr. Williams has also continued his lifetime involvement in the politics and civic matters of the community and surrounding areas.

Although Mr. Williams does not have enormous tangible richness, he considers himself to be a wealthy man. His wealth is evidenced by the respect that other members of the community have for him, the love of his family, and his place in the Kingdom.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE RECREATIONAL BOATING SAFETY ACT OF 1995

#### HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, safety is the primary concern of the millions of recreational boaters across this Nation. The bill I am introducing today would increase the level of safety enjoyed by recreational boaters by increasing the penalties for boating while intoxicated [BWI], requiring children to wear personal flotation devices onboard vessels and personal watercraft, and requiring the Coast Guard to develop plans related to mandatory boating education and certification, and boating accident reporting.

Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation conducted an oversight hearing on the National Transportation Safety Board's [NTSB] recreational boating safety study. In that study, NTSB found that alcohol use was involved in at least half of all boating accidents and that 85 percent of those who drown in recreational boating accidents were not wearing personal flotation devices [PFD's].

In their conclusions, NTSB recommended that comprehensive BWI laws be implemented, that minimum recreational boating safety standards be established, and that information about fatal or serious boating accidents be submitted to the U.S. Coast Guard.

I support many of the recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board and

have incorporated some of their suggestions within this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, section 2 of my bill would reduce boating deaths and serious accidents related to alcohol use. Section 2 requires the Coast Guard to develop a program in cooperation with State officials to reduce boating accidents by concentrating enforcement of BWI laws in areas where many boating accidents have occurred. Several States have implemented successful programs of this type, and national cooperative effort would reduce boating accidents across the Nation.

Section 3 and 4 are related to the use of personal flotation devices onboard recreational boats and personal watercraft. Section 3 requires children 12 years of age and younger to wear personal flotation devices, unless they are in enclosed cabins on the boat. Section 4 requires the Coast Guard to submit to Congress a plan to approve full inflatable life jackets for use by certain individuals under appropriate conditions.

According to Texas State boating officials, 71 people drowned in boating accidents in our State last year. Based on their educated analysis, these boating officials believe that more than 50 percent of those Americans would not have lost their lives if they had been wearing personal flotation devices.

Sections 5 and 6 would improve the information that is received by Federal and State boating officials on recreational boating accidents. Section 5 implements a recent suggestion by the National Transportation Safety Board and requires the Coast Guard to implement an information system for boating accident information similar to the one presently operated by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration that compiles highway accident information. Section 6 requires the Coast Guard to submit a plan to appropriate congressional committees to increase reporting of boating accidents nationally.

Sections 7 and 8 of my bill require mandatory boating safety education under certain circumstances. Section 7 requires individuals who violate the BWI laws to complete a boating safety course that is acceptable to the Coast Guard. Section 8 requires the Coast Guard to develop a plan for education and certification of individuals who operate recreational vessels. After we have experience with this program nationally, we may find that we can increase the age of individuals subject to these education requirements to gradually educate the entire boating public.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains extremely valuable changes to the laws designed to protect the safety of our waterways. I urge my colleagues to support early action on this important piece of legislation so that we can help to ensure that more people do not lose their lives on our Nation's waterways.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF ANITA SEMJEN

#### HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and commend Ms. Anita Semjen, director of the Cultural Exchange Foundation, for

her exceptional efforts in keeping alive the memories of the victims of the Holocaust.

Ms. Semjen is currently the director of the Cultural Exchange Foundation, a Washington, D.C.-based, non-profit organization promoting Hungarian-American cultural exchanges. Her most recent effort involve "Victims and Perpetrators," an exhibition which is scheduled to be shown in Budapest, Hungary on February 26, 1995. Following its presentation at the Budapest Jewish Museum, the works will be displayed in several major United States cities, eventually entering the collection of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

"Victims and Perpetrators" presents the works of Ilka Gedo and Gyorgy Roman, artists who lived through the Hungarian Holocaust, in which some 500,000 Hungarian Jews were taken to German concentration camps and murdered. Ilka Gedo's drawings from the Budapest ghettos expose painful memories of the past.

Gyorgy Roman, reputedly Hungary's most emulated artist, has sketched scenes from court proceedings of the war criminal trials. Ms. Anita Semjen found Roman's sketch work through a combination of determination and luck, which has led to its first ever public showing in "Victims and Perpetrators." Both artists' works are unique for their extraordinary insight coupled with their artistic value and intimacy of perception.

Ms. Semjen demonstrates an admirable understanding of the arts and peoples of both the United States and Hungary. At a time when innocent peoples still fall victim to religious and ethnic persecution, Ms. Semjen's exhibition rekindles our often passive conscience.

Therefore, today, Mr. Speaker, more than 50 years after the tragedy of the Hungarian Holocaust, I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring the diligent efforts of Anita Semjen in reminding us of the grievous memories of the past and of the lessons history teaches us in the interminable fight against cruelty and oppression.

#### TRIBUTE TO CAROL LYNN KELLEY

### HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to pay tribute to one of our outstanding citizens in Virginia's Eleventh Congressional District, Carol Lynn Kelley of Lake Barcroft.

Carol, known as "Kari" to her friends, was born 40 years ago in Woonsocket, RI, to Margaret and Stacia Klara. A 1972 graduate from Woonsocket High School, she graduated from Vassar College in 1976, and obtained her law degree from Case Western University School of Law in Cleveland in 1979. She practiced law in Cleveland until 1985, when she moved to Fairfax County, VA.

After being admitted to the Virginia Bar she practiced law in Northern Virginia from 1986 to 1992. At that time Kari decided to devote more time to her two young daughters, Elizabeth (Lizzy) and Allison and the community where she and her husband Tim make their home.

Kari has been active in the PTA's at Ellen Glasgow Middle School and Pinecrest School. She is an active Brownie leader in Falls Church and a member of St. Anthony's Catholic Church.

Last year Mrs. Kelly was appointed to the Fairfax County Civil Service Commission, a body which adjudicates disputes in the Fairfax County government and makes recommendations on civil service policy.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in honoring Kari Kelley, an outstanding mother, attorney, civic activist and civil service commissioner as her friends and community leaders honor her on Saturday, January 28, 1995, at the Morse Estate in Falls Church.

#### TRIBUTE TO THOMAS J. STEWART, JR.

### HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Ms. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of Thomas J. Stewart, Jr., who is retiring this month after 33 years of service with the Social Security Administration.

Tom began his career with the Social Security Administration in 1961 and worked in numerous offices in various capacities throughout the State of Connecticut. Most recently, he served as liaison for Connecticut's congressional delegation.

It was in that role that I had the opportunity to observe the commitment that Mr. Stewart had to the constituency he served. He understood how important Social Security was in their lives and he endeavored diligently to make sure that they received accurate and timely responses to their inquiries. The high standard of service that Tom maintained is an example for all of us in public service to emulate.

I am honored to rise in tribute to the years of dedicated service rendered by Federal employee Thomas J. Stewart, Jr. His three and one-half decades of professionalism constitute a legacy that is unparalleled. His talents and record of excellence will be greatly missed.

#### TRIBUTE TO JUSTICE FRED L. HENLEY

### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to pay tribute to former Missouri Supreme Court Chief Justice Fred L. Henley, who recently passed away in Jefferson City, MO. Born October 25, 1911, in Caruthersville, MO, Chief Justice Henley was an outstanding Missourian who served many appointments within the Missouri justice system.

In 1934, he received his bachelor of laws degree from Cumberland University in Lebanon, TN. In 1935 he was admitted to the Missouri bar. Ten years later he was admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States.

He established a general law practice in Caruthersville, MO in 1936. That same year he was elected city attorney, a position he held for 3 years. In 1939, he was appointed city counselor. He was city counselor until 1942 when he went to serve in the U.S. Army Air Corps, in 1946 he was commissioned a major in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

After his military service, Henley served as judge of the 38th Judicial Circuit from October 1955 to February 1960. Afterwards returning to private practice forming the firm Henley and Fowlkes.

Appointed chairman of the Missouri State Highway Commission in December 1961, a position he served until April 1964 when he was appointed to the Missouri Supreme Court. Originally appointed by Governor John M. Dalton, Henley remained on the court for a 12-year term that ended in December 1978. From 1969 throughout 1971, he served the court as Chief Justice.

Judge Henley also belonged to, and led, many civic and fraternal organizations within his community. He was an active member of the Presbyterian Church. Other organizations include, Caruthersville Lodge No. 461, A.F. & A.M.; and Missouri Consistory No. 1, M.R.S.; the Moolah Temple, St. Louis; Post 88 of the American Legion in Pemiscot County; the American Bar Association; and the Missouri Bar Association; the 38th Judicial Circuit Bar Association; the Caruthersville Rotary Club; the Caruthersville Board of Education; the Pemiscot County Chapter of the American Red Cross.

A devoted person in all he undertook, Judge Henley will be missed by all who knew him. I urge my colleagues to join me in my condolences to the family that he leaves. Survivors include three daughters, Sally Kate Sisson, Lynda Wayne Walters, and Karen Janet Currie; one son, Joseph Oliver Henley, and three grandchildren.

#### THE MEXICAN BAILOUT

### HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, why are the American people being asked to bail out the Mexican economy to the tune of \$40 billion?

Despite listening for 2 hours to administration officials this morning at the Banking Committee hearing, I still fail to understand why we should be expected to put the full faith and credit of the United States on the line for a country that has a long and painful past of undisciplined financial mismanagement.

I cannot support some hastily slapped-together financial deal, especially in the absence of the President providing a coherent policy. The President has an obligation to formulate a viable program that will guarantee Mexico's inflationary policies won't put Main Street America another \$40 billion in the hole. Last night all he said was—we need to bail out Mexico. On top of all his rhetoric last night, the President spoke to the importance of the Nation pulling together and making sacrifices for the greater good. I think it is unconscionable to

