

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LITTLE LEAGUE VERSUS THE IRS

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, spring time has arrived and the IRS has left it's annual April 15 calling card, taking more than one-third of our earnings. As American as apple pie, kids have also hit the playing fields. But this time, the IRS is trying to steal home. In Orange County, CA, the IRS was trying to take away something as American as hotdogs and apple pie—the girl's softball team. Only after public outcry did the IRS back down and leave the softball team alone.

By proving once more to be a large and intrusive Federal bureaucracy, the IRS has illustrated its uncanny ability to punish the right things and reward the wrong things. It's simply astounding that criminals are skirting the system and being rewarded while our hometown little league team was so close to being wiped out.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to shut down the IRS for good. If it weren't for the nationwide attention the Fountain Valley Girl's Softball League received, the IRS would not have reversed its decision to seize the league's tangible assets. How many times are we going to let the IRS hurt us and our communities before we do something to reform our tax system?

Recently, I cosponsored legislation introduced by my colleagues, Representatives DAN SCHAEFFER (R-CO) and BILLY TAUZIN (R-LA), which would abolish the Internal Revenue Service and enact a national retail sales tax. With a national sales tax, there would be no need for the 136,000 IRS employees who give us the runaround, the 480 different and confusing tax forms and the 190,000 disputes between the IRS and taxpayers which result in legal action.

Mr. Speaker, by enacting this legislation, we would be free from the IRS for good. All consumers would pay a tax on everything they buy. Little league players, volunteers and criminals alike would pay their just taxes to the Federal Government. Nonprofit groups and small businesses would be free from compliance paperwork.

The time is now to make a change. It is time to bring down the IRS, not our softball leagues and community associations.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI'S INAUGURATION

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, May 20, 1997, marks the first anniversary of President

Lee Teng-hui's inauguration. I would like to take a brief moment to congratulate President Lee and the Taiwanese people for reaching this important democratic milestone.

Ever since martial law was lifted in 1987, Taiwan has moved inexorably toward political liberalization and the development of a truly multiparty democratic system. Last year, the Taiwanese people, for the first time in their history, directly elected their President.

Besides holding free and fair elections, Taiwan has liberalized its economy and reduced its trade surplus with the United States. As a leading member of the Asian Tigers, Taiwan has emerged as one of the world's top 15 trading entities and America's sixth largest trading partner. It should come as no surprise that the United States is today Taiwan's main foreign investor and trading partner, underscoring our special relationship.

The United States receives about 25 percent of Taiwan's exports, mostly in the form of manufactured electronic goods, textiles, and other consumer products. I believe that it is imperative for the United States to strengthen its political and economic ties with Taipei by supporting Taiwan's efforts to join the United Nations and other international organizations. Moreover, the United States must continue to support Taiwan's ability to purchase necessary weapon systems so that it can better defend itself from potential military threats from its more imposing and threatening neighbor to the west.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I salute the indomitable spirit of the Taiwanese people and commend them and President Lee on this important democratic anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO BEATRICE CASTIGLIA-CATULLO

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Beatrice Castiglia-Catullo, an outstanding individual who has dedicated her life to the care of those in need.

Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo is our Mother Teresa of the South Bronx. Her life is an example of kindness, selflessness, faithfulness, generosity, and fruitfulness.

While working as a charge nurse, Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo faced the enormous challenge of her demanding work, raising three children, taking care of her mother-in-law who was terminally ill, and managing the household.

Her faith in God provided her with the strength to meet her daily responsibilities. In response to her answered prayers, she decided to devote more time to helping others in the community.

Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo raised funds for the Sister Servants of Mary who had helped her in her difficult times. She also organized and became the first president of the Parkchester Chapter of Cancer Care, Inc., and founded the Medical Mission Aid Center at St. Raymond's Parish.

Being a nurse, Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo was well aware of the need to provide continuing services to patients who were discharged from the hospital without proper home care. In 1964, she founded a home attendant service to take care of elderly patients.

Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo decided to name the organization R.A.I.N., for Regional Aid for Interim Needs, after she looked up to the sky for God's inspiration and saw that it was raining. She devoted her time and her own financial resources to the care of her patients. In gratitude and admiration for her generosity, one of her patients made a \$500 donation to the organization.

While still working at the hospital, Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo rented a space on Westchester Avenue to establish R.A.I.N. Through hard work and devotion she turned an office that held a desk, a chair, and a telephone, into an operation with a \$33 million budget.

R.A.I.N. home attendant services now assists over 1,100 disabled, homebound, disadvantaged elderly and youth. The organization serves over 2,000 meals daily through 5 senior citizen centers, Meals-On-Wheels, and the 3-H Program.

In her personal life, Mrs. Castiglia-Catullo has been blessed with three successful children and nine grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, the family of Beatrice Castiglia-Catullo, her friends, the people she has served, and the South Bronx community, in expressing our gratitude for her loving and longstanding service to the community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MARRIED COUPLES HOME SALE EQUITY ACT

HON. DAVE WELDON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Married Couples Home Sale Equity Act. This bill will correct an inequity in the Tax Code that unfairly penalizes married couples.

Let's take Tom and Mary as an example. Tom and Mary have been married for 30 years and have lived in their home for 15 years. They are each over the age of 55 and have decided to sell their home now that their children are no longer at home. They want to move to a smaller home and use the money they have earned from the appreciation on their home for their retirement. They bought

● 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.

their home for \$100,000 and it has appreciated to \$350,000. When Tom and Mary sell their home, they are allowed a combined \$125,000 exemption from capital gains taxes. This means they will have to pay capital gains taxes on the other \$125,000.

Let's take the exact same situation except we will assume that Tom and Mary chose not to marry but decided to live together outside of the bond of marriage. When Tom and Mary sell the home they are each entitled to exempt \$125,000 from capital gains taxes for a total of \$250,000. Thus they are exempted from having to pay any taxes at all, even though they realized the same gain on their home. The only differing factor is that they are not married.

Our Government should be about the business of encouraging strong families, not penalizing them for staying married. We should do everything within our power to promote strong marriages and families. Correcting this inequity will help us do this.

My bill gives both a husband and a wife \$125,000 each upon the sale of their home, thus raising from \$125,000 to \$250,000 the total exemption available to married couples. This is the same level of exemption nonmarried individuals are entitled to and its time we treated married couples equitably.

I encourage my colleagues to join me by co-sponsoring this bill. Let's help America's families. Let's encourage marriage and the stability it brings to our society and our children.

SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENTS OF RETIRED PHOTOGRAPHER, MAURICE SORRELL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Maurice Sorrell, a native Washingtonian, has been involved in photography in the D.C. area since the early 1950's. His interest in this medium was piqued as he observed his uncles, both amateur photographers, taking pictures of his parents. In 1947, determined to develop his skills, Mr. Sorrell enrolled in a 3-year photography course at the Department of Agriculture Graduate School which he completed in 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, in 1957, Mr. Sorrell was hired by the Pentagon as a photographer. As a result of discrimination, however, he was only permitted to work in the dark room. Maurice Sorrell left the Pentagon to work full-time as a freelance photographer and also worked as a photographer for the Johnson Publishing Co. Mr. Sorrell served as a mentor, colleague, and friend to the Exposure Group—the African American Photographers Association, Inc. in Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, Maurice Sorrell's photographs of black events graced the pages of the Washington Afro-American Newspaper. In 1961, through the efforts of the late Art Carter, publisher of the Afro-American Newspaper, and the late Louis Lautier, a national congressional correspondent, Mr. Sorrell was the first

black photographer to gain admittance to the prestigious White House News Photographers Association. Mr. Sorrell traveled to more than 24 countries including 14 countries in Africa. He shot the World Series as well as NFL sporting events. He photographed inmates on death row and in the gas chamber at a Federal prison in North Carolina. He traveled aboard Air Force One and covered six Presidents. Maurice Sorrell traveled throughout the South with Lady Bird Johnson taking pictures of "poverty." He covered the march to Selma, AL. He was in Memphis, TN, covering the garbage worker's strike when Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated. It was Maurice Sorrell who took the first group photograph of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this body join me in a salute to this photographer, this historian and the magnificent sum of his accomplishments.

FITTING WORDS HONORING DICK FITTON

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, Richard J. Fitton retired as chairman of the board of First Financial Bancorp on April 22, 1997. Today, I rise to honor Dick Fitton, a man for whom I have a tremendous amount of admiration and respect.

Dick began his banking career in 1952 as a management trainee for First National Bank and Trust Co. in Hamilton, OH. In 1965, he was elected to the bank's board of directors, and became president and chief executive officer the following year. He led management in the formation of First Financial Bancorp in April 1983 and served as the holding company's president and chief executive officer. In 1991, he retired as president of First Financial Bancorp and was elected chairman of the board. His retirement from day-to-day banking activities came in 1992 when he relinquished his duties as chief executive officer of First Financial Bancorp. During his distinguished banking career, Dick served on the board of directors of the American Bankers Association, the Ohio Bankers Association, and the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland—Cincinnati Branch.

As a lifelong resident of Hamilton, OH, Dick is one of this city's most respected and admired citizens. His continual commitment to the community and its people is an inspiration to all who know him. Dick carries with him a belief that his work is not finished until his community is better off. He has been a primary supporter of Ft. Hamilton-Hughes Memorial Hospital, Junior Achievement, the United Way, and the Hamilton Community Foundation. He has worked on many community projects that have benefited the city of Hamilton greatly, including the formation of Miami University's Hamilton campus, the Hamiltonian Hotel, and the low-level dam on the Great Miami River. His work on these projects, and others, have made his name synonymous with Hamilton, OH.

Mr. Speaker, Hamilton, OH, would not be the city it is today had it not been for the life-long commitment that Dick Fitton has put forth to this community's development. He is a friend and a citizen we can all be proud of.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THOMAS M. CLIFTON

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Thomas M. Clifton, chief of the Totowa, NJ, Police Department on his retirement after nearly four decades of dedicated and distinguished public service. Chief Clifton will be honored by his friends and colleagues at a retirement dinner tomorrow night. There will be a great outpouring of deepest appreciation for his years of service. He has been a leading figure in keeping Totowa a safe community—the sort of place where you can raise a family, own a business, and build friendships that last a lifetime.

Born in New York City, Chief Clifton grew up in Paterson, where he graduated from the Paterson Technical and Vocational High School. Chief Clifton joined the U.S. Navy Reserve for 2½ years at age 17, followed by a 4-year, regular-duty enlistment in the Air Force. He attained the rank of staff sergeant before his honorable discharge in 1955.

Returning to civilian life, Chief Clifton began his career in law enforcement in 1956 when he became a part-time police marshal with the Totowa Police Department. He was appointed as a regular patrolman in 1957, under the command of the late Chief James C. Pellington.

Chief Clifton made detective in 1968, and a series of rapid promotions followed. He became a sergeant in less than a year and was named detective bureau commander, with the rank of lieutenant, in 1971. He was promoted to detective captain in 1977, and 3 years later became deputy chief. He served in that post for a decade before becoming chief of police in March 1990.

While Chief Clifton spent the later years of his career in police management, he was active in the police union during his earlier days. He joined the Policemen's Benevolent Association in 1958, and served from 1963 to 1969, as the New Jersey State delegate for Local 80, which included the police departments of Totowa, West Paterson, Little Falls, Pequannock, and the Passaic County Park Police.

Married to the former Dorothy V. Darby, Chief Clifton and Mrs. Clifton are the proud parents of six children and nine grandchildren.

We place our full trust in police officers like Chief Clifton to protect our lives, families, children, neighbors, and property on a daily basis. The citizens of Totowa are extremely grateful for the dedication and professionalism that have been the hallmarks of Chief Clifton. His strong leadership has ensured that members of the Totowa Police Department have been among the finest in the communities that make up the Fifth Congressional District.

TRIBUTE TO JAKE POWERS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to revise and extend my remarks about an extraordinary member of the Worcester, MA, community, Jake Powers.

For literally decades in the city of Worcester, men and women and children of all ages have benefited from the leadership, vision, and organizational skills of Jake Powers and his special commitment to community service.

In the 1950's, Jake Powers organized a summer basketball league—which at the peak of its popularity attracted more than 12,000 fans annually. In the 1960's, Jake Powers created the Worcester Park Touch Football League which at one time had 2,500 participants each year and 5,000 spectators during the annual super bowl.

Remarkably, over a 20-plus-year period, Jake Powers' determination and common-sense strategies raised more than \$400,000 for the Mercy Center for Developmental Disabilities.

Then in the 1970's, he participated in the creation of the Stan Musial Baseball League and was the vice chairperson of the Irish Celtic Cross Memorial which is on the grounds of city hall.

Jake Powers is the acknowledged historian in Worcester of all subjects with an Irish theme.

And legend has it that this gentleman once removed a manhole cover and inserted a canoe at the basin of the Blackstone Canal. Jake Powers paddled under the streets of Worcester—for educational purposes—to study the structure of the canal which was built by Irish immigrants. Fortunately for so many of us, Jake didn't get lost on that occasion.

Jake's family includes his wonderful wife Martha and the proverbial apples of their eyes, Michael, Mary, and Kathy.

On behalf of Jake Powers' numerous students, fans, admirers, and beneficiaries of his lifetime efforts, I am inserting John Dempsey's column of May 16 from the Worcester Telegram & Gazette:

SORRY, JAKE, JUST GRIN AND BEAR IT

I'm pretty sure that Jake Powers does crack a smile now and then.

I figure he indulges in one occasionally with members of his family, or perhaps with some particularly close colleague. As for my own experience, all I can say is that I've known him for years and the closest thing to a smile I've seen on his long, lugubrious Irish face was a wry smirk.

Which isn't to say that he lacks a sense of humor. On the contrary, Powers wields a keen and waspish wit. It's as dry as a dowager's martini, and by the time you get the joke the conversation has often moved on to the next topic.

But Mr. Smiley-face, he's not.

Powers is formally known as Vincent E. Powers, professor of history at Worcester State College. But you'd have to go back even further than his last full-face grin to find anyone who actually uses his real name. The "Jake" dates back more than half a cen-

tury to his boyish summer days in the outfield, when his Lincoln Street buddies named him for some now long-forgotten baseball star. It stuck, but good.

His mother always loathed the nickname, refusing to pass on messages directed to Jake Powers. Her little boy was named Vincent, if you don't mind. There was nobody in her house by the name of Jake.

Powers is a legend in Worcester. He'll hate me for saying that, firstly because he loathes the kind of facile hagiographic stuff that too often makes its way into the newspaper, and, secondly, because as a former athlete he believes that games are won by teams, not individuals.

REVERED BY STUDENTS

But his achievements are undeniable. Former students revere his ability to ground the study of history in the reality of the city around them, and he is known for guiding graduates in their careers long after they have left his classroom. Powers, along with friend Edwin Butcher Jr., has long managed the city's huge parks football program, which over the past 20 years has raised one-third of a million dollar for the Mercy Center.

Along with North High classmate John J. Conte, now Worcester district attorney, Powers built up the basketball program at Crompton Park, which in its heyday drew thousands of fans.

Most importantly, without Jake Powers there would be next to no working-class history of Worcester. He pioneered research into the Irish immigrants who came here decades before the potato blight to build canals and railways. He knows Worcester inside-out, from the days when cows grazed on the Common, through its times of glory as a surging industrial power, right down to today, as the city uncertainly edges toward a post-industrial redefinition of itself.

Anyway, Powers is 67 now, and his many friends, former students and football and baseball players figured it was time for a tribute. So they've arranged a big bash Thursday at Wachusett Country Club. "He's always been a behind-the-scenes guy," said Walter Shea. "He's always done things for others, and was never really recognized."

The organizers thought Powers wouldn't be crazy about the idea—and they were absolutely right. But they went ahead anyway.

"One committee member is in the state police," Shea said, "so we figure we'll get Jake there even if we have to have the cops detain him."

They won't have to go that far, but Powers is still ticked off by the whole affair. This week he is trying to correct final exams and put together a summer baseball schedule, and the last thing he needed was some dumb appreciation night he didn't ask for anyway.

"I'm not sure what this damn testimonial is for," he said. "I don't even know what to call it. It's not a retirement party, because I'm not retiring. It's not a wake, because I'm not dead. If you say it's for coaching, well, I had good players. If it's for teaching, I had good students. For the sports programs, I had good people around me. No one person does it all. People exist in a social network, and they depend on the ability and cooperation of all involved."

Come on, Jake, I said. You have to admit that you're this unusual blend of jock and academic.

Wrong approach.

"I don't like labels," he said. "I like sports, but I resent being categorized as a jock. And I dislike the notion that if you're an academic you're somehow effete, intellectual and nonphysical."

Jake, I said, won't you at least try to have a good time?

He chuckled. "Oh, I guess I'll be able to enjoy myself," he granted.

In his own way, of course.

"He's got that expression, 'I'm not going to crack a smile no matter what,'" said Shea. "It'll make no difference if we use a video or a still camera for the benefit—all the photos of Jake will come out looking like still pictures."

IN RECOGNITION OF CARMEN PAPALE

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Carmen Papale who will retire next week as manager and international vice president of the Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees.

Mr. Papale was born and raised in Baltimore and went to work in the men's clothing industry as a cutter at Haas Tailoring Co. in 1965 rising to the level of shop steward. As many Members of the House may know, Haas Tailoring is the place to order custom suits. Haas produces the finest American made custom suits and over the years has served a diverse clientele, ranging from many members of the Baltimore Ravens, to Ambassadors and members of the diplomatic corps, to Tiger Woods. Carmen Papale was part of that fine tradition.

Carmen left Haas and went to work for the Baltimore Regional Joint Board in July 1973 as an organizer and soon was promoted to business agent representing members in shops in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. He was elected vice president of the International Union, the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers. He has been reelected to this position at every national convention since 1982. In addition, Mr. Papale has served as comanager and then manager of the Baltimore Regional Joint Board since 1982 and serves as chair of the board of trustees of the Board Health and Welfare Fund, as well as a member of the board of directors of the Amalgamated Bank of New York and on the executive board of the Maryland State and D.C. AFL-CIO.

To say that Mr. Papale retires from a lifetime of commitment to the working people of this country is an understatement. Carmen has seen and participated in great changes in the conditions under which clothing workers labor. He has also fought with all his heart his industry's abandonment of the great manufacturing centers of America for cheap labor around the world.

Over the years, Carmen has offered me his good counsel on many national and local issues. We have not always agreed, but I have always tremendously valued the wisdom, knowledge, and caring for the working men and women of this Nation that his words impart. While I wish Carmen the best in a well deserved retirement, I also hope to continue benefiting from his advice for years to come.

I hope other Members of the House will join me today in thanking Carmen Papale for all his work in the labor movement of this Nation. His efforts will be missed; his shoes hard to fill.

TRIBUTE TO BENJAMIN AND
VERONICA DEPHILLIPS ON THEIR
50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Benjamin and Veronica DePhillips on their 50 years of marriage. Benjamin and Veronica DePhillips are constituents of mine from Chicago, IL.

On June 15, 1947, Benjamin and Veronica took their vows at Five Holy Martyrs in Chicago, IL. This June marks 50 years of sharing their lives, dreams, work, struggles, and commitment to each other. The DePhillips were blessed with four fine children: Russell, Brian, Tina, and Kevin. Also, Benjamin and Veronica are the proud grandparents of two wonderful grandchildren, Danielle and Christopher.

The DePhillips have been members of the 23d ward for over 44 years. Now retired, Mrs. DePhillips worked at the Park District and Mr. DePhillips worked at the Department of Transportation in Illinois. Their devotion to the community and to each other is evident.

Mr. Speaker, the occasion of a 50-year wedding anniversary is truly worthy of a great celebration and I am pleased to offer my most hearty congratulations to the DePhillips on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL
MARITIME DAY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the gallant men who served in World War II in the United States Maritime Service. One of my constituents, Sol Axelrod, who himself is a veteran, wrote a poem, which he feels tells the true story of our merchant seamen.

At this time, I wish to share this fine poem with my colleagues:

SEA GOING AMERICAN PATRIOTS OF WORLD
WAR II

(By Sol Axelrod)

The Merchant Seamen and the Navy Armed
Guard

Fought valiantly with the help of God.

These brave lads brought soldiers to fight
When men were wanted at a combat site.

It was never easy or even routine

To sail the waters where death reigned su-
preme.

They roamed this world with cargo intact,
Even mindful of any enemy attack.

When supplies were needed, without delay,
They were delivered by night and by day.

As the battles turned hot,
Some got through, many did not.

Heroes all, in death as in life,
Doing their duty in time of strife.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and distinct honor to bring this dedication and recognition to the attention of the House of Representatives. I ask all my colleagues to join me in saluting our Merchant Seamen whose role in World War II was vital to all of our troops, and in applauding the commitment and talent of my constituent, Sol Axelrod.

THE RIEGLE-NEAL CLARIFICATION
ACT OF 1997

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the Congress and the Nation the concerns of the National Conference of State Legislatures with regard to H.R. 1306, the Riegle-Neal Clarification Act of 1997, which the House will consider today under suspension of the rules. H.R. 1306 was introduced on April 10, 1997, and referred to the Banking Committee where it was approved by voice vote in subcommittee with no full committee markup. As the NCSL letter notes, this legislation would negatively affect the ability of State legislatures to regulate the sale of the insurance products when those sales are conducted through banks. As most Members are aware, the Comptroller of the Currency presently is considering whether to preempt a statute enacted by the State of Rhode Island. I am inserting in the RECORD copies of the NCSL letter and the comment letter I signed with 11 other House colleagues critical of the OCC proposal. We have been afforded insufficient time and process to consider the negative implications of H.R. 1306 on consumer protection and fair competition. I remain concerned about these issues and trust that our Senate colleagues will address these matters with more deliberation than has the House.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF
STATE LEGISLATURES

May 16, 1997.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: We write to you today to reiterate the concerns of the National Conference of State Legislatures with regard to H.R. 1306, the "Riegle-Neal Clarification Act of 1997," which will be considered on Suspension Calendar during the week of May 19th. You may have heard from certain sources that NCSL had withdrawn its opposition to H.R. 1306. We want to make clear that this is simply not true.

The National Conference of State Legislatures has long been a proponent of our nation's dual banking system and the benefits of that system to our nation's financial well being. In recognition of the advantages of the dual banking system to the public and to the health of the financial services industry, NCSL historically has opposed any efforts by the federal government to restrict state authority to charter, supervise or regulate the powers of state-chartered banks and thrifts. For this reason we must oppose H.R. 1306.

The legislation would alter the intent of Congress as embodied in the Reigle-Neal Interstate Banking and Branching Efficiency Act of 1994, which set specific parameters for the branching of state chartered banks across state lines. For the 45 state legislatures which voted to "opt-in" to interstate bank branching, this would significantly change the ground rules which they accepted in allowing their states to host branches of banks from another state.

Let us provide one example of the impact of H.R. 1306 on the authority of state legislatures. The Rhode Island General Assembly has passed legislation which sets the requirements that all banks must follow in the sale of insurance products. At present the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) is considering preempting this legislation's applicability to national banks. Should this happen, under H.R. 1306, the Rhode Island statute would not apply to branches of state-chartered banks from other states doing business in the State of Rhode Island. The Rhode Island law would only apply to those state banks chartered in Rhode Island. This would cause an unfair competitive disadvantage for Rhode Island state banks and thus limit the ability of state legislative authority. It does not take any stretch of the imagination to understand that should H.R. 1306 be enacted in its present form the OCC will soon be the sole arbiter of banking law and regulation.

As state legislators we are as concerned about the financial viability of our state banking systems, as are state banking supervisors and governors. We are well aware of the enormous contributions that state banks have made to the economic vitality of our states and we seek to continue working with our states' governors to ensure the viability of the dual banking system. However, we must also be concerned that state chartered banks which have no desire to branch across state lines are not placed at a competitive disadvantage. Of the over 7,000 state chartered banks, less than 30% have assets over \$100 million and therefore are not likely candidates to branch across state lines. Most state banks are small community banks which have well served our nation's cities and rural areas and have been the economic backbone of our country for over one hundred years. They are the banks which have responded time and time again to our communities economic needs. They have no desire to become a multinational financial giant, branching from coast to coast. As elected state officials we have an obligation to these smaller community states banks and their customers that efforts such as H.R. 1306, geared to the top 30% of state banks, do not place unfair burdens on the vast majority of our state banking industry.

During the mark-up by the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, NCSL offered reasonable amendments to the legislation which would have provided sufficient accountability to host state legislatures and most importantly its citizens. Unfortunately, the Subcommittee did not accept our changes. Therefore, we must once again declare our opposition to H.R. 1306. We respectfully request that you abide by the commitment made by a previous Congress and we would ask that until some accountability is restored to the host state, you vote no on H.R. 1306.

Thank you for this opportunity to make clear NCSL's position on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

BILL SCHROEDER,

Senate Majority
Chairman—Colorado, Vice Chair,
NCSL Commerce &
Communications
Committee.

MYRA JONES
Chair, House City,
County & Local Af-
fairs—Arkansas,
Vice Chair, NCSL
Commerce & Commu-
nications Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, February 6, 1997.

Re Docket No. 97-01, 62 FR 1950 (January 14,
1997) Preemption Determination.

HON. EUGENE A. LUDWIG,
Comptroller of the Currency,
Washington, DC.

DEAR COMPTROLLER LUDWIG: We are writing in response to the above-referenced request for written comments on whether the "Financial Institution Insurance Sales Act," recently enacted by the State of Rhode Island, should be preempted by Section 92 of the National Bank Act.

The Act does not prevent banks from selling insurance. The Rhode Island State legislature passed this Act to remove Rhode Island's statutory ban on the sale of insurance by state-chartered banks. The legislation also is a valid exercise of that State's right to regulate the business of insurance by protecting consumers from unfair trade practices and providing a level playing field for all sellers of insurance products. For example, section 6 of the bill prohibits the illegal tying of the sale of an insurance product to the extension of credit and section 7 of the bill requires disclosure to consumers that an insurance product is not a deposit and is not federally insured. This legislation is the result of extensive negotiations with representatives of Rhode Island's federally-chartered and state-chartered banks.

The public has a substantial interest in the continued functional regulation of insurance by the States, regardless of who is conducting the activities. We support the principles of State's rights, functional regulation, and fair and reasonable consumer protection. We support the Rhode Island law and believe that it meets the standard established by the decision in *Barnett Bank v. Nelson* 116 S.Ct. 1103 (1996).

The Act authorizes the Department of Business Regulation's commissioner of banking to promulgate regulations to implement the sale of insurance under the Act and "to ensure the safety and soundness of the banking and insurance business." Your notice and request for comment makes no mention of the implementing regulations drafted by the Rhode Island Department of Business Regulation and that are pending a February 10, 1997 hearing before that Department and possible further revisions before finalization. As legislators we are outraged at your efforts to usurp the authority and subvert the processes of an elected State legislature that is engaged in valid lawmaking.

We strongly urge you not to act to preempt the Rhode Island Financial Institution Insurance Sales Act.

Sincerely,

John D. Dingell, Tim Holden, Earl Pomeroy, Bobby Rush, Collin C. Peterson, David Minge, Edward J. Markey, John S. Tanner, Gary Condit, Ron Klink, Anna G. Eshoo, Gene Green.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF
WOMEN HONORS SEVEN

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplishments of seven outstanding women who exemplify the best that the legal profession has to offer. These women will be honored next week by the New York City National Organization for Women because they have displayed the intelligence and perseverance that is absolutely essential to be a successful attorney, and possess an unwavering dedication to advancing the rights of women in society.

Janet Benshoof is one of the premier experts on reproductive rights and privacy law in America. As the founder and president of the Center for Reproductive Law and Policy, she had been involved in most of the landmark Supreme Court cases involving reproductive rights. Ms. Benshoof had been previously honored by the MacArthur Foundation Fellowship and by the National Law Journal as 1 of the 100 most influential lawyers in America.

Sylvia Law is the Elizabeth Dollard professor of law, medicine and psychiatry and codirector of the Arthur Garfield Hays Program at New York University Law School. She has been involved with many landmark cases, including *Goldberg versus Kelly*, in which the Supreme Court recognized that welfare is an entitlement that cannot be discontinued without reason or an opportunity to protest. She is also the author of several books and articles on jurisprudence, welfare, and health care policy.

Donna Lieberman is founder and director of the New York Civil Liberties Union's reproductive rights project, and one of the leaders of the New York pro-choice movement. She has broadened the base of the reproductive rights movement, linking reproductive rights with the issues of HIV/AIDS prevention, gender equity, and education.

Elizabeth Mason has gained national recognition in her representation of victims of sexual harassment and violence in the workplace. Elizabeth has been instrumental in drafting legislation to guarantee an employee's right to seek relief against an employer if she is sexually assaulted in the workplace.

Valorie Vodjik argued the groundbreaking Supreme Court decision that overturned the 152-year-old male-only admission policy at the Citadel. In that case she won the opportunity for women to obtain an undergraduate, military-style education. Ms. Vodjik is an expert on sexual discrimination and supervised the NYU sexual harassment law clinic.

As the U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York, Mary Jo White is a preeminent role model for women. Under her leadership, the U.S. attorney's office has prosecuted large-scale securities and financial frauds, other white collar offenses, international terrorism, money laundering, official corruption, organized crime, and drug trafficking. Her leadership has led to the dismantling of some

of the largest and most violent gangs in New York.

Patricia J. Williams is an internationally renowned expert on race relations and women's studies. She is a professor at the Columbia University School of Law and the author of a number of books, including "The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a Law Professor." She wrote an amicus brief in support of planned parenthood in the Supreme Court case of *Planned Parenthood versus Casey*.

Mr. Speaker, these seven women together have changed the course of the women's rights movement in America. Almost every woman in America has benefited from their actions. I am truly honored to recognize their accomplishments in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING THE TRI-STATE CHRISTIAN DAY CARE AND PRESCHOOL CENTER

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Tri-State Christian Day Care and Preschool Center in St. Clairsville, OH, on the occasion of their first child care appreciation ceremony as part of National Child Care Week in March.

The teachers and child care providers, under the direction of Pastor E. Keith Stevens and Administrator Connie Patton, are dedicated to providing a caring, learning environment for the many children who attend the Tri-State Christian Day Care Center. Today, there are many demands and responsibilities parents must balance while raising their children, and it is often necessary for both mothers and fathers to work to support their homes and their families. It is comforting for parents to know that their children are safe and being cared for by dedicated teachers, volunteers, and aides.

The Tri-State Christian Day Care and Preschool Center plays an important role in the lives of their students and the children who attend their day care center. The teachers and volunteers at Tri-State share a commitment to the child care ministry and to teaching God's word to the children who attend the day care and preschool center. As a parent, I am thankful that there are facilities like Tri-State Christian Day Care and Preschool Center which provide this important service to families and children.

I would like to thank the Tri-State Christian Day Care and Preschool Center for inviting me to attend their first child care appreciation ceremony and see the excellent services they provide for Ohio Valley families. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Tri-State, and child care centers like Tri-State, that are helping families by providing a caring atmosphere for children to learn and grow. I wish them continued success.

IS COSCO STRATEGIC THREAT

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, does the possible presence of the Chinese Ocean Shipping Co. [Cosco] in an American port represent a strategic threat to United States interests?

That is what I've asked Navy Secretary John Dalton to determine. Given the efforts of the People's Republic of China to manipulate American elections, given the PRC's success in securing ports on both sides of the Panama Canal, given the continued absences of human rights in China and the continued trade deficits we face with that country, I believe it is a fair question and one that we are obliged to ask as Members of Congress.

I place in today's RECORD a recent Washington Times story explaining, if such an explanation were necessary, why America should be concerned with the proposal to give China the former Navy base at Long Beach, and the unseemly help by the Clinton administration in facilitating the deal.

[From the Washington Times]

SOLOMON: IS COSCO "STRATEGIC THREAT?"
LONG BEACH DEAL TRIGGERS CONCERN

(By Rowan Scarborough)

A senior House Republican yesterday asked Navy Secretary John H. Dalton to report whether the Chinese Ocean Shipping Co. (Cosco) represents a "global tactical or strategic threat" to the Navy.

The effort by Rep. Gerald B.H. Solomon, chairman of the House Rules Committee, to force the Navy to make an assessment is the latest development in a campaign to block Cosco from taking over the abandoned Long Beach Naval Station in California.

"In order to understand the magnitude of the growing threat of the PRC [People's Republic of China], I would like you to state the U.S. Navy's position on [Cosco]," Mr. Solomon, New York Republican, wrote in a one-page letter to Mr. Dalton.

"Considering their potential world-wide information gathering capabilities, a history as the delivery system of weapons of mass destruction to terrorist countries and the size of this fleet under direct control of the communist regime—does Cosco pose a potential global tactical or strategic threat against the U.S. Navy?"

The Solomon letter represents a more specific question for the Navy. Before, congressional inquiries have centered on whether Cosco at Long Beach would be a regional threat. The congressman wants to know if Cosco, and its 600-ship fleet, poses a danger to the Navy itself.

Mr. Solomon was one of the first in Congress to speak out against the Chinese-Long Beach connection.

"This is almost a caricature of Lenin's prediction that the West will hand the rope to its Communist executioners," he said March 10. "The Clinton administration seems to be going out of its way to help the most serious threat to American security, the so-called People's Republic of China."

Cosco plans to lease 144 acres to operate a large container terminal, giving Beijing an important beach-head in making Cosco one of the world's largest carriers.

Lawmakers in recent weeks have emerged from closed-door intelligence briefings with conflicting interpretations.

Conservatives who oppose the deal say the intelligence shows Cosco is a tool of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, trafficking in weapons of mass destruction to known terrorist states such as Iran.

But local Long Beach legislators say the briefings show Cosco is not a threat.

President Clinton personally backed the city of Long Beach's overture to Cosco, after a commission had targeted the station for closure as part of armed forces downsizing.

The negotiations occurred at a time China is suspected of funneling millions of dollars in illegal campaign contributions into the United States in a government-sponsored operation to influence the 1996 election.

Some Republicans wonder if there is a connection between Cosco's expansion plans and the Democratic fund-raising scandal.

Reps. Duncan Hunter and Randy "Duke" Cunningham, both California Republicans, want to stop the Cosco-Long Beach marriage through legislation attached to the 1998 defense authorization bill. The House National Security Committee is scheduled to write the bill next month.

However, the Cosco transaction may die before the Navy officially transfers the property to the city's Harbor Commission.

A coalition of conservationists and history buffs have filed suit to stop the project, which calls for leveling every naval station building.

A judge in Los Angeles has ordered the city to terminate the Cosco lease and re-evaluate the plan's environmental impact.

The New York Times reported yesterday that Clinton appointee, Dorothy Robyn, in November urged the preservationists to abandon their effort to save any buildings.

Miss Robyn, who serves on the National Economic Council, told the paper she made the calls as a favor to Long Beach's mayor. She said she had no contacts with Cosco officials.

Meanwhile, Sen. John McCain, Arizona Republican, has asked the Federal Maritime Commission to report whether Cosco is guilty of predatory pricing.

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS
MEMORIAL DAY

HON. THOMAS W. EWING

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1997, hundreds of law enforcement officers from across the country came together at the U.S. Capitol to honor slain law enforcement officers on Peace Officers Memorial Day.

Last Thursday we paused to pay tribute to those who have lost their lives in service to the Nation as law enforcement officers. One hundred and fifteen officers were killed 1996. Among these fallen heroes was a 26-year-old officer from the 15th Congressional District of Illinois.

On October 17, 1996, Officer Anthony Samfay of the Kankakee Police Department was shot and killed while conducting a routine traffic stop on a vehicle at Fair and Greenwood Avenue in Kankakee.

Officer Samfay said the only job he ever wanted was to be a police officer. It is with much honor that I pay my respect to Officer Samfay, his mother, the other fallen heroes,

and all law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line every day to help protect and serve America.

MEMORIAL DAY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute, to the millions of men and women who have served this Nation in its Armed Forces. Call it by any name you wish, Remembrance Day, Decoration Day, Memorial Day. It is a time when this country recounts the price for the liberty and freedom it enjoys today. That cost was paid for in the numerous lives and countless sacrifices given to it, by the servicemen and women of this country. The courage and devotion they expressed are the finest example by which all Americans must measure themselves. It is their sense of responsibility and duty that has tied them to all the generations of Americans, past and present, who have answered their country's call to service.

Who are these extraordinary people who have made such a difference in our lives? They are not the sons and daughters of kings or emperors but the hard working farm boys of the heartland, who sat in the muddy trenches of Europe in World War I. They are the former store clerks and factory workers who withstood the crushing siege of Bastogne in World War II. They are the courageous men and women who fought to stem the tide of communism along the 38th parallel in Korea. They are the devoted servicemen and women who fought in the steamy jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam. In our own decade they have been our own sons and daughters and in some circumstances our grandchildren who marched off to the desert to liberate the country of Kuwait.

How does one thank these men and women who have suffered so much that many could live in freedom? Mr. Speaker the debt of gratitude we owe is immeasurable. These men and women, whose deeds and stories are countless, are the reason why this country has been able to remain a shining example of freedom and democracy for the world. To merely say thank you is not enough. This country's continued support for its veterans must be a priority. The words of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown, ring strongly: "I believe a Nation is judged by the way it treats its Veterans." It is this thought that we must bear in mind when issues arise in the Congress that may impact the veterans of this country.

To ignore these issues is to do our veterans and their families a great disservice. Their sacrifice and commitment must be equally reflected in our effort to pay a debt that can never be monetarily repaid. Mr. Speaker, what price can you put on the life of a citizen who is willing to pay the ultimate sacrifice for his or her country in a time of war or national peril?

It is fitting that on this occasion we reaffirm our support and gratitude to this special group of Americans whose devotion to duty was expressed in the highest manner. By their willingness to lay down their life for this Nation,

they have assured the security and future for generation of Americans to come.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure and honor to express my deep and heartfelt gratitude for the service of America's veterans. Call this day by what ever name you choose, it is a memorial to all the generations of men and women who have served this Nation and upheld its finest traditions of liberty and democracy. God bless our veterans.

HONORING THE BELLAIRE LIONS CLUB ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR CHARTER

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Bellaire Lions Club which will be celebrating the 50th anniversary of their charter on May 21, 1997.

The Bellaire Lions Club was chartered in district 13-G on May 21, 1947, with 24 original members. The district's motto is "Positive growth through teamwork," and the club is asked "to encourage service-minded men and women to serve their community." The Lions Club in Bellaire, OH, has exemplified this motto through 50 years of support and service to the Bellaire community and Belmont County.

Over the past 50 years, the Bellaire Lions Club has had many dedicated members. These members adopted the motto "We Serve" and chose work associated with the prevention and awareness of vision related illnesses. To promote the well-being of the community and awareness of vision related illnesses, the Bellaire Lions Club has sponsored eye testing, glaucoma clinics, and street signs. The club has also been active in area schools by donating science awards for Bellaire High School and St. John's High School as well as trophies for area sports teams.

The Bellaire Lions Club has stood as an example of the importance of volunteerism and helping one's neighbors. Their commitment to the Ohio Valley and to service continues today as they celebrate the 50th anniversary of their charter. I am proud to represent the members of this organization who generously give their time to others and work to improve their community. I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating the Bellaire Lions Club members on the 50th anniversary of their charter, and to wish them continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SONNY BONO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I am writing to explain that on Tuesday, May 20, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No.

139. If I was present, I certainly would have voted "aye" in support of approving the journal. Thank you for recognizing my position regarding this vote.

DOES MONEY TALK?

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, they say that money talks. If it doesn't, enough of it certainly seems to gain access to the White House. At least, that seemed to be the case for the Riady family of Indonesia. A recent Washington Times editorial reminds us that the Riady family has given various Democrat candidates and committees nearly \$2 million since 1991. It also seems to have been money well spent, because Riady managed to have one of their own, John Huang, strategically placed at the Commerce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, a White House or a foreign policy for sale is not a laughing matter. I submit the Washington Times editorial in today's RECORD.

WHAT MR. RIADY WANTS

The Pacific Leadership Council (PLC), a fund-raising and influence-seeking organization formed in the 1980s by Lippo Group magnate James Riady, Maria Hsia and John Huang, all of whom figure prominently in the Democratic Party's growing money scandal, was anything but indirect about its motives. One original PLC member acknowledged to the Los Angeles Times recently that the group's political support "wasn't altruistic at all." The Riady family and its PLC colleagues "wanted to know what kinds of appointments and what kinds of contracts we could get out of all this," the member candidly admitted.

How much is "all this"? According to the Times, the now-disbanded PLC and its members donated about \$500,000 through 1990, \$250,000 of it to the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC). Since 1991, Riady-controlled corporations, their executives and close associates have donated nearly \$2 million to various Democratic committees and candidates, including more than \$850,000 to the Democratic National Committee (DNC). Since the presidential election, the DNC has returned \$450,000 it received from the daughter and son-in-law of a Riady business partner.

At one PLC fund-raiser held in his home in April 1988, Mr. Riady raised \$110,000 for the DSCC. Four days later, Mr. Riady wrote a highly detailed three-page memo to Ms. Hsia instructing her to "follow up and let me know of progress" in pursuing the numerous quid pro quos Mr. Riady meticulously outlined in a summary appropriately headlined, "DSCC Issues and Agenda." Indeed, so blatantly and crassly self-interested was Mr. Riady's modus operandi that the then-DSCC chairman, Massachusetts Sen. John Kerry, later described Mr. Riady's letter to Ms. Hsia as a "raw, graphic memo" reflecting the kind of special-interest agenda that is "usually communicated discreetly and verbally, not in writing." Mr. Riady was even more direct in a second memo that month, this one

sent to DSCC Executive Director Robert Chlopak: "The issues and concerns that were discussed [at the Riady fund-raiser] need to be followed up and actions need to be delivered."

Among other things, Mr. Riady wanted the Democratic senators to "impress upon Taiwan to allow Asian-American banks (or at least the Bank of Trade [the former name of LippoBank] to be allowed to open a branch office in Taiwan." He also sought "appointments of Asian-Americans to policy-making positions in the federal government." As it later developed, thanks in part to a letter of recommendation overflowing with praise from Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, Mr. Riady's former top U.S. executive, Mr. Huang, was appointed to an influential position in the Commerce Department, where he received more than 100 secret briefings, including CIA information about China, and routinely telephoned LippoBank from his office. The FBI is now investigating whether economic espionage occurred and whether the Riadys, Mr. Huang or anyone else may have laundered and then funneled illegal campaign contributions from the Chinese government. In March, the vice president of the Asian-American Business Roundtable charged Mr. Huang with attempting to funnel \$250,000 illegally to the DNC through the group's members. Meanwhile, Mr. Huang has asserted his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination in refusing to cooperate with a congressional investigative committee.

And whaddya know? After Sen. Daschle could "personally attest to John's strong background" in a 1992 letter to the Clinton transition team, Sen. Daschle's aide recently told the Times that the senator "actually doesn't know John Huang well at all." Moreover, after receiving a telephone call from an irate President Clinton at one o'clock in the morning following Wisconsin Sen. Russell Feingold's call for an independent counsel to investigate Mr. Clinton's 1996 fund-raising, Sen. Daschle has managed to close the barn door, locking in all the other Democrats except Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York.

As for Ms. Hsia, she later helped Mr. Huang arrange the illegal fund-raiser at the tax-exempt California Buddhist temple where Vice President Gore shook down impoverished monks, bagging nearly \$150,000, much of which the DNC has promised to return. More laundering problems. As a founding member of the PLC, Ms. Hsia enticed then-Sen. Gore to visit Taiwan in 1989, promising him in a letter that she "will persuade all my colleagues in the future to play a leader role in your [next] presidential race" if "you decide to join this trip." Although political contributions from foreign nationals who are not U.S. residents are expressly forbidden, the PLC had planned to use that trip "to recruit new members overseas and potentially to raise some money for PLC," according to a document obtained by the Los Angeles Times.

Whether it is bankrolling Webster Hubbell to the tune of \$100,000 during the period when he was supposed to be cooperating with the Whitewater prosecutor or whether it is orchestrating nearly \$2 million in political contributions from family and associates to Mr. Clinton and associates, one thing ought to be clear by now: James Riady does nothing for nobody that is not intended to benefit his interests, including White House access to lobby for expanding trade with China and to downplay Indonesia's notorious human-rights record on East Timor.

COMMENDING THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI AS TAIWAN'S FIRST DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED PRESIDENT

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me today in commending the Republic of China on the first anniversary of President Lee Teng-hui as Taiwan's first democratically elected President. I was part of the official delegation President Clinton sent to mark the occasion last year.

President Lee was directly elected by the people of Taiwan as their ninth President and inaugurated 1 year ago today. Despite an attempt at intimidation, democracy won. The United States has vital economic and military interests in this area of the world, and it is important for our country to commend the democratic efforts in this region.

One year after his inauguration, President Lee is considered a beacon of democracy in the Far East. Taiwan's democratization should be an inspiring model for governments around the world. The United States is a government that rewards democracy and capitalism, so Taiwan's free and fair elections are indeed cause to celebrate.

Both President Bill Clinton and House Speaker Newt Gingrich have made clear that Taiwan is our friend, so it is appropriate today that we pay tribute to this young democracy on the first anniversary of President Lee's inauguration.

I also ask my colleagues to join me in commending Foreign Minister John Chang as he begins his second year of promoting stronger relations between the United States and Taiwan.

CELEBRATING PRESIDENT LEE'S FIRST YEAR AS PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this week the 2 million people of Taiwan went to the polls to participate in the first direct election of a President for the Republic of China. Voter turnout was high despite the attempts by the People's Republic of China to intimidate the electorate by conducting military exercises in the Taiwan Straits.

The voters of Taiwan overwhelmingly elected Lee Teng-Hui as President of the ROC. President Lee defeated three other candidates in a free and fair election. In doing so, President Lee became the first popular elected head of state in Chinese history. His election was the culmination of a 10-year period of democratization for the Republic of China. Today, the ROC is a full-fledged democracy with a strong, multiparty system. Government

officials from the President to members of the local legislatures are all selected by the people of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, this week also marks the 1-year anniversary of the selection by President Lee of John Chang as the Republic of China's Foreign Minister. Under Mr. Chang's leadership, the already excellent relationship between the United States and Republic of China has grown even stronger. During the past year, many members of this body have traveled to Taiwan to see firsthand Taiwan's impressive economic growth. Furthermore, many senior ROC Government officials have visited the United States and have met with Members of Congress and other United States officials. All of this activity is a tribute to Foreign Minister Chang.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to note that nearly 1 year has passed since Jason Hu assumed the post of Taipei's Economic and Cultural Representative in Washington. The Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative's office serves as the unofficial embassy in the United States, and Ambassador Hu, who previously served as President Lee's spokesman and a member of the Legislative Yuan, has done a very good job promoting a dialog between Congress and the people of Taiwan. He has worked tirelessly to visit with Members of this body and to inform Members of the current activities in Taiwan. Representative Hu, like Foreign Minister Chang, is proof that President Lee has made many fine choices in filling the senior appointed positions of his government. I am certain with President Lee's leadership, our relationship with the ROC will continue to be on a steady and even keel in the years ahead.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, for more than three decades, the Older Americans Act has been providing our Nation's seniors with the services that help them enjoy security, health, and independence. Therefore, it is with great pleasure that I introduce the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1997, which will update this statute for the 21st century and beyond.

The majority of this legislation is based upon the administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Older Americans Act which I introduced during the 104th Congress. It includes provisions that grant flexibility to States, area agencies on aging, and providers which will foster new and creative ways to design and administer services for the elderly. This measure also allows for the expansion of cooperative partnerships for the identification of local needs and delivery of comprehensive services. Most importantly, all this is accomplished with a strong commitment to those protections that have and will continue to ensure seniors' health and well-being for years to come.

Despite my support for much of what is contained in the administration's proposal there

are some areas which I feel warrant change and further negotiation. One area in particular concerns the future of the Senior Community Services Employment Program [SCSEP]. While the administration would transfer the SCSEP to the Administration on Aging, the legislation I introduce today retains the program within the Department of Labor. While in principle and practice I have previously supported various proposals to consolidate and coordinate related Federal programs and services, the fact that the SCSEP is fundamentally an employment program compels me to support maintaining the program within the Labor Department.

As take up the Older Americans Act reauthorization again this year, I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues on both sides of this aisle to fashion bipartisan legislation that continues to protect our Nation's seniors.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. ROBERT SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of President Lee Teng-hui's first anniversary in office, I wish to make a few remarks.

President Lee is the first democratically elected head of state in China's history. He is a man committed to preserving political freedom for his 23 million fellow citizens.

President Lee is also committed to economic growth. In the last year Taiwan has maintained its economic expansion and its position as a major trading partner of the United States. Many of our agricultural products find ready markets in Taiwan.

On behalf of my constituents, I send my best wishes and congratulations to President Lee Teng-hui, Dr. Jason Hu, Taiwan's top representative in Washington, and the people of Taiwan as they celebrate May 20, 1997, the first anniversary of President Lee's first term in office.

TRIBUTE TO THE TOWN OF JOHNSTON

HON. LINDSEY O. GRAHAM

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the rich heritage of the town of Johnston, SC, began during the Colonial days with three families: The Lott family to the east, the Gomillion family to the south, and the Bush family on land that is in the present town center. Before the Revolutionary War, a gentleman by the name of Richard Bush accumulated land in the area. In the mid-19th century, his descendant, Isaac Bush, sold 1,200 acres of land to Dr. Edward J. Mims of the nearby town of Edgefield. Dr. Mims and his family moved onto this newly acquired land which is the original townsite of Johnston.

The name of the town was not established until its inhabitants saw the rapid expansion of the railroad throughout the South. Dr. Mims was determined to include his community in the booming opportunity the railroad provided. He successfully petitioned William Johnston, president of the Charlotte, Columbia, and Augusta Railroad, to route the railway through the land on the Mims plantation. In return, Dr. Mims agreed to name the town for Mr. Johnston. Earlier the village was called Johnston Station, then Johnston's Turn Out, and finally, on May 25, 1897, it was chartered as its present name, Johnston.

Today, Johnston, known as the Peach Capital of the World celebrates the centennial of its charter. The Johnston Historic District, a collection of 146 houses, businesses, and churches dating from the 1870's to the 1920's is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. From the 1870's Johnston had a renowned educational institution, first called the Johnston Academy, then the Johnston Institute, and later Johnston High School. The town of Johnston remains proud of its history and maintains its early emphasis on agriculture and education. However, the town also has a strong present and future with state-of-the-art manufacturing technology in its many textile mills. With firm roots and forward progress, Johnston will continue to prosper well into the 21st century.

KEEP THE PROMISE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the promise President Clinton made to end welfare as we know it.

But when given a chance to do so, in the form of a sound program by Texas Governor Bush, the President did everything possible to scuttle the plan. The plan would have meant a savings in welfare administration costs of 20 to 35 percent for the people of Texas.

This is not the first promise this administration has broken. I suggest members read the Wall Street Journal editorial in today's RECORD as a reminder:

[From the Wall Street Journal]
CLINTON PROMISES

Trying to provide better health care coverage for some 150,000 needy children, Texas Governor George W. Bush wants to generate some savings by spending less on welfare administration. After nine months of stalling, the Clinton White House has just turned him down.

This is the same Bill Clinton who famously promised "to end welfare as we know it." This is the same Bill Clinton who has been pressing to expand health coverage for poor children, insisting that the budget agreement with Congress earmark \$18 billion for that purpose. This is the same Bill Clinton who during last year's election campaign signed a welfare reform bill supposedly giving wide discretion to the states. In the end, though, this same Bill Clinton overruled his own Cabinet to side with his reactionary union allies.

The story is worth recounting simply to show what it's like to negotiate with our

present President, but also because it has huge potential implications for welfare reform nationwide. The administrative costs that Governor Bush wants to pare in Texas cost federal and state governments a whopping \$28 billion a year—to deliver \$250 billion a year in welfare benefits. Several governors are convinced these administrative functions could be privatized, with likely administrative savings of 20% to 35%.

Many states are already experimenting with contracting out parts of their welfare apparatus. Thirty states use Lockheed Martin to collect child support payments, for example, and the company also runs the federal computer to find deadbeat dads. Maximus Corp. of McLean, Va., which helps run local welfare offices for states, has doubled in size in the past year. Wisconsin is allowing both private companies and non-profits such as Goodwill Industries to bid on screening, training and placing welfare recipients in jobs. California and Arizona have plans similar to that just vetoed in Texas.

Paring state bureaucracies, of course, is anathema to public employee unions: to them the loss of state jobs spells smaller union dues and less political clout. When Governor Bush and Texas legislators decided to contract with private firms to set up one-stop assistance bureaus that would allow recipients to apply for all their benefits at once, the unions went ballistic. Their radio ads featured the sound of exploding bombs; "Texas is under attack. They're coming after us," an announcer intoned. "The guys who brought us the \$3,000 toilet seat are trying to take over public services for families, children and seniors."

Worried that Governor Bush's plan would create a bandwagon effect in other states, the unions helped convince the White House to sit for nine months on his request for a federal waiver. On March 28, President Clinton met at the White House to discuss the Texas welfare plan with four union leaders, including AFL-CIO President John Sweeney.

In April, a memo to the President warned that "we must give Texas an answer immediately." The memo—signed by Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman and White House domestic policy adviser Bruce Reed—observed that "the state has engaged in good faith discussions with various agencies for more than nine months, and state officials are now publicly criticizing the administration." It suggested the White House approve a compromise plan, giving Texas leeway on administration of income supports while barring private workers from the food stamp and Medicaid programs, on which the welfare reform bill provided tighter federal regulation.

"As you know, labor leaders would like us to refuse the Texas request entirely," the memo read. "They see even limited privatization as a dangerous precedent and have made clear they view this decision as critically important to public employee unions." On May 5, Governor Bush fired off an angry letter to Secretary Shalala complaining about "double talk and runarounds." And last Friday, Governor Bush finally got his answer: No.

Mr. Clinton rejected not only the Texas waiver, but also the compromise proposed by his own Cabinet officials. At a news briefing Ms. Shalala explained that only state employees could determine eligibility for federal programs. Governor Bush's office criticized the White House for "letting its waiver policy be determined by the AFL-CIO."

For all the Clinton welfare promises, and all the ballyhoo about the welfare reform

bill, the Clinton White House is now fighting a rear-guard action to save welfare as we know it. We have to wonder what this says about whether the White House will make a good-faith effort to honor the federal budget agreement now being ballyhooed as welfare reform was a year ago.

PRINCIPLED WRITINGS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer into the RECORD two record examples of the fine writing often found in one of district newspapers, The Brazosport Facts. While many find it easy to deride the press as liberal and closed to the notions of liberty, free markets, and constitutional principles, I am pleased to report that The Brazosport Facts in general, and these two authors in specific, seek to bring a fair, even balance to the coverage of news and ideas.

Today I enter into the RECORD an editorial written by Glenn Heath, a former executive editor of The Brazosport Facts and now a retired member of the community active yet active on the paper's editorial board. Also, I enter into the RECORD a column written by Bill Sturdevant, a frequent contributor to the Facts.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my fellow Members of Congress to read these principled writings. I offer my congratulations and thanks to these two men for supporting the ideas of liberty; and to the entire staff of The Brazosport Facts for their ongoing dedication to presenting fair coverage of events and ideas.

FREEDOM & SAFETY

A larger principle than the bill itself is involved. The principle applies to many human circumstances where a mandated gain entails a substantial loss.

For decades, a safety measure has been before the Legislature, either asking the state to require motorcycle riders to wear a protective helmet, or asking the state to repeal such a law. Riders have been in the gallery in force to oppose one or support the other.

This time it's repeal. Sen. Jerry Patterson's bill would relieve all motorcycle riders aged 21 or over of wearing the helmet. Legislators deleted a provision that they must carry added insurance if they did so.

The Senate is expected to vote on Patterson's bill Thursday or Friday.

From a purely practical standpoint, the arguments for the original bill had merit. In case of an accident, the helmet would help protect against head injuries.

Even most riders would admit that motorcycles can be dangerous. In the best of road conditions, their speed capability is often abused; and on slick surfaces or loose surfacings they can be treacherous. In a crash with a four-wheel vehicle, the motorcycles always lose.

But motorcycles are designed as much for fun as for practical transportation. Even those who accept the helmet for its safety would agree that using one diminishes the pleasure of motorcycling.

More important, the helmet protects no one but the one wearing it. So the effect of the law is to force a person to do something entirely for personal safety.

That should be that person's choice. No government should regulate an individual's right to accept risks, and in doing so deprive that person of the freedom to enjoy a pleasure.

That doesn't mean there should be no rules of highway safety. Faulty brakes threaten not just the driver of an auto, but every other vehicle on the road. Slick tires, malfunctioning lights endanger others. These are concerns of government.

But not air bags. These don't prevent crashes and they don't protect others on the road; they only tend to reduce the injuries to a driver and possibly a passenger after a crash.

When air bags were a prospective federal mandate, the estimated cost for each was about \$300. Once they were in place, they were said to have saved 1,600 lives. For this to happen, tens of millions of motorists must pay the high cost of the devices.

And in a few cases, the air bags have actually killed people. New proposals would soften the impact, and would allow a motorist to have the air bag disabled. Then why shouldn't the motorist be allowed to avoid the expense altogether?

These are only two examples. We need protection from the negligence of others, but there should be limits on how much government limits our freedom and pleasure in protecting us from ourselves.

Benjamin Franklin had words for it: "Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety."

WHEN POLITICIANS SAY ENTITLEMENTS, THINK ROBBERY

(By Bill Sturdevant)

Rights are counterbalanced with responsibility; juxtaposed and eternally linked. In the United States of America, we have a government created by a group of individuals collectively called "the people," who are not only "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," those being "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," but also have the "equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry," and "to honor and confidence from our fellow-citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them." (Thomas Jefferson).

In short, we have the right to choose what is best for us. We have the right to pursue happiness as we define it, we have the right to keep the fruits of our labor that we earn in that pursuit, and we have the right to decide how to dispose of those rewards. At the same time, we must reconcile these rights with the responsibility of respecting the rights of others, and living with the consequences of our decisions and actions. If our country's founding fathers had written a golden rule for our citizens, it would have read "Respect the God-given rights of others, while at the same time protecting your own rights."

What bothers me is that there seem to be fewer and fewer people who understand and live by this golden rule. More and more often, people are turning to the federal government to secure the force necessary to take from others something that they are not by right entitled to. I may have the right to eat, but I don't have the right to steal someone else's food. I have the right to have children, but I don't have the right to force someone else to pay for my child's food, house, clothes or education. The decision is mine; it therefore follows that the responsi-

bility is also mine. Many federal "entitlement" programs, including Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, are morally wrong because they require, by threat of force, that people give up part of what they earn so that it can be redistributed to someone who did not earn it.

But wait a minute, you say. All of the above mentioned federal programs were created by the will of the majority of Americans, and it is therefore our civic duty to contribute. My response to that is, "So what?" My rights are not bestowed to me by government or by a majority of the electorate. They do not have the legitimate authority to force me to contribute to programs that are not enumerated in the Constitution. In too many cases in the history of mankind, the majority has used the power of government to enslave the minority, or at least create an unfair advantage for themselves.

Say that a congressman and a police officer were riding in a bus that was full of other passengers. On the bus was a "rich" man, who had one dollar more than the others. The Congressman announced: "If you vote for me, I will use the government's police power to take the dollar from the rich man, and redistribute it to you." A vote was held, and the majority of those on the bus decided the rich man should contribute his dollar for the good of all the rest. The policeman seized the dollar, and the congressman divided it up. He gave 25 cents to the policeman, 25 cents was given to the people on the bus, (which they immediately started fighting over), and he kept 50 cents for himself. It seemed that everyone, except the rich man, was happy, but were they right?

In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson said of the "sacred principle" of our federal government, "that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression." It could be argued that it was wrong to take the dollar from the rich man because he could have used it to build a factory, employ everyone on the bus, and thus create wealth for all.

My point is that it doesn't matter what you or I may think, the person who earns the money is the only one with the right to decide how to spend it, so long as doing so does not infringe on your or my legitimate rights. Jefferson continued by defining the "good government" as being "wise and frugal, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned."

The next time a politician promises you an "entitlement," think about who he is going to rob to pay for it. Ask yourself if, by accepting it, you would have to abdicate your personal responsibility and therefore your freedom. Ask yourself if you are legitimately entitled to it because you earned it. If the government has the power to "take from Peter to pay Paul," what is to stop it from taking from both? Ask yourself why the politician isn't battling to restore your lost liberty.

Please understand that I am not against charity. There are people who, through no fault of their own, need temporary assistance, and I believe we have a moral obligation to help them if we can. But to lose our freedom, in the name of "charity," by allowing confiscatory taxation of our money, really only benefits politicians and bureaucrats. This is not only dangerous, it is absurd.

Only by accepting our responsibility to honor the rights of others can we hope to protect our own rights. As Jefferson said, only by protecting our rights can we hope to "regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety."

SUPPORT OF THE SCREENING APPROACH ADOPTED IN THE COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING ACT, H.R. 1128

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss important information on the issue of colorectal cancer screening. Earlier this year, I introduced the Colorectal Cancer Screening Act, H.R. 1128, which would provide Medicare coverage for all available colorectal cancer screening procedures including the fecal occult blood test, sigmoidoscopy, the barium exam, and colonoscopy. I hope that Congress will soon consider colorectal cancer screening as part of a package of preventive benefits to be included in Medicare reform legislation.

The purpose of my remarks today is to share with my colleagues important recent statements in support of the colorectal cancer screening approach taken in H.R. 1128 by the American Cancer Society, former Virginia Governor L. Douglas Wilder, and the Washington D.C. Chapter of the NAACP. The Colorectal Cancer Screening Act is the only legislation in the House which provides coverage for all available colorectal cancer screening procedures, including the barium exam, allowing doctors and patients to choose procedures, rather than the Federal Government. H.R. 1128 is also important because it is the only House legislation which assures that adequate screening options will be available to meet the screening needs of African-American Medicare recipients.

In remarks submitted last Congress, I cited several medical studies which show that African-Americans disproportionately develop cancer in the right side of the colon, the portion of the colon that is beyond the reach of sigmoidoscopy, a common screening procedure. These studies make clear that a procedure, such as the barium exam, which can screen the entire colon, must be made available to meet the needs of African-American patients. The barium examination is the safest and most cost-effective way to screen the entire colon, and is one of only two procedures which can image the entire colon. The studies also indicate that colorectal cancer screening programs that do not include barium exams are inadequate for African-Americans.

The American Cancer Society recently released its new colorectal cancer screening guidelines. These screening recommendations were produced as a result of a comprehensive examination of all available information regarding the cost and availability of various screening procedures. One of the significant changes from earlier versions is that the ACS now recommends the barium enema as one of the options for the initial screening of average and

moderate-risk individuals over age 50. The American Cancer Society recommendations are as follows:

* * * the National Board of the American Cancer Society recently approved new colorectal guidelines which provide clear guidance to practitioners and their patients for the early detection of colorectal polyps and cancer at various levels of risk. These guidelines include the following:

For average risk individuals (65 percent-75 percent of cases), the American Cancer Society recommends annual fecal occult blood test plus sigmoidoscopy every 5 years; or colonoscopy every 10 years or double contrast barium enema every 5 to 10 years. Testing should begin at age 50.

For moderate risk individuals (20 percent-30 percent of cases), the American Cancer Society recommends colonoscopy or a total colon exam, which includes colonoscopy or double contrast barium enema, depending on family history and the size of the polyps. Testing interval and age to begin depend on initial diagnosis and family history.

For high risk individuals (5 percent-8 percent of cases) with a history of familial adenomatous polyps, the Society recommends early surveillance with endoscopy, counseling to consider genetic testing, and referral to a specialty center. Testing should begin at puberty. For high risk individuals with a family history of hereditary non-polyposis colon cancer, the Society recommends colonoscopy and counseling to consider genetic testing. Testing should begin at age 21.

In addition, former Governor L. Douglas Wilder recently wrote a commentary in the Richmond Times Dispatch, which discussed the importance of prostate and colorectal cancer screening procedures. His comments support the colorectal cancer screening approach adopted in H.R. 1128. Governor Wilder's commentary follows.

Finally, the Washington Branch of the NAACP wrote a letter to the House Ways and Means Health Subcommittee on the importance of colorectal cancer screening for African-Americans. The letter written by the NAACP supports the screening provisions of H.R. 1128 and barium exams. The letter follows.

I commend Governor Wilder and the Washington Branch of the NAACP for their involvement in this issue, and I urge my colleagues to read and examine all of the aforementioned statements.

Mr. Speaker, colorectal cancer screening is an important part of providing preventive services to our Nation's seniors, a concept which I strongly support. However, it is also important that colorectal cancer screening legislation meet the needs of our Nation's seniors. There is an emerging consensus that barium exams must be included in colorectal cancer screening legislation. I urge my colleagues to join this consensus by supporting the provisions of H.R. 1128, the Colorectal Cancer Screening Act.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Apr. 6, 1997]

BLACKS NEED BETTER ACCESS TO SCREENING TESTS FOR CANCER

(By L. Douglas Wilder)

RICHMOND.—A recent symposium on "Race and Health Care as We Approach the Twenty-First Century" at Virginia Common-

wealth University was the first of what will be annual topical discussions on matters of utmost concern to all of us. I was privileged, in my post at the Center for Public Policy, to convene the two-day meeting. Participants included scholars who have achieved national acclaim for providing solutions to the problems; they represented a broad spectrum of women, minorities, academicians, practitioners, and others. The participants discussed not only the unique challenges faced by African Americans in health care, but also the obstacles they face in gaining access to adequate screening for certain kinds of cancer.

At a time when President and Congress are considering measures to provide preventive screening to the Medicare population for certain cancers, it is essential that we consider the differences in how cancer manifests itself in American Americans, and what this means to appropriate screening.

The challenge is particularly acute for prostate and colorectal cancers. The data on these diseases are clear and simple: While the nation's focus has been on the 40,000 deaths each year from AIDS and the more than 44,000 deaths each year from breast cancer in the United States, it is important to recognize that colorectal cancer will claim more than 50,000 and prostate cancer more than 42,000, Americans in 1997. For African Americans, the statistics are particularly frightening, as African Americans are struck more frequently than, and differently from, other Americans. And surprise, surprise, there are no genetic or hereditary deficiencies that account for this.

For prostate cancer, African Americans males have the highest incidence in the world—66 percent higher than white men, with a mortality rate more than two times higher. If detected while localized, the five-year survival rate for prostate cancer is 99 percent. For colorectal cancer, the mortality rate among African Americans continues to rise, even as the American Cancer Society reports declines in colorectal cancer among other segments of the population.

African Americans who get colorectal cancer are 50 percent more likely to die of the disease than others in this country. In addition, the disease affects African Americans differently from the way it affects white Americans: The National Cancer Institute's Black/White Cancer Survival Study found that African Americans have a greater tendency to get colorectal cancer in the right colon—the portion not reached by sigmoidoscopy—than other Americans, explaining, at least in part, the higher mortality rate from the disease. These data illustrate the special importance of regular prostate and colorectal screening for African Americans to detect these cancers at the earliest stages and, to the extent possible, correct the disparity in the incidence of the disease.

What can be done to meet the challenge of reducing the mortality rate for these cancers among all segments of the Medicare population? I am pleased to see that Medicare coverage for preventive screening benefits is one area where President Clinton and Republican congressional leaders appear to agree. President Clinton has recognized the importance of preventive screening, and his FY 1998 budget proposes to extend Medicare coverage to including screening for prostate and colorectal cancer, as well as other preventive benefits. In addition, a group led by Republican Congressmen Bill Thomas and Mike Bilirakis, who head the two key Health Subcommittees in the House of Representatives,

has introduced legislation to provide similar benefits under Medicare. Similar efforts are underway in the U.S. Senate as well. With bipartisan support, these important screenings will be available to all elderly Americans served by Medicare.

The extension of Medicare coverage to include these new benefits may screening of the entire colon—with colonoscopy or barium enema—possible for early detection of colorectal cancer. Key members of the U.S. Congress have adopted an approach that provides appropriate choice for patients in the Medicare population, including the African Americans population and other Medicare recipients who prefer a comprehensive screening option. Congressman Norman Sisisky of Virginia, himself a colorectal cancer survivor, has taken a leading role in advocating regular preventive screening and has indicated that his "mission in the 105th Congress [is] to enact Medicare coverage for colorectal cancer screening."

Congressman Sisisky has supported the excellent work of Congressman Alcee Hastings and Senator John Breaux, who in the 104th Congress introduced legislation in the House and Senate to provide Medicare coverage for colorectal cancer screening and who are likely to do so again in the 105th Congress. Their approach has also been supported by a number of members of the Congressional Black Caucus, including the distinguished Ranking Member of the Ways and Means Committee, Congressman Charles Rangel. Caucus members know and understand the special needs of the African American population and are personally committed to providing appropriate screening options to accommodate those needs.

Legislation alone will not be enough to persuade Americans—including African Americans—to undergo preventive screening. A broad public education campaign is needed to foster serious discussion about the benefits of these screening procedures for all Americans. I hope part of this campaign will provide African Americans with information about the special impact of these cancers on our population, and about our special screening needs. I am pleased that the American Gastroenterology Association recently published recommendations for regular colorectal cancer screening, which recommended procedures appropriate for the African American population. I understand the American Cancer Society will also be issuing its recommendations for preventive colorectal cancer screening.

It is vitally important that preventive screening be covered by Medicare and that all Americans—have access to affordable, appropriate screening methodologies. Now is the time to act. I challenge President Clinton and the Republican-led Congress to make good on their promise to the American people that the next two years will be ones of action rather than delay and partisanship.

In this instance, the lives of tens of thousands of elderly Americans could be saved and their quality of life improved if President Clinton and the Congress have the courage to meet the people's challenge to work together for the common good.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,

Washington, DC, March 27, 1997.

Hon. WILLIAM THOMAS,
Chairman, Health Subcommittee, House Ways
and Means Committee, U.S. House of Rep-
resentatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to commend you for convening a hearing on the

issue of Medicare coverage for preventive benefits. The legislation you have introduced, the Medicare Preventive Benefits Improvement Act, H.R. 15, is a good first step towards addressing the health concerns of African Americans, who suffer disproportionately from diseases such as breast cancer, prostate cancer, and colorectal cancer. While I support the overall effort to enact preventive benefits legislation represented by H.R. 15, I believe that significant changes need to be made to address the colorectal cancer screening provisions of this legislation, which I believe are inadequate for screening the African American population.

You and I would agree that preventive screening is the key to detecting colorectal cancer in its earliest stage, so colorectal cancer can be treated and removed before it becomes fatal. It is my understanding that over the years you have supported several bills that provide Medicare coverage for colorectal cancer screening, and I applaud your efforts.

However, I am very concerned about the impact of H.R. 15 on the African American community. As it stands now, African Americans who develop colorectal cancer have a fifty percent greater mortality rate than the general population. In addition, medical studies have shown that African Americans disproportionately develop cancer in the right side of the colon, which means that African Americans need access to screening

procedures that can view the entire colon. Legislation that provides for screening with only fecal occult blood tests and flexible sigmoidoscopy is inadequate to meet the screening needs of African Americans. In addition, the high-cost and risk associated with colonoscopy also make this procedure an inadequate solution for screening African Americans for colorectal cancer. African American patients and their doctors should be given a choice of all available options.

As mentioned, the issue of choice is crucial for African American patients and their doctors when deciding which procedures to use for colorectal cancer screening. The Medicare Preventive Benefits Improvement Act (H.R. 15), does not provide Medicare coverage for all commonly used colorectal cancer screening procedures, and therefore, limits the choices of doctors and patients. This legislation would have a devastating effect on screening for African Americans, who would be denied access to one of the most cost-effective procedures for screening the entire colon, the barium enema. This lack of access to such an important screening procedure will needlessly cost thousands of lives.

Colorectal cancer screening is an important issue for all Americans, not only African Americans. Patients and doctors, whether they are African American or not, should decide which screening procedures are appropriate—not the federal government.

I urge you to support the provisions included in bi-partisan legislation introduced by Congressman Alcee Hastings and co-sponsored by members of the Congressional Black Caucus which provides Medicare coverage for colorectal cancer screening using all commonly used procedures including fecal occult blood tests (FOBT), flexible sigmoidoscopy, colonoscopy, and the barium enema. Congressman Hastings' legislation, the Colorectal Cancer Screening Act, provides the same Medicare coverage for FOBT, flexible sigmoidoscopy, and colonoscopy as H.R. 15, but also corrects a significant omission in H.R. 15 by including the barium enema. I believe that Congressman Hastings' provisions should be included in H.R. 15 to give all Americans a complete choice of colorectal cancer screening procedures.

Once again, thank you for your work to support and promote Medicare coverage for preventive benefits. As a supporter of Medicare coverage for preventive services, I also thank you in advance for pursuing the passage of inclusive colorectal cancer screening legislation which is not biased against African Americans.

Please include these remarks in the record of your March 13, 1997 Health Subcommittee hearing.

Sincerely,

REV. MORRIS L. SHEARIN,
President.