

many of my colleagues will learn about situations similar to Denise's, and I urge you to consider cosponsoring the IPA to advance this important crime fighting tool.

SMALL BUSINESS PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3310) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, for the purpose of facilitating compliance by small businesses with certain Federal paperwork requirements, and to establish a task force to examine the feasibility of streamlining paperwork requirements applicable to small businesses:

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3310, the Small Business Paperwork Reduction Act Amendments of 1998. One of the purposes of the original Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 was to promote prompt dissemination of public information for major Federal agencies which depend on vital information from businesses. However, the proposed amendments will indirectly contradict the original intent.

Although I support the financial relief offered to small businesses in this bill, it would open the door for willful mistakes that would put various elements of Government control and worker safety at a disadvantage. For example, the Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration [PWBA] which depends on reports to ensure proper investing to secure our retirement savings for the future. This bill will weaken the ability of PWBA to protect workers' benefits by undermining current disclosure requirements. Another agency that would be adversely affected is the Drug Enforcement Administration [DEA] which uses business reports in order to detect drug trafficking. This bill would jeopardize reporting requirements that could provide evidence of criminal activity. Our Immigration Department relies on employers to file reports to monitor the hiring of illegal immigrants.

H.R. 3310 would weaken the ability of Federal agencies to receive vital information by making it easier for companies to bypass their responsibility to provide basic statistics needed for regulatory purposes.

In addition to the adverse effects this bill will have on Government regulations, it also places millions of American workers at risk by undermining the hard work of unions across America which have been successful in promoting the safety and health for workers in mines, factories, and other workplaces. These amendments would erode hard-fought protections that have played a significant role in the decreased deaths of workers.

Mr. Speaker, businesses have an obligation to adhere to governmental regulations that protect workers and the American people by building a healthy society which ultimately benefit businesses.

I strongly support our small businesses as they are fundamental to the well being of our society, however, I do not support putting

American workers at physical risk by removing penalties for ignoring the law. I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

**IN HONOR OF THE LAKE ERIE
NATURE AND SCIENCE CENTER**

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 30, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dedication celebration of the newly renovated Lake Erie Nature and Science Center (LENSC) in Bay Village, Ohio.

In 1996, more than 124,000 people participated in the Center's programs. Students came from Cuyahoga and Lorain Counties, and other visitors represented 30 states and 11 countries. LENS provides educational programs, wildlife rehabilitation, non-releasable wild animals and exhibits. The Center's goal is to involve individuals of all ages from every background in learning to care for wildlife and the earth in a fun, hands-on way.

LENSC recognized the growing need for more educational programs and exhibits and planned a \$2.3 million renovation project. The dedication ceremony will take place on Saturday, April 4th. Since its founding in the home of Dr. Elberta Wagner Fleming in 1945, LENS has undergone remarkable changes and growth. This newest renovation added a new classroom designed for preschoolers, an event center, an expanded resource center, a new lobby with a nature art mural, a courtyard, volunteer room and a new conference room.

My fellow colleagues, please join me in honoring the accomplishments of the Lake Erie Nature and Science Center.

**TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND DR.
MARTIN LUTHER KING JR.**

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 30, 1998

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the legacy of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who, thirty years ago this week was senselessly murdered by an assassin in Memphis, Tennessee.

Dr. King contributed more to the causes of national freedom and equality than any other man or woman of our century. His achievements as an author and as a minister were surpassed only by his leadership, which transformed a torn people into a beacon of strength and solidarity, and united a divided nation under a common creed of brotherhood and mutual prosperity.

It was Dr. King's policy of nonviolent protest which served to open the eyes of the American populace to the horrors of discrimination and police brutality. This policy revealed the Jim Crow laws of the South as hypocritical and unfair, and forced civil rights issues into the national dialectic. It is due to the increased scope and salience of the national civil rights discussion that the movement achieved so much during its decade of greatest accomplishment, from 1957 to 1968.

It was in 1955 that Dr. King made his first mark on the nation, when he organized the

black community of Montgomery, Alabama during a 382-day boycott of the city's bus lines. The boycott saw Dr. King and many other civil rights activists placed in prison as "agitators," but their efforts were rewarded in 1956, when the Supreme Court declared that the segregational practices of the Alabama bus system was unconstitutional, and demanded that blacks be allowed to ride with equal and indistinguishable rights. The result proved the theory of nonviolent protest in practice, and roused the nation to the possibilities to be found through peace and perseverance.

In 1963, Dr. King and his followers faced their most ferocious test, when they set a massive civil rights protest in motion in Birmingham, Alabama. The protest was met with brute force by the local police, and many innocent men and women were injured through the harsh response. However, the strength of the police department worked against the forces of discrimination in the nation, as many Americans came to sympathize with the plight of the blacks through the sight of their irrational and inhumane treatment.

By August of 1963 the civil rights movement had achieved epic proportions, and it was in a triumphant and universal air that Dr. King gave his memorable "I Have a Dream" speech on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. In the next year, Dr. King was distinguished as Time magazine's Man of the Year for 1963, and he would later be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for 1964.

Throughout his remaining years, Dr. King continued to lead the nation towards increased peace and unity. He spoke out directly against the Vietnam War, and led the nation's War on Poverty, which he saw as directly involved with the Vietnam struggle. To Dr. King, the international situation was inextricably linked to the domestic, and thus it was only through increased peace and prosperity at home that tranquility would be ensured abroad.

When Dr. King was tragically gunned down in 1968 he had already established himself as a national hero and pioneer. As the years passed, his message continued to gather strength and direction, and it is only in the light of his multi-generational influence that the true effects of his ideas can be measured.

Dr. King was a man who lacked neither vision nor the means to express it. His image of a strong, united nation overcoming the obstacles of poverty and inequality continues to provide us with an ideal picture of the "United" States which will fill the hearts of Americans with feelings of brotherhood and common purposes for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to appropriately remember the significant deeds of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and to join in a moment of silent meditation in his honor.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 30, 1998

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was away from the House with the President on the historical visit to Africa. I was unable to vote on Rollcall votes 68 through 80. If I had been here I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall—68, aye; 69, nay; 70, aye; 71, aye; 72, aye; 73, nay; 74, nay; 75, nay; 76, nay; 77, yea; 78, nay; 79, aye; 80, nay.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM—AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE SOME PROGRESS

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 30, 1998

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, last October, a group of 30 Republican members asked Speaker GINGRICH to set open ground rules for the House debate on the issue of campaign finance reform. He promised to bring up these issues in March and he has done so.

I and other co-signers hoped that we could build a bipartisan consensus to bridge the disagreements on campaign finance that divide the parties. As one who has been involved in this issue for many years, I had few illusions about the difficulties of this effort. But I believed that the House had developed a bipartisan group committed to genuine reform and that this group could become the nucleus for a broad agreement.

The bipartisan Shays-Meehan group, the Tuesday Group Republicans, the Blue Dog Democrats, and the bipartisan freshman group of 1996 had demonstrated the possibilities on a limited scale. By joining forces, I hoped we could be the engine of bipartisan campaign reform in the House.

Beginning last October, members of these groups and their staffs worked many long hours in an intense effort to produce the broad, bipartisan consensus all of us wanted. Unfortunately, despite the best of intentions and the good-faith efforts of all involved, we simply could not come to a final agreement.

We diverged on a number of issues, including the extent of a ban on so-called "soft money" which seems unlimited and is largely unregulated contributions that both parties collect from corporations, unions, and wealthy individuals outside the scope of our present Federal election laws. Some of us were committed to a full and complete soft-money ban at the Federal, State and local levels. Others preferred the more limited approach in the freshman bill that bans soft-money at the national party level and prohibits Federal officeholders, candidates, and their agents from any involvement in raising, soliciting, directing, or transferring such funds. But it would not ban soft money at the State level.

This disagreement was fundamental—it reflects strongly held principles on both sides and it is an honest difference of opinion.

The members of the bipartisan working group also could not resolve disagreements over so-called "issue ads"—the television and radio advertisements that flood the airwaves at the end of a campaign launching anonymous attacks on candidates without being required to disclose the source of their funding.

A number of us wanted all special interest issue ads to comply with the same Federal election disclosure laws that bind us as candidates. That would include limits on contributions from individuals and political action committees and full disclosure and complete reporting of all contributions and expenditures. Others believed that imposing those restric-

tions on non-candidates would violate First Amendment freedoms and that, at most, we should require disclosure.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these are not phony arguments. These are real differences of opinion on complex issues.

There were other less severe disagreements, but in hindsight we failed to give adequate consideration to what is probably the most serious roadblock to any broad bipartisan consensus on campaign finance. That roadblock is the role of union money in our campaigns.

From the start of the bipartisan discussions, Democratic members were very clear that they were united in opposition to certain Republican proposals, such as the "Paycheck Protection Act" that would require unions to obtain permission from individual union members before their dues could be used for political activities. This proposal was viewed as a pure "poison pill" intended to kill reform and therefore not subject to compromise.

At the same time, a majority of House Republicans—162 of 225 are cosponsors of the paycheck bill—view this legislation in the exact opposite light. That is, many Republicans believe that failure to include Paycheck Protection is a poison pill for reform because a soft-money ban would cut off Republican funds for grassroots activities such as voter registration and get-out-the-vote efforts while leaving largely pro-Democratic unions free to spend their own money on such efforts for the Democrats.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there are stark and fundamental disagreements between the two parties on this issue and the efforts to resolve those conflicts have not succeeded despite the very intense effort that was made over the past 5 months.

The failure of the bipartisan working group means we are largely back where we began—splintered on two or three plans that are nominally bipartisan. While I believe that each of these proposals has merit, the reality is that each also lacks the depth of support and the staying power necessary to win passage in the House and the other body, to survive a difficult conference, and to be signed into law.

Barring the development of a genuine bipartisan consensus, I see little reason to hope that we can pass a significant campaign reform bill this year. While some argue that a majority of the House supports the McCain-Feingold II proposal, I question the wisdom of trying to force the passage of a bill that already has been killed in the Senate and that does not enjoy broad bipartisan support here.

If we are every to achieve real reform, it must be done on a fair, bipartisan basis and the unfortunate truth is that that basis does not now exist. As one who has spent a great deal of time on the McCain-Feingold proposal, a Commission bill and major disclosure legislation, and a lot of energy in seeking a bipartisan consensus, I am disappointed but I am not willing to give up. Neither am I willing to waste time trying to assign blame or score partisan points on this issue.

Republicans and Democrats must share equally in the failure to achieve consensus on this issue and both must be prepared to make important compromises if we are every to move forward. That means we must craft legislation with real reforms that affect both parties and every special interest group.

The bill offered by Rep. BILL THOMAS, chairman of the Committee on House Oversight is

a serious effort. He accepted a number of our ideas. He worked avidly to build a consensus. He sought to strike a balanced and fair framework for campaign finance reforms. The legislation is not perfect. No bill is. Among other reforms, this bill would:

Ban soft money contributions and spending by the national party committees and prohibit federal officeholders, candidates and their agents from being involved in soft money activities.

Require full public disclosure of the sources of the special interest funding for issue ads that identify a candidate for federal office in the last 90 days of a campaign. Voters have a right to know who is trying to influence an election.

Provide basic tools for state and local officials to combat voter fraud so that the votes of U.S. citizens are not canceled out by illegal votes.

Require that unions and corporations give their members or stockholders the power to block the use of their dues or funds for political activities. Frankly, I believe some of the language in this section is too broad and needs refinement but the goal of balanced limits on unions and corporations is sound and necessary.

These are real reforms. This bill would produce genuine, substantive and far-reaching changes in the way our campaigns are conducted. I support it and I urge my colleagues to do the same. If it passes, real progress will have been made.

IN CELEBRATION OF EDWARD RYBKA'S 70TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 30, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a leader in the Polish-American community in Cleveland, Ohio, Edward Rybka, who will celebrate his 70th birthday on April 14, 1998.

Edward has worked for years to promote understanding between the Catholics and the Jewish in Cleveland. His dedication has earned him the Good Joe award from the Cleveland Society of Poles as well as the Brotherhood Award from Fairmount Temple. Edward is also owner and President of a prosperous real estate agency, Rybka Realty.

Edward will celebrate his birthday with a family reunion in Florida with his wife, Irene, son, Robert, daughter Michelle, and his two grandchildren. My fellow colleagues, please join me in wishing a happy birthday to Edward Rybka, a great community leader and family man.

DR. NAPOLEON B. "PAPA BEAR" LEWIS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 30, 1998

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I stand to offer my condolences to the family of