

efforts of the people fighting against this discrimination.

ILLEGAL FOREIGN  
CONTRIBUTIONS ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

**HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 30, 1998*

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Illegal Foreign Contributions Act, H.R. 34.

This bill, if enacted, would ban contributions to federal election campaigns by legal permanent residents. I believe this would be a colossal mistake and a constitutional blunder. This bill would restrict the First Amendment free speech rights of Legal Permanent Residents. These residents are required to perform citizenship obligations, such as registering for the military draft and serving in the armed forces, but we would deny them the basic citizenship rights we require them to defend.

Consistently throughout federal constitutional law, Legal Permanent Residents have all First Amendment freedoms of full U.S. citizens. This has been consistently upheld by the federal courts and the Supreme Court. H.R. 34 would deliberately abridge and deny those rights in the name of campaigning finance reform. It would trample on the constitutional rights of hundreds of thousands of people without justification. The bill picks out a specific group of people and says we are going to prevent you from expressing your political views.

This bill is a gag of political expression in the disguise of campaign reform. The reality is that hard-working, tax-paying, military-serving individuals are being told they can have no say over who is elected to determine the policies that determines their fates and lives.

Mr. Speaker, I also fear that legislation that singles out specific groups of people for treatment different than that of citizens will lead us down a road to finding scapegoats when there are failings in our government and society. This is a dangerous precedent, and I urge my colleagues to think carefully before they cast their vote on H.R. 34, and to vote against this ill-conceived "reform".

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE, MORRISTOWN,  
NEW JERSEY

**HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 1, 1998*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the Neighborhood House in Morristown, New Jersey.

The Neighborhood House, known as the "Nabe" among its clients, began in 1898 as a one-room mission dedicated to easing the daily hardships of immigrant life among a growing number of Italian-American families in Morristown. The building housing the mission burned down in 1901, and activities were soon moved to a more spacious, donated home.

The larger accommodations allowed the mission to expand its work, and by 1908, then officially named the Neighborhood House, these activities included tutoring in English, providing help in finding affordable housing, and classes in music, carpentry, and crafts.

While continuing its community outreach with the opening of Morristown's first baby clinic in 1915, the Nabe was also instrumental in the development of several local non-profit organizations. These included such groups as the Urban League of Morris County, the Colonial Little Symphony and the New Jersey Choral Society. By the 1930's, the Neighborhood House expanded its work to accommodate newer immigrant groups that had settled in the Morristown area, and in 1936 there were 46,016 individuals affiliated with the House, a record number at that time.

In 1953, in response to concerns that the House's building was potentially unsafe due to overcrowding, more than \$200,000 was raised for a new building on the original lot. Construction of this building was completed in 1957, and additional renovations have included several new wings, which have vastly increased the space available for classes and other activities.

The Neighborhood House has been blessed with strong and caring leadership since its inception. From 1912 to 1938, the Neighborhood House was run by Aldus and Marie Antoinette Pierson, a couple deeply committed to the community, who oversaw much of the House's expansion in activities. Ten years after the Pierson's retirement in 1938, Carmeta Meade became the House's first African-American Executive Director. Mrs. Meade was among those who recognized the need for a new Neighborhood House building and in 1985, after serving the Neighborhood House for thirty-four years, retired with a sterling record of service.

The Neighborhood House is led today by Sam Singleton, who had been active as a young man for ten years before returning to become Executive Director in 1991. As Mr. Singleton lays the foundation for the Neighborhood House's continued success, ensuring, in his words, that "the Neighborhood House [becomes] a model of the community center of the future," I want to ask you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues to join with me in commemorating the Neighborhood House on this special anniversary year.

YOUTH TOBACCO POSSESSION  
PREVENTION ACT OF 1998

**HON. GENE GREEN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 1, 1998*

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Youth Tobacco Possession Prevention Act of 1998. I did this because, as we consider the best way to reduce the youth smoking rate, we have neglected one of the most obvious and appropriate solutions—making tobacco possession by people under the age of 18 illegal.

It is estimated that 3,000 young people start smoking every day. Worse yet, one third, or 1,000, of these people will eventually die from tobacco related disease. Consider the emotional and financial strain these horrible situa-

tions will place on American families in the future. In response to this national crisis, the public health community, State attorneys general, the U.S. Congress and even the tobacco industry have proposed a variety of methods to reduce youth smoking rates.

Most of the proposals would spend money on counter advertising, tobacco cessation programs and tobacco education programs—all worthy and necessary components of comprehensive tobacco legislation. However, the leadership of the American government has been sending mixed signals to America's youth and nothing in the proposed settlement would change this.

Under current law, it is illegal to sell tobacco products to anyone under the age of 18 in all 50 States. However, if a person under the age of 18 is somehow able to obtain tobacco products—which, it is painfully clear, they are easily able to do—there are only a few States that have enacted laws regarding the possession of tobacco by these young people. I find it incredibly hypocritical that we, as a government (either Federal or State), are so willing to make buying tobacco illegal but are virtually silent on possessing tobacco.

Following the lead of my home State of Texas, I have introduced the Youth Tobacco Possession Prevention Act of 1998. This bill would encourage States to pass legislation making it illegal for a person under the age of 18 to possess tobacco.

There are two key components to this bill. First, in dealing with the youth, it focuses on education rather than punishment. For first and second time offenders, youth will be required to complete tobacco education and cessation programs, as well as tobacco related community service. If they continue to disregard the law and their health, their driver's license would be suspended from three to six months. This last resort was suggested during one of our Subcommittee hearings by a local teenager, who told the Commerce Health Subcommittee that kids would only respond to this type of approach.

Second, the bill would require States to enact stern punishments for people over the age of 18 who provide tobacco products to youth. At that same hearing, many of our teen witnesses admitted one of the primary sources of tobacco are older people who buy for teens. This is simply not acceptable. I believe every adult has the responsibility and moral obligation to do whatever we can to prevent our nation's youth from starting this deadly habit.

Unlike many proposals, this bill will not punish States who choose not to enact the outlined legislation. It will, however, reward those States which act responsibly and do. Each State that passes the provisions outlined in this bill will receive 5 additional points on their Health and Human Services competitive public health service grant applications. This incentive will hopefully encourage States to take action and do the right thing.

A PROCLAMATION CONGRATULATING  
THE IRANIAN WRESTLING  
TEAM

**HON. ROBERT W. NEY**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 1, 1998*

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues:

Whereas, Iran has announced its twenty-one member delegation, which includes eleven wrestlers that will compete at the 1998 World Cup of Freestyle Wrestling on the Campus of Oklahoma State University in Stillwater on April 4-5, 1998; and,

Whereas, this annual freestyle dual meet championships is behind only the World Championships and Olympics in importance; and,

Whereas, the Iranian lineup includes Gholam Reza Mohammadi, Bahman Tayebi-Kermani, Ali Reza Dabier, Abbas Haji Kenari, Massoud Jamshidi, Majied Khodaei, P. Dorostkar, Ali Reza Heydari, Davoud Ghanbari, Abbas Jadidi, and Ali Reza Rezaie; and,

Whereas, the tournament marks Iran's first competition in the United States since the 1996 Olympic Games; and,

Whereas, in February, the United States participated in the Takhti Cup wrestling tournament in Iran, the first U.S. team of any sport to compete in Iran in almost twenty years; and,

Whereas, I join the citizens of Southeastern Ohio, with distinct please, in honoring the Iranian wrestling team for their participation in the 1998 World Cup of Freestyle Wrestling in Stillwater, Oklahoma.

#### REPEALING THE MARRIAGE PENALTY

#### HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 1, 1998*

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the reason I'm cosponsoring the Marriage Tax Elimination Act in Congress is because I believe marriage is an institution that should no longer be discouraged by federal tax laws.

At a time when various government chief executives, in Colorado and in Washington are exhibiting confusion about the importance of marriage and the meaning of fidelity, few people are aware that there are several of us in Congress actually making progress toward strengthening families and honoring the integrity of these sacred unions.

The current tax law punishes married couples who file income taxes jointly by pushing them into higher tax brackets. The marriage penalty taxes combined income at higher rates than if each salary were taxed individually.

For example, an individual with an income of \$24,000 would be taxed at 15 percent. But a working couple, each with an income of \$24,000 or a combined income of \$48,000, would be taxed at 28 percent on a portion of that income. They would pay \$600 more in taxes simply because they are married.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated over 21 million couples are affected by the marriage penalty, averaging \$1,400 in additional taxes. Indeed, I've heard from many of them, and I'm quite sympathetic since, for twelve years, I have been a victim of the penalty myself.

Rarely does the marriage penalty subject fail to come up as I listen to taxpayers. Every week I conduct a public town meeting here in Fort Collins, and I hold several more throughout the Fourth Congressional District. Last month during a local hearing held specifically to discuss education issues, a state Board of Education member cited the marriage penalty

as an example of anti-family policy that ultimately hurts schools and children.

More recently, I conducted an additional series of live electronic town-hall radio call-in programs. Callers demanded the marriage penalty be lifted. Also, my Web page has been inundated with support for the marriage tax repeal.

The marriage tax penalty is not new, nor are efforts to repeal it. But previous efforts ran into stiff opposition in Congress from those who believe the government needs the money more than the families who earn it.

Fortunately, with the current Congress, those placing the priorities of government above the needs of families have finally been outnumbered by those of us who are serious about tax reform, tax relief, and more robust family budgets.

Since Republicans earned the majority at the Capitol, We've delivered more tax relief to the middle class and working poor than any Congress of the last half-century. And in Colorado, the Republican state legislature has produced even more prosperity for us all.

In December, the Coloradoan reported a study by the Center on Budget Priorities revealing the average income of Colorado's poorest families increased faster than all other income categories over the last decade Colorado's low state tax rates, frugal spending habits, and favorable economic policies have provided that needed hand-up to those of formerly meager means.

On top of the pro-family tax relief bills passed last year, we're moving ahead in Congress on a second package of tax proposals, the cornerstone of which is marriage penalty elimination.

As a general goal, I believe the total tax bite for American families should be no more than 25 percent of income. Of course, the current burden is much higher than that and we have a long way to go.

But, while we tackle the more sweeping objectives of IRS reform and overhauling the tax code, Congress ought to move swiftly and reaffirm its commitment to American families by repealing the marriage tax penalty.

#### THE 105TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF DOVER, MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

#### HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 1, 1998*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 105th Anniversary of the First Baptist Church of Dover in Morris County, New Jersey.

The First Baptist Church has been serving the Dover community since 1893, when thirty-nine Dover residents, all members of the neighboring Netcong Baptist Church, came together to establish a church in their own town. While on the date of its establishment the church had no building of its own, by 1895 the cornerstone of a new building was set and, one year later, a dedication service for the church was held.

As the church continued to attract new parishioners over subsequent years, it soon became clear that there would not be enough space to house the entire parish. By 1966, the First Baptist Church purchased 12 acres of land on which to build a newer, larger building

for worship. Construction of this building was completed on Easter Sunday, 1975, and recent renovation of the church's interior has included a complete overhaul of the church's main auditorium.

Continuing its long tradition of social outreach, the First Baptist Church today supports close to sixty-seven missionaries, who extend the good works of the church throughout New Jersey and in countries overseas. The church has also been blessed with strong leadership over the years, and has seen thirteen pastors since its inception in 1893. It is led today by Reverend John L. Hackworth, Senior Pastor.

On Sunday, April 5, 1998, Reverend Hackworth, with the assistance of the church's parish and clergy, will lay the foundation for continued success into the next century. On this momentous occasion, I want to ask you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues to join with me in commemorating the First Baptist Church of Dover on this special anniversary year.

#### THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT IS NOT "WAR ON THE WEST, PART TWO"

#### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 1, 1998*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently, some of my colleagues on the Resources Committee have been trying to convince the public that the Administration is placing an unfair burden on western property owners by deliberately implementing the Endangered Species Act more harshly in the western U.S. The facts simply do not support the allegations. While no one can argue that California has far more endangered and threatened species than most states (Hawaii has the most), my colleagues have confused the simple logic of cause and effect.

The western and southern states are the most biologically diverse and unique regions in the nation. In California alone, we have an extraordinary range of coastal and upland forests, deserts, grasslands, and shrublands—all with large numbers of rare and endemic species which are vulnerable to the effects of our economic prosperity. While my colleagues would argue that environmental protection laws like the Endangered Species Act inhibit economic growth, the facts lead to a very different conclusion. In 1996, the average number of housing starts per month were 661,000 in the southern states. In the western states, they averaged 361,000 a month, while there were only 132,000 a month in the Northeast. Florida's growth rate is legendary; Texas is growing at a rate of about 6 million new people per decade; and California is expected to have 18 million more people by the year 2025. The reality is that the West, and California in particular, are at the forefront of the ongoing battle between development and open space.

What is really needed in the West is a means of addressing the loss of family farmland and open space while we address the needs of endangered species and their habitats. Any rewrite of the Endangered Species Act must contain incentives for small, private