an historic stand he took against baseball's segregated major leagues almost 60 years ago, Mr. Lacy stood at the podium in Cooperstown, N.Y., July 26, where he was officially inducted to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

As the 49th recipient of the J.G. Taylor Spink Award, a picture of Mr. Lacy will hang in the baseball writers' wing of the Baseball Hall of Fame Museum but the picture would have to speak more than a thousand words to tell his story.

Mr. Lacy has garnered a reputation as a writer of integrity and principle, willing to make a sacrifice for another's cause. Even as he accepted the Spink Award, his mind was on the family members, numerous friends and supporters who had made the trip to upstate New York, to witness his moment of glory. In his acceptance speech, the 94-year-old deflected attention from himself toward the Black press.

''It was a very pleasant experience because of the recognition it gave the Black press,'' said Mr. Lacy. ''The response I got from friends was tremendous. There were about 50–60 people who were in Cooperstown last weekend, who would not have been there otherwise.''

Along with late Pittsburgh Courier writer Wendell Smith, Mr. Lacy is credited with facilitating the integration of the league that showcased America's favorite pass-time. Mr. Smith, however, joined in a fight that Mr. Lacy had picked with the majors late in the 1930s. Feisty and unabashed, the Washington D.C. native began a writing campaign that drew the nation's attention to the separatism practiced in the league, which earned him significant sayso when the time came for skin color to take a back seat to talent.

A decade after Mr. Lacy had written his first column criticizing the segregated majors, Jackie Robinson took the field as a Brooklyn Dodger. Though now highly acclaimed, the break through was not painless for Mr. Lacy.

The suggestion of integration coupled with the agitation of Mr. Lacy's writing, drew the ire of White baseball club owners. When he approached Washington Nationals' owner Clark Griffith about hiring Black players for his team, the club executive told Mr. Lacy integrating the majors would kill the institution of Negro Baseball.

''I told him Negro Baseball may have been an institution but it was also a symbol of segregation. The sacrifice would be worth it,'' said Mr. Lacy.

That position was less than popular with Black baseball club owners. Mr. Lacy, as usual held his ground but things didn't get any easier. The selection of Mr. Robinson as the first Black player to compete in the major leagues was not based totally upon skill. Mr. Lacy, Mr. Smith and Brooklyn Dodgers owner Branch Rickey knew the player chosen would have to be composed enough to endure the racist flack that would be heaped upon him.

Fittingly, Larry Body, a player whom Mr. Lacy had also considered along with Mr. Robinson, was also inducted during Sunday's ceremony. Mr. Doby was the first Black to play in the American League. He acknowledged the significance of following Mr. Robinson into the big leagues.

''We proved that Black and Whites could work together, play together, live together and be successful,'' said Mr. Doby, who played for the Newark Eagles of the Negro Leagues.

There were other Negro League players who felt they should have been chosen before Mr. Robinson and Mr. Doby. Pitching sensation Satchel Paige, slugger Josh ''The Big Man'' Gibson, Buck Leonard, who was known as the ''Black Lou Gehrig'', Oscar Charleston and Sam Bankhead were some of the players many felt should have been moved up first.

Lacy stood his ground.

As Mr. Robinson and Mr. Doby began to experience success in the majors, Negro League attendance begin to fall off. Some players and club owners blamed Mr. Lacy for their misfortune.

Meanwhile, Mr. Doby, Mr. Robinson and Mr. Lacy caught hell in the White baseball world. Fans jeered Mr. Robinson and Mr. Doby and players tried to injure them. Lacy was barred from press boxes and they all were barred from fields in certain states. With criticism coming from White and Black quarters and players, Lacy was catching it from all directions.

The stand he took on behalf of Black inclusion in major league baseball, was misunderstood and had turned some his fellow African Americans bitterly against him.

''They were a little resentful. They saw the deterioration of their (Negro League) attendance. Black newspapers were easing off coverage of the Negro Leagues and the (Black) stars in the majors were getting the press,'' said Mr. Lacy.

''At the time you had to wonder why they would be jealous of their former teammates. If they (Robinson and Doby) go up and are successful, why couldn't they (other Negro League players) just follow them?''

At Sunday's induction ceremony, Mr. Lacy took a tumble on the way to the podium, then in classic fashion, rose to the occasion to make a poignant speech. Those gathered showed they understood and appreciated Mr. Lacy's stand for multicultural baseball. They gave him one standing ovation, then stood and gave him another.

HALL OF FAME LACY

There seems to be no end to the forms of recognitions being conveyed upon Sam Lacy, our illustrious sports editor. There is, however, no denying that his recent induction into the Baseball Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y. must rank among Mr. Lacy's highest honors.

There have been many expressions of adoration used to described Mr. Lacy's invaluable contributions to baseball and sports. The one which seems most often repeated relates to Mr. Lacy's persistance in reminding major league baseball of the atrocity it was committing by continuously excluding African-American athletes.

There seem to be a fair number of African Americans who have been enshrined at the Hall of Fame in Cooperstown. Most of them participated in baseball well after Mr. Lacy's efforts helped break down the barriers to Jackie Robinson being admitted into the 'big leagues.'

The importance of Mr. Lacy's contribution has not diminished one bit as demonstrated in Cooperstown last weekend, when the 'ole timers' all stepped back to give Mr. Lacy his long overdue recognition. For a brief moment, everyone remembered what it was like in the old days and in the process applauded Mr. Lacy's contribution to making it better.

A bigger job now appears to loom in getting the current major league stars to remember that their arrival in the bright lights of today's big leagues is due to the efforts of the 'ole guard,' which now forever includes our Sam Lacy.●

TRIBUTE TO FONTBONNE COLLEGE ON ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Fontbonne College in St. Louis, Missouri. On October 15, 1998, Fontbonne College will celebrate its 75th anniversary.

Fontbonne has served more than 10,000 graduates in pursuit of academic excellence. As Fontbonne moves toward the 21st century, it is looking to continue the ministry of higher education begun by the sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet.

Fontbonne's history goes back to seventeenth century France, the beginning of the Sisters of St. Joseph. In LePuy, France in 1647, six women under the direction of Jesuit priest Father Jean Pierre Medaille were brought together to dedicate their lives to the spiritual and material needs of the people. The order was publicly recognized as the Sisters of St. Joseph on October 15, 1650.

Around 1778, Jeanne Fontbonne entered the congregation, received the name of Sister St. John Fontbonne, and later became the Mother Superior at Monistrol. With the violence of the French Revolution, the sisters were forced to disband. Several were imprisoned and executed. After the death of Robespierre, the day before Mother St. John was to be executed, she was released and asked to reform the congregation. In 1807, 12 women celebrated the rebirth of the Sisters of St. Joseph.

Bishop Joseph Rosati of St. Louis asked Mother St. John to send sisters to the area to teach the deaf. Six sisters set sail for America and established its current home in Carondelet, on the southern border of St. Louis. A log cabin built on a bluff overlooking the Mississippi River became the ''cradle of the congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet.''

The sisters opened a day school in the area, a school for deaf and a girl's high school. With these successes, the sisters discussed a new twentieth century idea—higher education of women.

Fontbonne College was chartered on April 17, 1917, but the entrance of the United States in World War I in that year precluded the beginning of classes. Construction at the Clayton location started in 1924. The first Fontbonne class began in 1923 at St. Joseph's Academy. New buildings were ready for the fall term of 1925. On June 18, 1927, Fontbonne conferred its first bachelor of arts degree on eight women.

Since its beginnings in 1923, Fontbonne has changed with and been ahead of the times, but has also kept its identity. Fontbonne admitted African American students in 1947, eight years before the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision. Male students were admitted in selective majors in 1971, then in 1974 all classes were opened to men and women. In the 1980s, Fontbonne created degree programs with flexible scheduling to meet the needs of working students. Now Fontbonne has its first male president.

Today Fontbonne is deeply rooted in the tradition and values—quality, respect, diversity, community, justice, service, faith and Catholic presence—of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet.

I commend Fontbonne College staff and students for their dedication and perseverance throughout the college's many years of existence and hope they

continue to enrich the St. Louis community for years to come.●

INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, the Internet, as an growing form of communication, commerce, and information exchange, is a powerful medium for all who are able to take advantage of the opportunities it presents. The initial version of S. 442, the Internet Tax Freedom Act, would, in my opinion, have provided this already powerful tool with even more competitive advantages. Frankly, I believed that the original version was too one-sided in aiding Internet-based businesses at the expense of other interests. However, I was very pleased with the willingness of the authors of this bill to address the concerns raised by state and local governments as well as ''Main Street'' business owners in such a way that I was able to support the final bill.

The final version of S. 442 contains several positive features. Among those is the inclusion of the Hutchinson amendment, which will allow the Commission created by S. 442 to examine the impact of all types of remote sales. Every year states lose billions of dollars in revenue from remote sales, most recently via the Internet but also in catalog sales. The Hutchinson amendment, which is faithful to the recommendation of the Finance Committee, makes a proper and relevant expansion of the mandate of the Commission.

Not all states and municipalities have imposed taxes on the Internet. However, those that have should not have their Constitutional right to impose these taxes stripped away by Congress. The grandfathering of existing taxes on electronic commerce contained in the final version of S. 442, is consistent with our federalist system and balances the needs of interstate commerce with the proper role of states and municipalities.

Although these and other positive provisions in S. 442 allowed me to support the overall bill, I am hopeful that the initial concerns I had with S. 442 will not arise again when the three year moratorium established by the bill expires. The purpose of this temporary moratorium is to allow government and industry representatives time to work together to decide the rules for electronic commerce. However, S. 442 offers no guarantee that the moratorium will not be extended after the three year period. I supported Senator GRAHAM's amendment that would have required a super majority to extend the moratorium, but unfortunately, it was defeated.

There is a precedent of another ''temporary'' moratorium that never expired. In 1959, Congress enacted Public Law 86–272, which limited state corporate income tax collection on out-of-state corporations. Like the goal of the Commission created by S. 442, a moratorium was imposed to try to negotiate a uniform standard with regard to the tax treatment of out-of-state corporations. The results of P.L. 86–272 was an increase in litigation and a decrease in state and local tax revenue. This precedent explains state and local leaders' skepticism about a temporary Internet tax moratorium. It is my hope that when the three year moratorium expires, Congress will not extend the moratorium. The experience of P.L. 86–272 does not need to be repeated.

I fear that a continuation of the moratorium would tilt the scales heavily in favor electronic commerce at the expense of local ''Main Street'' businesses. Internet sales should not receive any privileges that are not available to other forms of commerce. Business competitors of Internet-based firms should not have to experience such legalized discrimination.

Although the use of computers will certainly continue to grow, there will always be consumers who will not have access to the Internet. If attempts are made to extend the three year moratorium, Congress will, in effect, be offering a tax break to those who can afford a computer and Internet access to the detriment of those who cannot.

I wanted to take this opportunity to applaud the efforts that have been made to address this rapidly emerging form of trade, and I believe that the compromise version of S. 442 is an appropriate balance that will give the Commission time to make a recommendation while not greatly interfering with interstate commerce. However, I urge caution by my colleagues, when we revisit this issue in three years, that in our zeal to encourage the growth of the Internet and all the promise it offers we should not compromise the needs of our states, cities, towns, and local merchants. I pledge my efforts to achieve that goal.●

AUTO CHOICE REFORM ACT

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, while I know that the Senate will not take up consideration of S. 625, The Auto Choice Reform Act of 1997, during the 105th Congress, I wanted to put my views regarding this legislation on the record.

S. 625 creates a federally mandated two-tracked automobile insurance system under which car owners would have the option to enroll in a ''personal protection system'' or the traditional ''tort maintenance system.'' Those who select the personal protection system are promised ''prompt recovery'' of economic loss, regardless of fault. However, they forfeit the right to recover damages for pain and suffering while being exempted from liability for such damages themselves.

I have some strong concerns regarding this type of so-called ''reform'' legislation.

First and foremost, I believe that the argument that ''Auto Choice'' will reduce insurance premiums is unfounded. Over the last few years, the numerous states that have adopted no-fault insurance programs similar to those in this legislation have had the highest premiums in the country. In fact, in 1995, 6 out of the 10 states with the highest average liability premiums were no-fault systems. In light of the failure of auto choice to lower premium costs, I cannot understand why we are seeking to put such a system into place across the country.

I am also greatly troubled by the fact that this bill involves an attempt by the federal government to impose a one-size-fits-all solution on the states. While I recognize that some reforms are necessary, I do not believe that federalizing our tort system, is, or should be the solution.

For more than 200 years, states have had the power to develop and refine their own tort systems. Supreme Court Justice Powell wisely observed: ''Our 50 states have developed a complicated and effective system of tort laws and where there have been problems, the states have acted to fix those problems.'' Mr. President, federally directed reform efforts such as those contained in S. 625 detract from the states' abilities to fashion their own initiatives and deny them the opportunity to provide solutions to meet their own particularized needs.

Furthermore, I am troubled by the fact that this bill allows people to waive their right to recover for non-economic damages. Mr. President, such a provision could lead to a lifetime of pain and suffering for those who suffer massive injury in a car accident. In fact, that possibility is so high, no state, not one, allows its citizens to choose to waive their right of recovery for pain and suffering.

Consider the fact that in all likelihood people would ''choose'' to waive these rights when they are sitting in their den, filling out their insurance forms. Mr. President, I would argue that the timing of such a choice precludes the possibility of informed consent on the part of the consumer. No one can predict the future, people cannot say whether they will need to pursue recovery for some accident. I predict that, many of those who so choose will one day find that they guessed wrong. Mr. President, checking off a box on a form could forever cost someone the ability to seek damages for loss of a limb, blindness, loss of a child or permanent disfigurement. This legislation does not provide a choice, it opens people up to take an unnecessary chance.

This legislation contains another flaw in that it does not fully protect the rights of those who choose traditional tort protection. Someone who chooses tort law coverage can only seek complete access to the courts if the at-fault driver has also selected traditional tort law coverage. Thus, a victim in an accident has to hope to be lucky enough that the person that hits him has selected the ''right'' type of coverage. Again, what appear to be