his long and fruitful career, and I wish him the best of luck on the next stage of his life as educator.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PARENTAL LEAVE EQUITY ACT OF 1996

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Parental Family Leave Act of 1996, a bill which will ensure that employees who choose to care for a foster child or adopt a child will benefit from the same leave policy as their coworkers who are birth parents. This bill does not mandate that employers provide leave benefits beyond existing law, but rather that if they choose to provide such benefits, they do so for all parents equitably. Because the employers involved are generally larger businesses and the number of children is small, the bill will not burden employers.

The Family Medical Leave Act of 1993 [FMLA] provides that employers must grant up to 12 weeks of unpaid, job-protected leave for adoptive, birth and foster parents to care for a new child. Although some employers go beyond the mandate of the act and provide paid leave or allow paid sick leave to be used by employees with a new child, they often extend these benefits only to birth parents and not to foster parents or parents who adopt. My bill tracks the FMLA, correcting this inequity by providing that if an employer allows additional leave benefits for the birth of a child, the employer shall provide the same leave benefits to parents of a foster child or an adopted child. Thus, my bill does not require employers to provide leave policies beyond the requirement of the FMLA, but provides only for equal treatment for adoptive and foster parents, in keeping with the intent of the original legislation.

The basis for granting parental leave to both foster and adoptive parents overlap, but the circumstances of foster parents and adoptive parents are often different. Foster children are generally older children who have been removed from their own homes. Often they are children with specific needs. Sometimes they have been abused. Thus, a foster parent will normally have a greater challenge of adjustment than a new birth parent. A foster parent must acclimate to a child who already has set habits and personality traits. The foster child is sometimes intimidated by being thrust into her new surroundings. She may have come from dangerous or perhaps life threatening circumstances. In addition, foster care systems, especially those in large cities, are in great disrepair. A recent GAO report reported disgraceful circumstances for the care of many of these youngsters, a situation that is pervasive throughout the United States. The wreckage left behind by failed foster care systems is often reflected in the lives of foster children. They clearly need their parents in their new home as much, and probably more than the newborns who are the major recipients of paid leave.

Adopted children are generally not as old as foster care children and do not generally come to their new families from troubled circumstances. However, because most adoptive parents are caring for an infant, they find themselves in a situation similar to the parents of newborns. There is no reason, therefore, to treat them differently than birth parents.

There are few foster or adoptive parents in any single workplace, guaranteeing that the effects on the employer would be minuscule in keeping with the policy of the FLMA. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to help ensure that foster parents and adoptive parents receive the same opportunity as birth parents to bond with a new child and to acclimate that child to her new family and surroundings.

ZION EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and the Nation that the Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church or Ironwood, MI, is celebrating its centennial anniversary on June 22, 1996. It was 100 years ago that 20 Lutherans were drawn together by their common faith to form the Church of Ironwood, MI. Today, the congregation has nearly 600 dedicated members who are proudly celebrating the love and faith that has been shared within the congregation and the Ironwood community for the past century.

In 1896, Pastor Michael Kivi was asked to lead the small congregation. He graciously accepted the offer and began his new job for a salary of $20 a month. Thirteen dedicated pastors have served the congregation since Pastor Kivi. Currently, Pastor Francis Strong leads the members in worship and fellowship.

The congregation has been planning the anniversary festivities since 1992. ''The History of the Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church,'' a concise history of the parish, was printed last fall. An original stage play was written for the celebration entitled ''Workers in the Vineyard.'' A centennial feast is being hosted on June 22 for members and friends of the congregation.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all northern Michigan, and the entire Nation I would like to congratulate Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church on 100 years of faith, love, and ministry.

FATHER THOMAS PATRICK JOSEPH DOYLE, S.J.

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Father Thomas J. Doyle, S.J., who will be celebrating the 50th anniversary of his ordination into the Society of Jesus on June 30, 1996.

Father Doyle, a product of the Philadelphia community, attended the Gesu Grammar School, Roman Catholic High School, and St. Joseph's Preparatory School before deciding to serve God and the community. Upon his graduation from St. Joseph's in 1933, Father Doyle entered the Society of Jesus. After performing his priestly studies in Toronto, Canada, he was ordained on June 30, 1946, by James Cardinal McGuligan. Father Doyle returned to Philadelphia to celebrate his first mass at Our Lady of Mercy Church before traveling the world as an educator, mission director, editor, and preacher.

Since returning to Old St. Joseph's Church in 1967, Father Doyle has become a pillar of the Philadelphia Community. He has served as chaplain to the Federation of Irish Societies of the Delaware Valley, the Irish Society, Legion of Mary, Knights of Columbus, and the Ancient Order of Hibernians. Father Doyle was honored as the 1992 Hibernian of the year for his selfless dedication to the community and willingness to help those in need.

Father Thomas Patrick Joseph Doyle epitomizes the Jesuit ideals. Today, I join his friends in offering both thanks and congratulations for his years of dedicated service.

CUTTING SPENDING

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, June 19, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CUTTING SPENDING

Despite much of the political rhetoric in Washington, Congress and the President have made significant progress on reducing the federal budget deficit. For the first time since President Truman, the deficit has been reduced for years in a row. In fact, the projected 1996 deficit ($140 billion) is less than half of the 1992 deficit ($290 billion). Compared to the size of the economy, the U.S. deficit is now lower than that of any other major industrialized nation. However, much more must be done. The challenge facing Congress is to maintain this discipline and stay the course until the deficit is erased. In past months, Congress has taken a number of positive actions.

1996 SPENDING

With my strong support, Congress recently passed the last of the yearly appropriations bills which fund basic government operations. Overall, these bills cut spending $23 billion blow 1995 levels—about 5 percent. I voted to eliminate more than 200 wasteful programs, including the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the modular helium reactor program, a congressional warehouse and parking lot, and many more.

LINE-ITEM VETO

With my support, Congress passed a line-item veto, and the President signed it into law. Under this provision, the President can object to any specific project or program and return it to Congress. Without a two-thirds vote in both the House and Senate, the program would be eliminated. This is an important step in efforts to block wasteful spending and ''pork-barrel'' projects. I am disappointed that the congressional leadership delayed this provision until 1997 by defeating an effort to make it effective immediately. If this had passed, even more could be saved from spending bills this year.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

For the first time in history, the House last year approved a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The version that passed the House would require a ⅗ vote of

both the House and the Senate to pass an unbalanced budget or to raise the debt limit. It would allow certain exemptions in time of war or national security threat. I voted for this amendment, and am disappointed that it failed in the Senate.

DOWNSIZING GOVERNMENT

With my support, Congress voted in 1994 to cut more than 270,000 federal positions by 1999. We are significantly ahead of schedule, with more than 160,000 positions eliminated, leaving the federal workforce smaller now than at any time since the mid-1960s. We should continue this course, focusing particularly on top-heavy bureaucracies that have the bulk of their employees in Washington, D.C. It has been my personal practice each year to reduce administrative spending for government programs and agencies to lessen the opportunity for waste. During the appropriations process for fiscal year 1996, I supported many amendments to reduce overhead in certain government agencies and programs.

REFORMING GOVERNMENT PURCHASING

Too often we hear about outrageous government purchases of $600 toilet seats or $100 screwdrivers. Centralized management is often inefficient. Last year, with my support, Congress passed legislation to streamline the wasteful government procurement process. The new law reduces paperwork burdens, streamlines acquisition procedures, and cuts government purchasing costs. It encourages federal employees to act like private businesses and purchase certain supplies at a local office supply store if it saves money. It also expands the bidding process to make it more competitive and efficient.

SIX-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET

I voted for a plan to balance the budget in six years. This conservative ''Coalition'' budget asks all Americans to do their fair share with equitably distributed savings. This plan would cut spending by more than $700 billion. It reforms welfare, protects Social Security, preserves Medicare and Medicaid for the future, maintains investments in education and job training, and cuts corporate subsidies. The Coalition budget would reduce the deficit by $9 billion in 1997, $25 billion in 1998, and continue on a glidepath to a balanced budget in 2002.

Unfortunately, the House defeated this budget and passed a version that would increase the deficit in 1997 and 1998. This is the plan that was supported by House Speaker Newt Gingrich. I voted against increasing the deficit. The main difference between this plan and the Coalition budget is that the Speaker's plan borrows an additional $150 billion to expand certain tax breaks. As a result, the national debt would be billions of dollars higher in 2002 than under the Coalition budget. The Coalition budget demonstrates that it is possible to make tough budget choices while reflecting the values American cherish: responsibility, honesty, fairness, and the promise that the future will be better for our children. The problem with the budget supported by Speaker Gingrich is that increasing the national debt would leave even more of a burden on our children.

It is correct that both the Speaker's plan and the Coalition plan balance the budget on paper, but the Speaker's plan postpones 82% of the deficit reduction until after the 1998 elections. In fact, the President's separate plan makes a similar mistake. History shows that such an approach is a recipe for failure. Time and time again Congress has passed ''deficit reduction'' plans that postpone serious spending cuts for several years. My position is that we should use the Coalition approach and pay our bills now, and not just promise to pay them later. We should continue reducing the deficit, year by year, in a disciplined, methodical manner.

Unless significant changes are made, the final budget plan is expected to be vetoed by the President. Although the differences between the sides are significant, I think the American people want Congress and the President to continue negotiating to reach agreement on the budget. It is the responsibility of leaders in both parties to put aside partisan differences for the common good of the nation.

Over the past year, both the President and the congressional leadership have moved towards the Coalition budget. There is still time to unite the American people behind a tough, honest, and fair balanced budget that reflects basic American values and invests in our future. It would be a tragedy if the progress that has been made since 1992 is reversed with a budget that increases the deficit in 1997 and 1998. I will continue to urge all of my colleagues to seek a final agreement.

TRIBUTE TO HUGH B. MITCHELL, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a former Member of both Houses of Congress, Hugh Burnton Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell died on June 10, at age 89, and his family and friends are gathering at Daybreak Star Center in Seattle to remember him today.

Hugh Mitchell was a true son of the Northwest, and true Democrat. His belief, that government could help people realize their dreams, was at the core of his public service. He was born in Great Falls, MT in 1907, grew up on a dairy farm, and attended public schools. After graduating from Dartmouth College, he engaged in editorial work at an Everett, WA newspaper. In 1933, he joined the congressional staff of U.S. Representative Monrad Wallgren, and extended his service on the Hill for 12 years, including Wallgren's term in the Senate.

When Wallgren was elected Governor of the State of Washington, he appointed Mitchell to serve the balance of his Senate term. Hugh Mitchell was just 37 years old when he was sworn on January 10, 1945—the second youngest U.S. Senator at the time. He was defeated for election in 1946, but was elected to the House in 1948 and served in the 81st and 82d Congresses. He was not a candidate for renomination in 1952, but mounted an unsuccessful bid for the governorship of Washington in 1952.

Mr. Speaker, our country has changed dramatically in the 40 years since Hugh Mitchell graced the floor of this Chamber, but the principle that animated his public service is timeless: that government could and should aid the people he represented. He listened to the people, and tried to put government to work for them.

Hugh Mitchell's congressional career began as World War II was ending; the country's agenda then was similar to that which faces it today in the post-cold war era. Mitchell urged conversion of America's war-related industries to peacetime infrastructure-building, both to put people to work, and to prevent a reversion to the hardships of the Depression.

America's hard-won superiority in science and technology, he believed, should be used to relieve the tensions and miseries of the war-torn world. He supported the Marshall plan for Europe, but also proposed a similar program of engagement in Asia. Had the Congress heeded his prophetic advice, we might have avoided the disastrous route that took our country into conflicts in Korea and Vietnam. ''We must make allies in Asia,'' he warned, ''or we are doomed to protracted, costly, and indecisive wars.''

His ideas about cultivating constructive cooperative relationships with Pacific Rim countries were part of the long tradition of trade and friendship among the people of the Northwest and their neighbors to the East. Our APEC program today is a culmination of the vision of Washington State advocates such as Warren Magnuson, Henry Jackson, and Hugh B. Mitchell.

Mitchell's legislative agenda also included the careful stewardship of the abundant natural resources of the Pacific Northwest. Adoption of his plan for comprehensive management of the Columbia River Valley by the Congress might have averted the ecological crisis we now struggle to overcome.

Hugh Mitchell's reputation as a far-sighted intellectual is complemented by his legendary attentiveness to the wisdom of his constituents. His civility of discourse and equanimity in the face of adversity sprang from his faith in the democratic process. His pragmatic vision of government of, by, and for the people is a legacy that enhances this body, Mr. Speaker, and I commend it to you.

AMERICA WANTS HEALTH CARE REFORM

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, America's wait for health care reform is nearly over. My colleagues in both the House and the Senate have reached agreement on the Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996. This is the health care bill the American people have wanted for years.

The Republican health care reform plan is portable and affordable. Despite the extremist efforts of the Clinton administration to nationalize this Nation's private health care system, the long wait for portable and affordable heath care is over, and, it took a Republican Congress to get it done. Our plan ensures portability, fights fraud and abuse, cuts red tape, increases access, and enhances affordability.

For the first time, working Americans will be able to leave their jobs without having to worry about losing their health care insurance due to preexisting conditions. Up to 25 million Americans per year will benefit from this agreement, which eliminates preexisting condition exclusions for persons with prior health insurance coverage. An additional 4 million job-locked Americans are freed to job hunt because insurance companies will be required by law, to accept persons who had prior health insurance coverage.

This agreement fights fraud and abuse by creating new penalties against those who engage in health care fraud. It creates a national