Science in 1927, he established his first funeral home on E. 81st Street. He and his family have also operated another funeral home in Sagamore Hills Township for the past 3 years.

Mr. Ferfolia was a member in a number of different organizations. He belonged to the Cuyahoga, OH, and national funeral directors and embalmers associations. For over 30 years he was president of the Woodland Hills Businessmen Association. Mr. Ferfolia also belonged to the Catholic Order of Foresters, West Side Slovenian Home, Newburgh-Maple Heights Pensioners, St. Monica Catholic Church, St. Monica Golden Agers, and the Martineer's Club. He was a supporter to many men's and women's bowling teams.

Mr. Ferfolia was also a member of several Slovenian fraternal organizations including KSKJ, SNPJ, and AMLA. In 1980, he was honored as Maple Heights Slovenian Home Man of the Year. Mr. Ferfolia and his wife, Theresa, were active travelers. Trips were taken to the Amazon River, Europe, and to Florida.

Along with his wife, Mr. Ferfolia is survived by his son, Donald of Maple Heights; his sister; 4 grandchildren; and 16 great-grandchildren. He will be missed by his family and by all who had the pleasure of knowing him.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOMBING OF THE JEWISH CENTER IN ARGENTINA

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the third anniversary of the most brutal terrorist attack in the Western Hemisphere. Eighty-six people were killed and over 300 injured when a terrorist bomb ripped through the Jewish Social Service Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, on July 18, 1994. The building which was destroyed in that bombing houses social services and other agencies for the Jewish community of Argentina.

To this day, Mr. Speaker, the perpetrators of this despicable and cowardly act of violence have gone unpunished. I am deeply concerned at the inability of the Argentine Government thus far to bring a successful conclusion to this investigation. The families of the victims of that horrendous crime still await the final information about those who committed this crime, and all law-abiding citizens everywhere await justice for the victims and appropriate punishment for those murderers who carried out this dastardly act. It is essential that these outlaws be apprehended and punished.

For 3 years, the people of Argentina and citizens throughout the world have been waiting for justice in this horrendous bombing. But this is not the only unresolved terrorist crime in Argentina. In addition to the 1994 Jewish Social Service Center bombing, the 1992 bombing of the Israeli Embassy also in Buenos Aires, Argentina, also remain unsolved. Swift and certain justice is the only effective way to deal with terrorists. If we do not bring this matter to a close, we fail families and survivors of those who lost their lives and those who have been maimed and injured in these bombings. This only encourages terrorists.

It is essential that the international community work together to confront terrorism and to ensure that terrorists understand that we will not be swayed by such ruthless and underhanded tactics. It is the responsibility of all of us living under the threat to terrorism to keep up the pressure to see this issue solved. In memory of those victims of 3 years ago, I urge the Government of Argentina renew its efforts to bring those responsible for this most horrendous crime to justice.

GROWTH IN MANAGED CARE MAY BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DECLINE IN MEDICARE RESEARCH

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1997

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, the future of graduate medical education [GME] has been one of the most frequently discussed topics, both by this Congress and the interested public. While the budget reconciliation bills currently underway in the Congress make some changes in GME, the key long-term problems are not being addressed, and time is running out for our Nation's premier academic teaching and research institutions.

Health care in 1997 is far different than it was in 1965 when Medicare was established. The environment and methods for training the next generation of physicians and other health care providers has changed, but the way we fund that training has not kept pace. The evolution of managed care has had a definite impact on our medical schools and our academic health centers. Governmental support in the form of Medicare has been sufficient in the past, but similar guarantees no longer exist. Now is the time to consider revolutionary changes in graduate medical education. The establishment of an all-payer trust fund, supported by the Government, as well as by all users of health care, is a reasonable option to consider. If we don't begin to rethink and change the way in which we currently fund graduate medical education, the quality and stability of health care in America may be the price we pay.

The most recent edition of ''The Journal of the American Medical Association'' [JAMA] includes an alarming study that may represent the direction we are heading if we continue to treat graduate medical education the same way it has always been treated. The study focuses on the decreasing levels of research being conducted in academic medical centers. The authors found that, ''Anecdotal evidence suggests that managed care has the potential to affect research conducted in academic medical centers by challenging clinical revenues.'' Their findings provide evidence of the existence of an inverse relationship between growth in awards by the National Institutes of Health [NIH] and managed care penetration among U.S. medical schools. They found that medical schools in markets with high-managed care penetration had slower growth in dollar amounts and numbers of NIH awards compared to schools in markets with low- or medium-managed care penetration.

If managed care has the potential to affect research levels in a negative manner, then we must find a way to provide for alternative funding mechanisms to continue research in our medical schools and academic health centers. An all-payer trust fund could help support vital and necessary research activities in appropriate settings.

The authors state:

> Managed care plans often select physicians and hospitals on the basis of cost. As managed care entities negotiate discounted fees with the faculty practice plans and teaching hospitals that support medical schools, the ability of medical schools to maintain their research base may be jeopardized.

It is a known fact that medical schools in the United States rely heavily on clinical revenues generated by their faculty. These revenues help support a wide variety of medical school functions, including the core academic programs, undergraduate and graduate medical education, and biomedical research. According to the study in JAMA, this clinical support was estimated to total $2.4 billion in 1993. Of this, approximately $816 million or $0.10 of every faculty practice plan dollar collected was used to finance research. If the emergence and growth of managed care has had a demonstrable impact, as suggested by the article, then we must explore other avenues to ensure that valuable research activities are not sacrificed in the process.

Establishing an all-payer trust fund would better ensure that all components of medical education receive adequate support. For years, Medicare has been the single best source of reliable funding for teaching and research hospitals, but the available funds are already shrinking in relative terms as we struggle to maintain solvency of the Medicare trust fund while preparing for the aging of the baby boom population. An all-payer trust fund would help alleviate some of the current drain on Medicare through GME while concurrently increasing the total amount of funds available to qualified institutions. A trust fund would rely on support from a broader patient population than exists today. It would require fair and equal contributions from all those who benefit from care provided by physicians and health care professionals trained in the world's most advanced and well-respected institutions.

The idea has been discussed previously. Research today. What about tomorrow? What activities will be sacrificed next because of insufficient funds in the world of health care? If we continue to delay, we may discover the hard way what the answer to that question is. That's one risk I don't intend to take. The time for support is now. The report of a decline in research activities should be a call to action.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HON. HAMILTON FISH

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today marked the passing of one of our outstanding Members of Congress.

Congressman Ham Fish was part of a disappearing breed—an individual dedicated to public service for no purpose other than helping others. Ham was devoted to creating a better nation for all of us.

During his congressional career, Hamilton Fish became the ranking Republican on the Committee on the Judiciary. It was in this capacity that he earned a nationwide reputation as a leading proponent of civil rights for all Americans. He was the champion of our minorities and the downtrodden.

Ham Fish was also a member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families.

Ham Fish's experiences on these panels exposed him to school administrators, teachers, parents, criminal justice officials, and students who alerted him to the escalating levels of violence in and around our schools. In his largely suburban and rural Hudson Valley, NY congressional district and in other areas of the country, Congressman Fish recognized a steady decline in safe and secure environments in which young people could learn, free from fear of violence and crime.

During the development of the crime bill of 1992, Congressman Fish utilized his practical experience to propose funding for an institute, comprising experts in education, health care, and juvenile justice which would determine effective antidotes and intervention strategies that would be made available nationally to schools and communities in crisis.

Although not accomplished before he left public office at the end of the 103d Congress, Hamilton Fish continued his advocacy for this institute, actively working on its behalf with his former colleagues up until a week before his death.

Bipartisan congressional support for his dream was achieved with passage of the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1997. The U.S. Department of Justice has now begun funding the institute.

The institute has now been renamed ''The Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence'' in recognition of much that characterized the man and the Congressman: total commitment to country, family, the young, as well as integrity, dialog, and reconciliation.

The Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence is a living memorial to an outstanding legislator and remarkable individual whose career is an example to us all.

Mr. Speaker, two individuals have eloquently captured the essence of Ham Fish. The first was Ralph G. Neas, a longtime family friend who delivered the eulogy at St. Albans Chapel here in Washington a year ago next week. The second was William L. Taylor, who spoke a few words of tribute at the Hamilton Fish Library in Garrison, NY, earlier this year. I request that both of these tributes be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF RALPH G. NEAS AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON FISH. JR.—ST. ALBANS CHAPEL, WASHINGTON, DC, JULY 30, 1996

Mary Ann, Hamilton, Alexa, Nicholas, Peter, others in the Fish family, Speaker Gingrich, Members of Congress, and distinguished guests, I am profoundly grateful and deeply honored to have this opportunity to help celebrate the extraordinary life and legislative career of Congressman Hamilton Fish, Jr.

As the Executive Director of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the legislative arm of the civil rights movement, I had the privilege of working with Ham Fish on nearly two dozen legislative campaigns between 1981 and 1995. Hamilton Fish was a civil rights champion, a mentor, and a close friend.

During the past week, the press coverage of Ham's thirteen terms in Congress has accurately characterized his personal integrity, his principled leadership, and his courageous commitment to equal opportunity for all Americans.

But, frankly, what I have read does not capture the sheer magnitude of Ham Fish's legislative accomplishments or, very importantly, the manner in which he achieved them. For a few minutes, I would like to share with you my perspective on this great man.

First, let us look at Ham Fish's civil rights record. It was legendary in its scope and breadth. Propelled by an awesome sense of justice and a determination not to rest until he had completed his mission. Ham Fish played an important role in virtually every civil rights law enacted over the past two and a half decades.

Even during the Reagan and Bush presidencies, when Ham often faced formidable odds, he helped shepherd through Congress nearly a score of civil rights laws. Indeed, during this remarkable era, Ham, along with Don Edwards, his Democratic partner in guarding the Constitution, actually strengthened all the major civil rights statutes.

To sum up all these legislative successes would take up most of the morning. But I would like to mention specifically five landmark laws where Ham Fish was either the House author or the lead Republican sponsor. And, with respect to several of them, Ham was the legislator who fashioned the bipartisan compromise that catapulted the bill toward passage.

The 1982 Voting Rights Act Extension. Extended the Voting Rights Act for twenty-five years, overturned an adverse Supreme Court decision, and extended for ten years bilingual ballot assistance for language minorities.

The Civil Rights Restoration Act (1988). Overturned the notorious 1984 *Grove City* Supreme Court decision and once again made it illegal to use federal funds to discriminate against women, minorities, persons with disabilities, and older Americans.

The Fair Housing Act Amendments of 1988. Provided at long last an effective enforcement mechanism for the 1968 Fair Housing Act. The 1988 Amendments also prohibited discrimination in housing against families with children and people with disabilities for the first time.

The Civil Rights Act of 1991. Overturned eight Supreme Court decisions that had dramatically weakened our nation's equal employment opportunity laws. And provides, for the first time, monetary damages for women and persons with disabilities who are victims of intentional discrimination.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (1990). Prohibits discrimination against 49 million Americans with disabilities in employment, public accommodations, communications and transportation.

These historic civil rights laws have benefitted, and will continue to benefit, millions of Americans. And let me state this as unequivocally as possible: these laws would not have been enacted without Congressman Hamilton Fish. His leadership during the most challenging of times was absolutely indispensable.

But it was not just the quantity and quality of these civil rights laws, or the legislative skills that made them possible, that made Hamilton Fish so special. In fact, his other attributes are what truly set him apart, providing standards of leadership that should serve as a model for everyone.

First, Ham Fish always understood thoroughly the need for bipartisanship. He knew how to build coalitions and forge a consensus. He knew the art of the timely compromise, the good compromise made at the right time that will produce the requisite number of votes, either a simple majority or a super majority, that is needed to enact a law.

The numerical results of the legislative victories I cited previously ample demonstrate this commitment to bipartisanship. The average final passage vote on these five laws was 90 percent of both Houses of Congress. Thanks to Ham Fish and his allies, the past decade and a half has been, legislatively, a bipartisan reaffirmation of civil rights laws and remedies.

Second, while Ham Fish was passionate in his beliefs, civility characterized his every action. He treated everyone with dignity. Few in Washington have matched his ability to command both the respect and the love of his peers. Time and again he proved that a nice guy can finish first.

Third, Ham Fish revered the institution in which he served. He enjoyed immensely being a member of the House of Representatives and always strove to make the House work. And while the House held his primary allegiance, he also respected the other institutions that comprise the federal government.

When the need arose, Ham Fish could be a fierce partisan. But he knew that bipartisan cooperation, not partisan confrontation, must ultimately prevail if government is to function at all.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, Ham Fish was courageous. Whether it was voting to impeach a President of his own party or standing firm on civil rights legislation, Ham Fish did what he believed to be fair and just.

Last week, Congressman Maurice Hinchey summarized eloquently how Ham carefully balanced loyalty and independence in order to further the national interest. He stated:

''Ham was very proud to be called a loyal Republican, but he knew that loyalty does not mean surrender of one's own judgment and temperament . . . He believed that he served his party best when he served his country best, and that he served the country best by bringing the best of his own mind and heart to every issue he addressed.''

After he retired from the House, Ham Fish continued to work on behalf of his favorite issues. Just last month the two of us visited Senator Nancy Kassebaum and Congressman Amo Houghton lobbying on behalf of affirmative action and legal services.

As you can tell by now, I cherished my friendship with Ham. He was always there to help, performing any task with graceful enthusiasm. I will miss so much his warm smile, his mischievous sense of humor, and his calm and gentle presence.

As I sat praying at St. Albans chapel this morning, I thanked God for allowing Katy and me the opportunity to get to know Ham. And I was thankful that we all had the benefit of Ham's leadership at critical moments during our nation's past quarter of a century. As we leave the chapel shortly, let us all pray that God will bless America with a few more Ham Fishes.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HAMILTON FISH—GARRISON, N.Y., APRIL 27, 1997

(By William L. Taylor)

It is truly a great honor and privilege for me to be asked to say a few words of tribute to the memory of Rep. Hamilton Fish.

I have worked as a lawyer in the field of civil rights for more than 40 years, starting as an attorney on the staff of Thurgood Marshall in 1954. During that time I have established my own private hall of fame for people

who have made important contributions to providing opportunity to millions of citizens who have suffered discrimination. It is not a very large hall of fame and several of those in it are people whose names or contributions are not well known to the American people, because they did not seek to draw public attention to themselves or seek acclaim for their work.

One of those people is Judge Robert L. Carter who was Thurgood Marshall's chief deputy in bringing the case of Brown v. Board of Education and other landmark cases that started the legal revolution in civil rights and then went on to a distinguished career as a federal judge in New York. Bob Carter was my first boss at the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. He is celebrating his 80th birthday at an event in New York City that starts in a few minutes and that is the reason I can't stay with you this evening.

Another of the people in my hall of fame is Ham Fish. Although I had met him before, my first substantial encounter with Ham Fish came under somewhat dramatic circumstances in 1981. I was working with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights in seeking a reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 which many people think is the most effective piece of civil rights legislation passed in this century. But in 1981 we were in a tough fight because many in Congress thought the time had come to end the special provisions of the Voting Rights Act. An agreement that had been made by civil rights forces with another Republican member of Congress fell apart just as the House Judiciary Committee was to meet to consider the bill. Mr. Fish was a senior member of the committee and a supporter of the extension of the Voting Rights Act, but he had not been intimately involved with the legislation. I spent all night with other civil rights lawyers redrafting the bill and Rep. Don Edwards arranged for me to see Mr. Fish at 10 am, just before the Committee was scheduled to meet.

I approached the meeting with some trepidation. What would Rep. Fish think about our coming to him at the last moment? Would he be able to master the details of a complicated piece of legislation in so short a time and serve as its chief Republican spokesman?

In his book Giantkillers, Mike Pertschuk describes what happened:

"Taylor, on three hours sleep, briefed Fish just 15 minutes before the Committee meeting. Fish, a quick study, quickly grasped the essential elements and later deftly defended the bill in committee as if he had spent all night writing it."

The legislation passed and Fish proved "an eloquent advocate."

Afterwards, I thought back on how remarkable that meeting had been. The typical member of Congress of whatever political persuasion would have spent at least some time berating me for coming to him only when we were in dire straits (and would have had some justification for saying so). Ham Fish didn't waste any time massaging his ego. Instead, he asked a few incisive questions about the bill until he was satisfied he could support it and serve as its spokesman. He knew that there was an important job in fighting voting discrimination still to be done and he kept his eye on the ball.

That first meeting in many ways typified the relationship we came to enjoy over more than a dozen years. During those years, Ham Fish was the Republican leader in the House responsible for passing several pieces of landmark civil rights legislation—including the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988, the Fair Housing Amendments of 1988, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Civil Rights Act of 1991. It is fair to say that those laws have benefitted millions of people—people of color, women, disabled people, older people. The laws did not give people special favors or breaks; rather they enable them to remove barriers to achieving their potential and to their ability to live in dignity. And though few may know his name, all of these millions owe a debt to Ham Fish for his leadership in passing these laws. Indeed, all of us who have led advantaged lives owe Ham a debt for enabling us to live in a society that is fairer, more just, less marked by ugly prejudice than the world inhabited by our forebears.

But while I think about these great achievements, I also think about the personal qualities of Ham Fish. He had both a first rate mind and traits of modesty and humility. That is a rare enough combination in the general population and it is almost unheard of among politicians. Often, in his office or in a committee meeting or on the floor of the House, someone would put forth a proposition that would not bear scrutiny. Instead of challenging the person aggressively, Ham would get a twinkle in his eye and a slight hint of a smile and would then ask in gentle, matter-of-fact tones a question or two that would expose the flaws in the speaker's argument. And that was his manner with people from all parts of the political spectrum. I sometimes brought lawyers from our civil rights coalition into his office who were very bright people, but who may have been off on a tangent that was not realistic or sensible. Ham brought them back to earth. In fact, although I don't like to admit it, I may have been a victim of that twinkle and amused smile once or twice myself.

The other legislative leader who comes to mind whose manner was similar was Phil Hart from Michigan—another member of my private hall of fame. Both he and Ham Fish genuinely deserve the appellation used so freely in the Congress—gentleman.

This is not to say that Ham Fish was modest to the point of self-abasement. He took a quiet pride in his work on civil rights. I remember how touched he was when the NAACP decided to honor him for his leadership. He shared a draft of his acceptance speech with a couple of us because he wanted to be sure that he was conveying adequately how important the cause was and how appreciative he was of the honor.

Ham Fish was also courageous. By the 1980s, civil rights legislation, although vitally needed, was not popular in many places. Although there were 40 or so Republicans in the House who joined with Ham Fish in providing the critical votes for civil rights laws, by the mid-80s almost none of them were on the House Judiciary Committee. That meant that Ham walked a lonely path. Often, under circumstances when we would ordinarily meet with staff, we met with Mr. Fish alone because of concerns about the divided loyalties of the committee staff. That isolation had to be difficult for Ham although he never talked about it or said a bad word about any of his colleagues. It surely would have been easier to go along with fellow committee members who could, if they became displeased enough, vote him out of his position as ranking minority member of the committee. But Ham Fish followed his conscience just as he did in that early vote to impeach a President and on so many other matters.

Last year as I was leaving the moving memorial service for Representative Fish at St. Albans Chapel in Washington, I ran into a Republican Congressman I knew. He is a very bright and capable legislator who had made an unsuccessful run for higher office and then returned to the House and his record on issues of civil rights and social justice is a mixed one. As we were parting I said to him "I hope you will carry on in the tradition of Ham Fish." I hadn't planned to say that and I wasn't sure how he would take it since he regards himself as very independent. But he clearly was flattered and he replied that he hoped he would be equal to the task.

In the months that followed, there was one clear test of character in the House and this Congressman stood up with a handful of other Republicans to go against his party's demands and to vote his conscience. I like to believe he was thinking of Ham Fish when he cast that vote. I don't know that for sure.

But I do know that Hamilton Fish left his legacy in many places—in the passion for justice of his children who I have become acquainted with over the years, in the civil rights and other communities he served, and in the Congress itself. It is a legacy of commitment, of generosity of spirit and of courage. And it should leave us all a bit more hopeful about the future.

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAY YES TO EDUCATION

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1997

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the 10th anniversary of a program that has made a dramatic difference in the lives of students in Philadelphia and two other cities, and that has helped our Nation focus attention on better ways to promote success for inner-city students.

In June 1987, a trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, George Weiss and his former wife Diane, made an announcement at the Belmont Elementary School that changed the lives of 112 West Philadelphia students and launched a program that has become a national model for intervention in urban schools.

Say Yes to Education began with a promise by the Weisses to pay complete costs for college or postsecondary training. However, they knew that more would be needed to ensure that the students would be prepared to take advantage of their promise. The Say Yes to Education Foundation was formed under the educational leadership of Dr. Norman Newberg, its executive director and Randall Sims, its senior project coordinator. The program provided counseling, tutoring, mentoring, and summer programs to enrich the cultural and intellectual lives of the student. Perhaps even more important was the personal involvement of the Weisses and the Say Yes staff in encouraging the students. On more than one occasion, George Weiss himself knocked on doors to personally urge students to reject negative influences and take education seriously. It's this kind of dedication that makes the Say Yes program a national example of true educational reform.

Under Dr. Newberg's leadership, Say Yes is organized as a four-way partnership between sponsors, a college or university, the students and their families, and the public schools. The relationship with a college or university adds a significant dimension to the program because of the vast human and institutional resources which are available to be used in support of student progress. The university connection helps to spread information and ideas to other educators about what works.