

Los Angeles to be the organizing pastor of a new church in Tarzana, St. James Presbyterian Church.

The membership grew quickly, from 132 members in 1952 to 1,295 members in 1961. Luckily they were able to begin construction of a sanctuary to accommodate all who wanted to worship. They dedicated their magnificent sanctuary and the first service was so moving it was televised on the program "Great Churches of the Golden West." Unfortunately, it was this sanctuary that was destroyed by the earthquake.

Many members have struggled financially with the hopes of worshipping with the entire congregation under one roof again. This dream is finally a reality with today's groundbreaking ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in celebrating the groundbreaking of this beautiful sanctuary. The members of this congregation deserve this recognition for their dedication and sacrifice.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FORMAL
DEDICATION OF ANHEUSER-
BUSCH HALL AT WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

HON. STEVE R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 26, 1997

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincere best wishes and congratulations to the Washington University School of Law in St. Louis, MO, as the school formally dedicates its new building, Anheuser-Busch Hall. This state-of-the-art facility will provide plenty of much-needed space and provide the students and faculty with all of today's modern technology to make for a productive learning environment. This environment will enable Washington University students to continue to excel and will allow the distinguished faculty to continue to provide an excellent education for the lawyers of the 21st century.

As a graduate of Washington University's School of Law, it is exciting to see this new five-story structure open, complete with its 350,000 volume law library. Mudd Hall, the old site of the law school and the building in which I spent many days and nights studying, taking classes, and working, holds special memories for me and many others. However, I am sure that Anheuser-Busch Hall will only enhance the law school's ability to provide a high quality education for our future leaders.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating the university and school of law, all its students, faculty, and benefactors, and wish them the best in Anheuser-Busch Hall.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE,
JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDI-
CIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2267) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes:

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bartlett Amendment.

This extreme amendment blocks the U.S. from taking even the first step toward fulfilling its debt to the U.N.

Mr. BARTLETT cloaks his amendment in the rhetoric of reform. He claims that his amendment will somehow take us down the path to reform.

But let's be very clear, Mr. Chairman. This amendment is NOT about U.N. reform. This amendment is simply about blocking the U.S. from fulfilling its obligations to the U.N.

I don't think there is anyone in this House who is not supportive of further U.N. reform. That is why we worked to elect a new Secretary General. That is why the Administration and the Congress have come up with a reform and arrears plan that is currently being negotiated by a conference committee. And that is why we will continue to advocate far-reaching reforms throughout the U.N. system.

But this amendment approaches the issue in an irresponsible, haphazard manner. In fact, the amendment would upend the ongoing negotiations between the Administration, Congressional leaders, and the U.N., setting back our efforts to implement reform in the U.N.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. has a tremendous amount of influence within the U.N., but that level of influence is in danger of decreasing.

Our outstanding debt to the U.N. is draining our power in the organization and has created a climate of resistance to U.S. proposals.

The U.N. has historically served U.S. interests, but our debt is making it hard for the organization to carry out the very activities that serve these interests.

For all of these reasons, the U.S. must fulfill its financial obligation to the U.N. But that will not happen if the Bartlett Amendment passes.

In the interest of reforming the United Nations, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Bartlett Amendment.

INVESTIGATE ABUSES SURROUND-
ING THE CITIZENSHIP U.S.A.
PROGRAM

HON. MARK E. SOUDER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 26, 1997

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting additional evidence supporting the need for my amendment approved by the House on September 24, 1997 which provides \$2,000,000 for the inspector general's office at

the Justice Department to complete a thorough and objective investigation of the abuses surrounding the Citizenship U.S.A. Program accelerating the naturalization process prior to the 1996 elections. This evidence includes an executive summary of the KPMG Peat Marwick LLP Report, a statistical listing of the naturalizations where complete background checks were not done provided by the Justice Department, and an editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Burned Again."

Naturalization is a critical symbol of the American democratic experiment and the continuing contribution immigrants made. The time has come to eliminate this blemish on the immigration system and those, the overwhelming majority of whom, legally pursue their citizenship. These abuses of the Clinton/Gore administration should not be tolerated which cheapen the integrity of citizenship and the naturalization process.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, NATURALIZATION QUALITY PROCEDURES IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW

FINAL REPORT—APRIL 17, 1997

Executive Summary: The Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, engaged KPMG Peat Marwick LLP to review the Immigration and Naturalization Service's (INS) implementation of the November 29, 1996 Naturalization Quality Procedures (NQP). The Naturalization Quality Procedures address seven key enhancements to the naturalization process. These enhancements include (1) standardization of work process, (2) fingerprint check integrity, (3) enhanced supervisory review, (4) instructions regarding temporary file (T-file) use, (5) implementation of a standardized quality assurance program, (6) guidance regarding revocation procedures, and (7) requirements for increased monitoring of outside English and Civics test sites. The instructions contained within the November 29, 1996 memorandum were effective upon receipt, and affected interview scheduling and oath ceremonies.

DoJ contracted with KPMG to conduct a review of NQP implementation to evaluate the effective implementation of these procedures. This document contains our review of the NQP directed internal controls implemented by INS to determine if INS field offices and service centers were complying with Memorandum provisions. We conducted our review between February 19 and March 26, 1997. The sites reviewed by KPMG represent approximately 85% of the INS naturalization processing capacity and provide a cross-section of INS offices. Our review indicates that, of the seven areas addressed by the Memorandum, the INS continues to have the most significant control problems with the fingerprint process and the identification of statutorily-barred applicants.

A key control implemented by the Naturalization Quality Procedures was the establishment of a data match between INS naturalization tracking systems and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) billing system to identify aliens with a disqualifying criminal history. This data match allowed INS to direct that no cases could be scheduled for interview or oath ceremony until receipt of a definitive response from the FBI regarding criminal history had occurred. Although this data match utilizes the same methodology used to determine the number of cases identified for the felony case review, there is one important exception. Unlike the methodology utilized during the felony case review, the production system requires a match of not only the A-number, but also the first and last names of the applicant. This additional