Our thoughts go out to his wife Anna Marie and daughter Hayley who are missing and grieving for a man they deeply loved. At only 2 years of age, Hayley is forced to grow up without her father all because some vicious criminals were afraid they would be held responsible for their crime. A close knit family has now been separated because these villains could not see behind the police uniform to a man who was loyal, honest and loving. I ask you to remember Officer Vanderjagt and all he did to serve his community and his family. This tragic loss is being felt all over the State of Colorado. His family needs our prayers and concern today as they grieve his loss.

The Congress of the United States expresses its sympathy for a brave officer who gave his life for the freedom of his fellow citizens.

WHY I INTRODUCED THE PAYCHECK PROTECTION ACT

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on the face of it, no one would argue against an individual's right to deny the use of his money to support a cause he opposed. The very idea of being coerced into doing so violates the basic tenets of a democratic society. But what if the consequences of protecting this right were to cost powerful labor unions a great measure of influence they wield in Washington?

Suddenly, as one might have guessed, the issue becomes muddied with flawed rhetoric and vitriol. Indeed, the principle of involuntary contributions is at the center of the debate over the Paycheck Protection Act currently being considered by Congress.

The act, which I authored and introduced along with 161 other cosponsors, would require explicit consent from American workers to allow use of their wages for political purposes. Though aimed at union abuses, the bill also applies to corporations.

Not surprisingly, union-friendly forces in Congress have variously referred to the act as a violation of unions' rights. Some say it's partisan retribution for the $400 million unions spent bashing Republicans in the 1996 elections.

Opponents also claim the act is redundant because of the Supreme Court's 1988 Beck decision ruling that forbids involuntary political union contributions. Each of these arguments is very weak and upon closer examination, simply falls apart.

Claims that the Paycheck Protection Act would limit unions' free speech ignore the fact that unions use other peoples' money—including that of conservative Republicans—to support liberal candidates. In fact, the act does not forbid the unions continuing this practice. It merely requires that union bosses and corporations first have written permission from the individual worker whose wages are withheld and spent on politics. Of course, union bosses retain the ability to make ''soft money'' contributions, but they do not have the right to unilaterally appropriate their members' salaries for the same purpose.

Union leaders and their supporters also argue that the Paycheck Protection Act is an attempt by Republicans to prevent a repeat of 1996 when union PAC's spent nearly $50 million on an issue advocacy campaign aimed at Republican candidates. The wise should not be persuaded by this argument. In the current climate of rabid partisanship, only political insiders narrowly view this debate in terms of what will be gained or lost by either party.

What is forgotten however, is that the battle is primarily waged on a human level. Indeed the main impetus for reform stems from a legitimate concern for individuals—not a political party, union, or corporate agenda.

Oklahoma's DON NICKLES, the act's lead sponsor in the Senate, became aware of the issue at one of his Tulsa town hall meetings. There, union workers, whether Democrat, Republican, or unaffiliated, simply objected to having portions of their salaries taken from them, regardless of how it's used. For these people—and for many Republicans in Congress—the issue begins and ends there.

In the 1988 Communication Workers versus Beck decision, the Supreme Court ruled that unions must return dues used for political purposes to those requesting repayment. Currently, these workers' only recourse is to apply for a rebate of the money that has already been donated. But most unions have created a rebate procedure that is deliberately arduous and not often attempted. According to accounts from union members who have sought a return of their money, this process can be a harrowing one.

There are widespread reports of harassment of workers who seek a rebate. One union member for example, was asked to give up his union membership before getting a refund. The National Right to Work Committee found that most unions provide a very small period of time during which members can apply for the refund.

Rebates are made even more difficult through the practice of publishing obscure notices in union newspapers informing workers of these limited time frames. The courts have failed to enforce the Beck decision and Congress is right, even obligated to make a stronger attempt at justice.

Unions were founded on the premise that workers need to collectivize to preserve their rights in the workplace. The UAW, the AFL–CIO and the Teamsters have grown very powerful because millions of Americans have put great faith in this notion.

How ironic it is that the union practice of using involuntarily-collected member dues to further their political agenda offends the very rights they claim to protect. The Paycheck Protection Act is a reasonable, sound, and timely response to this abuse.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN DAVID ARNOLD AND PORTABLE PRACTICAL EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION, INC.

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an organization, Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc., [PPEP] and its founder, Dr. John David Arnold, and to congratulate them for 30 years of outstanding contributions to the residents of rural Arizona.

On the 30th anniversary of PPEP, the Arizona community recognizes that Dr. John David Arnold is the driving spirit of PPEP. It is his vision and energy that transformed ''La Tortuga'', a large old bus converted into a mobile classroom, into a major force for ''Improving the Quality of Rural Life'' in Arizona and in the world. In these 30 years, Dr. Arnold has had the vision and dedication to guide and to expand PPEP from the La Tortuga bus to the information superhighway. Their address on the Internet is ppepruralinst.org.

The work began by Dr. Arnold so many years ago and carefully shepherded by him through the social, economic, and technological changes that these 30 years have brought to Arizona's rural residents, is remarkable proof of his ability and dedication to utilize diverse resources and to surround himself with an exceptionally wise, creative, and committed staff. Together, he and his staff have created opportunities for many who had been excluded from the American dream. Through opportunities for education, economic and business development, child and health care, housing, and job training, Dr. Arnold gave hope to the hopeless; for them, he made possible a rewarding future.

The emphasis on education and on self-help have enabled the PPEP program to be flexible and responsive to a wide range of needs in the rural communities. PPEP has been a pioneer in the charter school movement and has created 14 charter high schools that provide learning opportunities to rural, at-risk, and farm worker populations. PPEP has also been instrumental in promoting first-time home buyer programs, affordable housing programs, and transitional housing programs designed to meet the needs of welfare reform mothers.

I also comment the many community volunteers who have served on PPEP's board of directors and in its programs over these 30 years. They, too, have served a greater vision and have provided a collective consciousness for PPEP's continuing to be a relevant, positive force in rural lives.

I applaud PPEP for its contribution and efforts in the community over the past 30 years. PPEP's 30 years of history are about people and the resilience of the human spirit. May its future continue to be the same.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTRACTING PRACTICES

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the revitalization of our nation's capital will require the participation and commitment of both the public and private sectors. Public-private partnerships will be the anchor of any economic revitalization. This goal will be successful only if all participants are assured that this is a sincere effort, with a level playing field, and not simply an extension of the two decades of poor policy decisionmaking that helped spiral Washington, DC into its recent situation.

The Congress has no desire to run the daily affairs of the city. However, the Congress does have a unique constitutional responsibility to the District of Columbia. Without micromanaging the affairs of the city, the Congress