

the Bay County Juvenile Home nearly twenty-four years ago as a youth development worker. She became Team Leader after five years, supervising other child care workers, and served as Interim Director of the Juvenile Facility until a new Director was hired. She most deservedly was named in 1982 as the Child Care Worker of the Year for the State of Michigan by the Michigan Juvenile Association.

Her care for children extends beyond her professional tasks. She has served a two-year term on the Youth Board Ministry for Immanuel Lutheran Church, two terms on the Compensation Board for the City, and as volunteer coordinator for the annual Christmas Dinner for the residents of the Bay Medical Care Facility and their families.

Evie has three children, Larry, Bob, and Brenda, a daughter-in-law Julia, and several grandchildren, Adam, LaSelle, Robbie, Julia, Vanessa, and Jared. They have learned valuable lessons about the need to support young people from Evie, and we are all better for it.

As Evie Foster leaves the Office of the Bay County Prosecutor to have more free time for golf, fishing, and other matters of significance to her, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and all of our colleagues to join me in thanking her for the important and vital work she has done, and the example she has set. May her retirement be as satisfying as her years of devotion to her community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1998

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1998, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the Johnson amendment (Roll No. 312) to H.R. 4193—FY 1999 Interior Appropriations Act to restore the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) funding to its previous level of \$98 million. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "No."

LEGISLATION TO OPEN PARTICIPATION IN PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1998

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to open participation in presidential debates to all qualified candidates. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

My bill amends the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to organizations staging a presidential debate to invite all candidates that meet the following criteria: the candidate must meet all Constitutional requirements for being President (e.g., at least 35 years of age, born in the United States), the candidate must have qualified for the ballot in enough states such that the candidate has a mathematical chance of receiving the minimum number of electoral votes necessary for election, and the candidate must qualify to be eligible for matching

payments from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

This legislation will ensure that in a presidential election campaign the American people get an opportunity to see and hear from all of the qualified candidates for president. Staging organizations should not be given the subjective authority to bar a qualified candidate from participation in a presidential debate simply because a subjective judgment has been made that the candidate does not have a reasonable chance of winning the election.

The American people should be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether or not a candidate has a chance to be elected president. So much is at stake in a presidential election. A presidential election isn't just a contest between individual candidates. It is a contest between different ideas, policies and ideologies. At a time when our country is facing many complex problems, the American people should have the opportunity to be exposed to as many ideas, policies and proposals as possible in a presidential election campaign.

My bill will ensure that this happens. It will give the American people an opportunity to hear new and different ideas and proposals on how to address the problems facing our nation. I have confidence that the American people are wise enough to make a sound decision.

Some of the basic principles America was founded on was freedom of speech and freedom of ideas. I was deeply disappointed that in the 1996 presidential campaign, the ideas of qualified candidates for president were not allowed to be heard by the American people during the presidential debates. It is my hope that Congress will pass my legislation and ensure that the un-American practice of silencing qualified for candidates for president is permanently put to a stop.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ADMIRAL ALAN SHEPARD

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1998

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of sadness that I note the passing today of Alan Shepard, an authentic American hero. Admiral Shepard will always be remembered for having the "right stuff". He was one of the original seven Mercury astronauts, and he won an enduring place in history by being the first American in space. His 15-minute suborbital flight in the Freedom-7 capsule on top of a Redstone rocket on May 5, 1961 provided a badly needed boost to the American psyche, coming less than a month after the Soviets had launched Yuri Gagarin into orbit. Admiral Shepard's successful mission cleared the way for President Kennedy to announce the goal of landing a man on the moon by the end of the 1960s.

Alan Shepard was the consummate professional as an astronaut. Even after being sidelined for several years by a medical condition, he kept himself trained and fit in case it proved possible to return to flight status. His perseverance was rewarded when he eventu-

ally was returned to flight status as the Commander of the Apollo 14 mission to the moon. The Apollo 14 crew made the third successful manned landing on the moon on February 5, 1971, and they restored our confidence in America's lunar exploration program—confidence that had been shaken in the wake of the ill-fated Apollo 13 mission.

Mr. Speaker, the nation's space program has made great progress since those early days in 1961. We have landed 12 human beings on the moon. We have sent probes to every planet in the solar system save one. We have satellites that probe the mysteries of the universe and that help us to better understand our own planet Earth. We also have spacecraft that help us better forecast the weather and communicate around the world. We now send both men and women into space in an almost routine manner, and we are engaged in a cooperative project with 15 other nations to build a space station in Earth orbit. We have indeed come far in space since 1961. However, we should never forget the individuals who have helped bring us to this point. Alan Shepard was one of the most distinguished of those individuals.

I know that I speak for all Members when I say that we send our deepest condolences to his family.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4193) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Furse amendment to reduce funding for the federal timber sales program and to reallocate the funds for better use within the U.S. Forest Service.

There is a very basic fact associated with our federal timber sales program: It is intended to produce revenue and it does not. It not only fails to fulfill this promise to the taxpayer, timber sales actually result in added costs to the taxpayer. Why would we engage in such a financial relationship when we know that it is a big loser?

Who pays? Not the private corporations doing the logging. The taxpayer pays. It simply does not make good management sense to conduct a federal program in such a financially inefficient manner. Look at the numbers: According to the General Accounting Office, the Forest Service's federal timber program cost taxpayers almost \$1 billion from 1992-94—more than \$330 million on average for each year. Last year, the loss was \$88.6 million, by Forest Service reports.

The cry for government reform should include reforming the way the U.S. Forest Service loses hundreds of millions of tax dollars in logging and unnecessary logging road construction in our national forests. The proposed

elimination of the Purchaser Road Credit Program is a good first step toward bringing an end to subsidies for the timber companies at the trough of the federal timber program.

The Furse amendment transfers funds from the timber sales program and puts them where all Americans can reap the benefits—in environmental restoration and improved recreational management. In the words of the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service: If we are to redeem our claim to be the world's foremost conservation leader, our job is to maintain and restore ecological and socially important environmental values . . . Values such as wilderness and roadless areas, clean water, protection of rare species, old growth forest, naturalness—these are the reasons most Americans cherish their public lands.

Now is the time to build on that concept and the momentum of eliminating the Purchaser Road Credit Program by eliminating all subsidies for the federal timber program. Let's put an end to this corporate handout. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Furse amendment.

STARR NOW OBJECTS TO AN
INVESTIGATION OF HIMSELF

HON. JOHN CONYERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1998

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the reported resistance by Independent Counsel Starr to Chief District Court Judge Johnson's decision to begin an investigation of whether Mr. Starr leaked grand jury materials to the press in violation of federal law. Rather than obey that judge's order, Mr. Starr apparently has filed an unusual motion to prevent her order from going into effect until such time as he can be heard before the D.C. Court of Appeals.

The central issue appears to be whether Mr. Starr will be forced to comply with Judge Johnson's order that President Clinton's lawyers be allowed to participate in the questioning of members of the Independent Counsel's office concerning the alleged leaks. We have not yet been informed of exactly why Mr. Starr is so concerned about direct questioning of his staff by the President's lawyers concerning alleged violations of federal law.

Judge Johnson's decision to permit such questioning is, however, fully justified by Mr. Starr's prior misleading statements on the issue of whether his office was the source of leaks. Mr. Starr has previously stated that leaks were "prohibited" in his office and that he had "no reason to suspect" that anyone in his office may have been the source of reports about his investigation. Later, of course, as we all now know, Mr. Starr admitted that his office speaks frequently with reporters, but that these contacts do not fall within his narrow definition of a "leak."

Mr. Starr's resistance to standard truth-seeking measures such as adversarial questioning is blatantly hypocritical in light of his numerous public statements suggesting that the White House and others are improperly obstructing his investigation simply because they ask courts to balance important private and governmental interests against Mr. Starr's apparently boundless interest in new inves-

tigative leads. Now that Mr. Starr has apparently found some interests of his own that he believes justify limiting an important part of a proposed criminal investigation, will Mr. Starr now concede that asking a court to evaluate a privilege is an appropriate response to a criminal investigation?

Assuming that Mr. Starr is unwilling to make this concession, will he then ask himself the same question he asked during his recent speech to the bar association in North Carolina? In that memorably inappropriate attack on the President by the Independent Counsel, Mr. Starr self-righteously posed the following question:

At what point does a lawyer's manipulation of the legal system become an obstruction of the truth?

Witnessing Mr. Starr's own legal manipulations this week, I am forced to ask my own question: What does Mr. Starr have to hide? Mr. Starr should live up to his own rhetoric, stop resisting Judge Johnson's order and allow a credible investigation to proceed into these significant allegations of serious wrongdoing.

TRIBUTE TO DALE VANDER BOEGH

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1998

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mr. Dale Vander Boegh as he retires from his post as chief of the Manhattan Volunteer Fire Department in Manhattan, Illinois. Mr. Vander Boegh's outstanding service to his community exceeds 50 years on the volunteer fire department, including 30 years as the chief.

Dale, known as Chubb to his family and friends, has set an example through his dedication to his community and neighbors that few of us can comprehend. For nearly fifty-two years, Dale made himself available at all hours of the day and night to fight a dangerous fire or offer help to anyone in need. Remarkably, Dale even kept the fire department's emergency telephone in his family's home for many years.

By all means, there are many families in Manhattan and throughout Will County who are eternally thankful for Dale's leadership and heroic efforts. One can only imagine the number of lives and properties Dale has saved throughout his service.

Mr. Speaker, it is only right and proper to honor Chief Dale Vander Boegh and his family for the remarkable lifetime commitment they have made to their community and neighbors. Chief Vander Boegh is a fine American and a true hero. I wish he and his wife, Beverly, the best life can offer in their retirement.

SECURITIES LITIGATION UNIFORM
STANDARDS ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1998

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, during the 104th Congress I voted, with a large bipar-

tisan majority of my colleagues, for the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (PSLRA) because I believed it was an important step toward protecting companies against "frivolous" law suits. The extremely litigious environment that existed prior to this legislation had a chilling effect on growth in technologies and did little to curb fraud and abuse.

A new concern has developed, however, which threatens to unravel the changes that we have made. In effect, the standards in the Federal securities laws, as amended by the PSLRA, are being bypassed.

According to a study done last year, Stanford University found that 26 percent of securities class action cases have shifted from Federal to State courts. Trial lawyers have discovered a loophole around the Federal statute through State litigation, where it is much easier to file complaints without substantial cause. This practice is an unprecedented and unanticipated move that stands to harm America's companies, especially the high tech community.

These high technology companies account for 34 percent of all the issuers sued last year. It is ironic that the very companies that have contributed disproportionately to the economic growth of our Nation and have been a great source of wealth for investors are the ones being harassed. They are, in effect, being penalized for success.

The Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act, H.R. 1689, would amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 so that any class action law suit brought in any State court involving a covered security would be heard in a Federal court. Only those suits traditionally filed in Federal courts would be affected by H.R. 1689, while those claims that historically have been pursued in State courts would be left undisturbed. H.R. 1689 is limited to covering nationally traded securities on the New York Stock Exchange, NASDAQ, or the American Stock Exchange. At the same time, the legislation expressly preserves the authority of public State officials to police State securities markets.

It is clear that what is needed are uniform standards for private securities class action litigation to cover nationally marketed securities. I hope that my colleagues will join me once again in support of securities litigation reform. We need to take action to close this loophole and protect our innovative entrepreneurs and companies that have done so much toward this country's economic health.

SECURITIES LITIGATION UNIFORM
STANDARDS ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1998

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Chairman BLILEY, Chairman OXLEY, my friend Mr. WHITE and Ms. ESHOO for their work on this fine piece of legislation, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act.

Nearly 3 years ago we passed the precursor to this bill. Before that, dozens of sue-first, ask-questions-later lawyers had made fortunes by organizing groups of shareholders to sue companies when their stock didn't live up to