Donald is survived by his wife Jacqueline as well as five children, two brothers and two sisters.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues and the citizens of Prince William County join me in mourning Donald’s passing. His presence in the community will be missed, but his many accomplishments and good deeds will be fondly remembered.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HAROLD E. FORD, JR.
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1998

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 16, 1998, I was unavoidably detained on official business and missed the following rollcall votes: No. 232 and No. 233. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 232 and “aye” on rollcall No. 233.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 17, 1998, I was unavoidably detained at the White House and missed rollcall vote No. 234. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 234.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

HON. RON PACKARD
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1998

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate my allegiance and pride in our nation, its flag and the words we speak to express these beliefs. Recently in my home district, a high school student refused to stand and say the words, “I Pledge Allegiance to the Flag, of the United States of America.” While I have been disappointed to learn of the student’s refusal, perhaps it can serve as a reminder of just why we say the pledge.

The words we call “The Pledge of Allegiance” were first written on paper in 1892 by Francis Bellamy, a Baptist minister. Bellamy was also a chairman of a committee of state superintendents of education in the National Education Association. Part of his job description was to prepare the program for the public schools’ quadricentennial celebration for Columbus Day in 1892. Bellamy structured this public school program around a flag raising ceremony and a flag statute, now known as “The Pledge of Allegiance.”

Mr. Bellamy also jotted down a journal of what he was thinking while he formulated our nation’s words of Allegiance. It reads, “The true reason for allegiance to the Flag is the ‘republic for which it stands’... And what does that vast thing, the Republic mean? It is the concise political word for the Nation—the One Nation which the Civil War was fought to prove. To make the Nation stand erect, we must specify that it is indivisible, as Webster and Lincoln used to repeat in their great speeches.”

Mr. Speaker, as you know, everyday this Congress meets, someone in the U.S. House of Representatives gives a prayer and recites “The Pledge of Allegiance.” It personally see this as a symbol of respect and pride in our country, and I am thankful each day that I can serve our nation.

IN HONOR OF A VALUED VETERAN, JUEL MARIJEREN

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1998

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to the memory of Juel Marijeren who passed away on Wednesday May 20, 1998. The life of Juel Marijeren was taken prematurely as he was preparing to go home from a day of work. I would like to take this time to extend my condolences to the family and friends of Juel Marijeren, especially his wife, Kathleen and two children, Elizabeth and Steven.

Juel Marijeren was a loving husband, father and respected employee of the United States Army from 1967 to 1969. Juel Marijeren dedicated his life to serving others, and his fellow veterans. He will be sorely missed by all who have come in contact with Juel.

It is a privilege for me to rise today to honor a fine man, husband and veteran. May he rest in peace, and may the Lord grant peace and comfort to the family and friends of Juel Marijeren.

THE OFFICIAL LAUNCH OF EASTBAY WORKS AT THE OAKLAND PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL’S OAKLAND CAREER CENTER

HON. BARBARA LEE
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1998

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to congratulate the Oakland Private Industry Council as it celebrates the official launch of EASTBAY Works, a one-stop career and human resources center. A total of seventeen one-stop centers will operate throughout the East Bay and the Oakland Private Industry Council is proud to have an EASTBAY Works site located at their Oakland Career Center.

EASTBAY Works is the direct result of a collaborative effort among organizations which recognized the need for coordinated, comprehensive services from the work force development community. Its purpose is to advance the economic well-being of the region by developing and maintaining a skilled workforce. This will be accomplished through a customer-focused collaboration of employment, training, economic development and educational partners working together to meet the needs of employers, job seekers and workers.

EASTBAY Works will serve a wide range of individuals, such as, career changers, welfare recipients looking to enter the workplace, down-sized middle managers, under-employed workers, recent graduates, youth and more. It will offer a broad range of free services and resources, including: a career resource room, with telephones, faxes, and computers; job listings; job search skills training; information about and referral to job training programs; labor market information and on-line access to the state of California’s Employment Development Department.

Employers will also receive services through EASTBAY Works. These employers will be matched with an employer representative who will provide services including; job posting capability in the career center and through the Internet, recruiting assistance with access to a large diverse pool of job applicants, labor market data and information about tax credits, hiring incentives and business permits.

EASTBAY Works is an exciting and innovative endeavor which will serve as a model for career centers across the entire nation.

FASTERENER QUALITY ACT AMENDMENTS

SPEECH OF

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1998

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3824, the Fastener Quality Act Amendments. I would like to commend the work of the Science Committee, Chairman SENSENBRINNER and Mr. BROWN; as well as the efforts of Chairwoman MORELLA and Mr. BARCIA of the Technology Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3824 is important and urgently needed legislation. As my colleagues know, the Fastener Quality Act was enacted eight years ago when there was considerable concern about defective and counterfeit fasteners, mostly manufactured in foreign countries, which were found in military equipment, bridges, and airplanes.

However, much has changed over the past eight years, especially in terms of the technology now employed by the fastener industry to guarantee quality. This bill accomplishes two important goals. First, it eliminates the unnecessary and duplicative regulatory burden on fasteners produced to the standards and specifications of aviation manufacturers which are already regulated by the FAA. And, second, this Act delays implementation of the Final Rule for the Fastener Quality Act issued on April 14, 1998 and due to be implemented on July 26, 1998.

During this delay, the Secretary of Commerce will undertake and review the Fastener Quality Act in light of the new advances in technology made by the fastener industry and determine what changes are needed, if any, to assure consumer safety on the one hand and prevent unnecessary and outdated regulation on the other.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is that in many ways the industry has moved beyond the Fastener Quality Act passed eight years ago. Since 1990, enormous strides have been made by both the manufacturers and their customers in the way they ensure the quality and safety of their products. For example, although the Fastener Quality Act originally envisioned an end-of-the-line lot testing procedures, the fastener industry’s quality assurance systems have evolved substantially beyond this to testing throughout the manufacturing process. Even NIST concedes that this method is far superior to lot testing.

Although NIST attempted to accommodate these new procedures in their Final Rule, I am concerned that they were not able to go far enough. The Final Rule did not fully accommodate the new advances in quality demanded by major users of fasteners such as the auto industry. Because of this, if the Final