

of the Southwest Detroit Vicariate from 1970–72 and served on the Archdiocesan Pastoral Assembly, Bread for the World, Clergy Advisory Board for the Archdiocesan Office of Hispanic Affairs and Pastoral Alliance of Detroit. Since 1968, Father Samonie has been a member of a pastoral team that assists Latin-Americans and has been Guadalupe Society Director since 1963. He also has the distinction of being the first priest to serve on the Michigan Judicial Tenure Commission, which investigates charges of misconduct against any State court judge.

Father Samonie's hobby is painting. His acrylic compositions are created using oils, acrylics, watercolors, and airbrush on a variety of surfaces. Angels and flowers are the pastor's favorite subjects but all of his works include messages and themes. There have been two successful exhibits of his artwork. During his retirement Father Samonie plans to concentrate on painting people and biblical scenes.

From civic duty to painting, Father Samonie has fostered beauty and kindness throughout his career. His life is a testament to the vast good a dedicated person can achieve within a community. Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to join with me in congratulating Father Samonie on his distinguished career of service and to wish him continued good health, happiness, and involvement in the many causes he holds dear.

TRIBUTE TO THE STURGIS NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRAM AND STURGIS FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK

**HON. FRED UPTON**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 1995*

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the fine efforts of the Sturgis Neighborhood Program and Sturgis Federal Savings Bank who were recently recognized by The Social Compact with its 1995 Outstanding Community Investment Awards. They received this honor for their partnership achievement: stabilizing lower income neighborhoods and families through the rehabilitation of affordable rental housing which is rebuilding community hope and pride.

Sturgis Neighborhood Program [SNP] was founded in 1991 in response to the Sturgis Area Chamber of Commerce's call for greater responsiveness to the housing needs of the city's lower income residents. The downtown business district of Sturgis, a small rural city, has a high concentration of deteriorating and substandard housing. These units, built before 1940 and converted from single-family, owner-occupied residences to multifamily properties, are rented to very-low-income families and require high maintenance. Many of the residents receive public assistance and lack necessary skills to balance their household budgets and maintain their property.

SNP combines housing rehabilitation with support services to address the needs of Sturgis citizens. Since its inception, SNP has rehabilitated five single-family homes, with numbers six and seven on the way. Tenant families are employed, receive family development guidance, and participate in maintenance

education programs. A Family Services Coordinator meets with each family on a regular basis to develop a goal-setting plan, a program that is helping families become self-sufficient, productive members of the community. I must say that SNP's Director, Judy Sommerfield, has done a wonderful job with all of the various activities of the organization.

Sturgis Federal Savings Bank, the first of four financial institutions to support SNP's mission, played a vital role in SNP's initial success. The thrift's president, Leonard Eishen, provided key financial direction and guidance in the area of administration and the development of community support, a major issue for SNP.

In order to gain community support, the nonprofit organization undertook an extensive, year-long campaign to meet with community leaders. Sturgis Federal also helped SNP with a line of credit, a \$1,000 annual grant toward operating support, low interest rates, and flexible terms. With the assistance of Sturgis Federal, SNP received \$124,000 in grants and subsidies which allowed the organization to successfully renovate five units of affordable rental housing. The Michigan State Housing Development Authority also awarded grants for the rehabilitation of the second house and subsequent projects.

By the end of SNP's 1996–97 fiscal year, it hopes to have completed 24 housing units in the targeted downtown area. These efforts improve the neighborhoods and support the local economy. Besides its partnership with Sturgis Federal, SNP has actively sought partnerships with local government, industry, business, financial institutions, youth groups, and service organizations. A network of volunteers from these groups helps to complete small projects on SNP houses.

Working together increases community pride for those who volunteer and for the individuals and families who don't want a handout but only an opportunity for a hand up. With its initial success, SNP has earned the trust of the community it serves and has become an integral part of the community's vision for improving the lives of its lower income residents.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. END G. WALDHOLTZ**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 1995*

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, due to a family illness, I missed votes on Wednesday, June 7. Had I been here I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 357, the rule for consideration of H.R. 1561, and "yea" on rollcall No. 359, the Hyde amendment to H.R. 1561.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION  
REAUTHORIZATION

**HON. BILL MCCOLLUM**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 1995*

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. STENHOLM and I introduce a bill which proposes to reauthorize the Legal Services Corporation and institute major and significant re-

forms to the Corporation. Over the years we have seen extensive abuses within the Legal Services Corporation by lawyers with their own political agendas actively recruiting clients, creating claims, and advancing their own social causes. They have been involved in inappropriate lobbying, highly controversial issues like abortion litigation, and impact litigation in an attempt to socially engineer change in our laws and rules.

It is for this reason that Mr. STENHOLM and I today introduce a bill which calls for extensive reforms in the Legal Services Act. This bill will restore the very limited and appropriate Federal role in the delivery of legal services to the poor. At the same time, this bill enhances accountability and compliance for the restricted and limited activities of the Legal Services Corporation.

I will submit for the RECORD a partial section-by-section summary which outlines the reform measures included in our bill. We seek to significantly limit the activities of a Legal Services Corporation and to return its function to the original and envisioned intent, providing the bread and butter basics of legal representation for the poor of this Nation.

THE LEGAL SERVICES REFORM ACT OF 1995

In order to create a non-political, accountable and fair federal legal service program, The Legal Services Reform Act of 1995 does the following:

NON-POLITICAL

*Prohibits redistricting activity (Section 4)*

Redistricting at all levels is inherently political. Many non-federally funded organizations, including the major political parties, are actively involved in redistricting fights. No matter which party is advantaged by litigation of these matters (who is advantaged is unclear) federally funded legal services attorneys should not be involved.

*Prohibits solicitation of clients (Section 6)*

If as many poor persons are being turned away for lack of funding as the American Bar Association estimates, the only reason to solicit would be to find clients that fit the political agenda of the lawyers. Our bill specifically allows outreach to educate potential clients of their legal rights but leaves it up to clients to seek legal help.

*Prohibits lobbying or rulemaking activity (Section 8)*

Nothing is more political or creates as much controversy as lobbying. We believe the intent of Congress in 1974 was to provide poor persons access to the legal system to have their existing legal rights vindicated. There are hundreds of organizations which have competing views on what changes in the law are in the best interest of the poor. Taxpayer's should not be forced to fund any particular side of that debate.

*Prohibits the use of funds from any source for prohibited activities (Section 11)*

While Congress continues to believe that certain activities are too controversial or otherwise inappropriate for the use of federal funds—controversy will still attach to programs which engage in those activities with funds from other sources. Let the many groups of lawyers, on the right and on the left, who are not constrained by Congressional restrictions, handle the highly political cases. In our opinion, we should promote this diversity. Why give a virtual monopoly to the federally funded program?

*Prohibits abortion litigation or lobbying (Section 15)*

Abortion is probably the most volatile issue facing the country today. Organizations and activist attorneys abound on each

side of the debate. As in 1974, abortion remains highly controversial and a threat to the support of the program. It would be inappropriate for Congress to fund either side of the right to life/right to abortion struggle.

*Prohibits training for political purposes (Section 18)*

This prohibition has been in appropriation riders since 1982 and reflects Congress' concern about political activity by legal services attorneys.

*Elimination of the regional resource centers (Section 14)*

These regional resource centers have proven to be a bed of controversy where research, training and technical assistance have been used to promote a particular agenda, not necessarily to the benefit of the poor. The Legal Services Administration Act practically gave these Centers carte blanche authority to pursue their social agendas.

ACCOUNTABLE

*Requires local boards to set and enforce priorities (Section 10)*

Our bill requires local boards of directors of LSC recipients to set and monitor priorities for the use of recipient resources. We feel strongly that deviating from those priorities should be the exception, not the rule; our bill would require staff attorneys to follow an established procedure when an emergency requires taking a case that is outside the specific priorities set by the local Board.

*Allows clients to affect priorities by modest co-payments (Section 19)*

Some observers of the Federal legal services programs see the number of cases taken by LSC recipients involving drug dealers as a symptom that programs are often out of touch with client concerns. Requiring a modest co-payment will help insure that resource allocations reflect client priorities. Co-payments would allow clients to feel a sense of dignity and control and the lawyers would be held accountable by their clients.

*Requires keeping time by type of case and source of funds (Section 9)*

Today—no one—not Congress, not the LSC, not the recipients themselves, can determine whether one program is more or less efficient than another. It may take one program 4 lawyer hours to handle a type of case which takes another program 12 lawyer hours to handle. The taxpayers have a right to know exactly what they are getting for their money. Accountability depends on knowing where a grantee spends its time and money. Currently no one knows.

*Organizations to compete periodically to obtain federal funding (Section 13)*

The genesis of protection Congress gave to existing LSC recipients was concern that a hostile Administration would replace grantees on ideological grounds. To the extent that threat ever existed it has passed. The presumption that a grantee will be refunded has meant an existing grantee will be funded again no matter how poorly it performs or complies with Congressional mandates.

Competition generally produces innovation, efficiency and excellence. It is hard to believe that, if competition involving complex weapons systems—long resisted by the defense industry—has produced the F15, the best fighter of its generation and the Advanced Tactical Fighter—then competition will not produce better delivery systems for legal services to the poor.

We have defined our proposed competitive bidding system in Section 13 where we note that this competition is not in the sense of the least cost program that might be offered but rather competition in the sense of quality and variety in the type of service that a program might offer.

*Application of waste, fraud and abuse laws (Section 5)*

There is no disagreement that the federally funded legal service program should be subjected to the same rules as other federal programs.

*Prevention of evasion of congressional restrictions (section 24)*

In 1981 the GAO found that a number of legal services recipients had set up mirror corporations to evade Congressional restrictions. That must not happen again. If a group of lawyers want to engage in activities which Congress prohibits, they should not be set up and controlled by federally funded recipients.

*Attorney client privilege defined*

Recently the GAO was asked to investigate legal services practices in a particular industry but reported it was unable to reach any conclusions because it was denied access to records and documents by LSC grantees. While we do not want to preclude legitimate claims of attorney client privilege, we should not allow exaggerated claims to shield programs from legitimate oversight.

*Appointment of corporation president (Section 23)*

This section changes the way in which the president of the Corporation is appointed making him serve at the pleasure of the President of the U.S. upon the advise and consent of the Senate. Presently, the president of the corporation is elected by the Board. This will serve to bring more accountability to the LSC.

*Naming plaintiffs and statements of fact (section 7)*

Private parties who are sued by Federally funded LSC attorneys are often at a tremendous disadvantage. They are generally not lawyers and must bear the often considerable expense of hiring legal counsel. Demands for money damages often strain or exceed their ability to pay. Our bill attempts to help such citizens by requiring, under most circumstances, that they know who is bringing the complaint and that a statement of facts by the plaintiff is on file. The potential defendant can then intelligently evaluate whether to settle or litigate.

*No attorneys fees from private defendants (section 14)*

Private parties who are sued by Federally funded attorneys pay four times: (1) their taxes, (2) their own attorneys fees, (3) a money judgement and (4) the attorney's fees of taxpayer funded attorneys who sued them. We don't think that is fair. Our bill provides that while government defendants would still be liable for attorneys fees, taxpayers would not be required to pay the attorneys fees of taxfunded lawyers.

ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MASSACRE AT THE GOLDEN TEMPLE

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1995

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, June 3, marked the 11th anniversary of a very dark day in India's history—the Indian Army's assault on the Sikhs' Golden Temple in Amritsar. On that date in 1984, the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the holiest shrine of the Sikh nation, was brutally attacked by 15,000 Indian troops.

The brutal assault on the temple was timed to occur on a Sikh holiday. Simultaneously, 38

other Sikh temples throughout Punjab were attacked. Over 20,000 Sikhs, mostly civilians, were killed during the month of June.

At the Golden Temple, hundreds of people were herded into tiny rooms, where many died of asphyxiation. Many Sikh women were raped and then murdered. One hundred Sikh students between the ages of 8 to 12 were lined up in front of the temple's sacred pool and asked one by one to denounce the movement for an independent Sikh nation named Khalistan. One by one the children refused to do so and were shot in the head.

These types of horrible atrocities have become routine in Punjab, in Kashmir, and in other areas under India's control. India has over a half-a-million troops in Punjab and another half-a-million in Kashmir who are brutalizing those people—raping women, torturing prisoners, murdering civilians. Countless thousands of Sikhs, Moslems, and Christians have been murdered by Indian soldiers and paramilitary forces. This brutality has led the Sikhs of Punjab to seek independence so that they can enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Indian Government should understand that its brutal campaign of terror will not wipe out this movement, it will only add fuel to the fire.

The Indian Government must be called to account for its crimes and human rights violations. It has become notorious for its disrespect for sacred religious sites. In 1992, Hindu mobs sacked the Mosque at Ayodhya. Just last month, Indian forces in Kashmir gutted the ancient Moslem shrine at Charar-e-Sharief on a Moslem holiday. The democracies of the world must not turn a blind eye on these heinous acts.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in making the 11th anniversary of the attack on the Golden Temple by calling on India to begin to respect the human rights of all people.

THE WELFARE SYSTEM

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, today President Clinton suggested that Republican welfare proposals would give States incentive to cut loose the poor in order to save money simply by throwing people off the welfare rolls. Frankly, nothing could be further from the truth and the Clinton administration knows it.

The President has expressed skepticism of plans that give more authority to the States, yet the States have a proven track record on welfare reform and we should move the responsibility for welfare programs out of Washington and back to the States. The only examples of successful welfare reform have come at the State level, led by Republican Governors. Furthermore, as Governor of Arkansas, the President urged increased authority to the States.

The President continues to defend a failed system that even most welfare recipients do not believe in. The current system has resulted in increased poverty, dependency, and violence. The poverty rate today is higher than it was when Lyndon Johnson launched the war on poverty in 1965, even though trillions