

lectures in the Congressional Record, Grandy gave Gingrich a blanket exemption from complying with the House Rules cited in his letter. It is completely lost on Tobin that Grandy's letter, like all advisory opinions from the Ethics Committee, granted only conditional approval for Gingrich's conduct, so long as Gingrich complied with all House Rules.

By highlighting the Grandy letter, Mr. Tobin has undermined Mr. Gingrich's case. We now have learned from Gingrich's staff that he used official resources on the course. Documents before the Ethics Committee show that GOPAC staff reprinted Gingrich's Congressional Record remarks and enclosed them with their Requests For Funding, violating the prohibition on "official endorsement." And of course, we know that Gingrich personally profits from the course with his \$4.5 million book deal that agent Lynn Chu and Jeffrey Eisenach both say is based on the course.

Is there any doubt now why an independent counsel is needed in this case? If the Gingrich organization will go to these lengths to distort the facts, change dates, and misrepresent what actually happened, what more are they hiding?

Sincerely,

STEVEN J. JOST.

(Mr. Jost is a Democratic political consultant who worked on the Ben Jones race against Newt Gingrich in 1994 and assisted with the ethics complaint filed by Jones.)

TERM LIMITS

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will hold the first ever vote on term limits. The American people will witness a historic vote on an issue that previous Democrat-controlled Congresses prevented from ever being voted on in committee or on the House floor. Last September, House Republicans pledged to bring this historic legislation to the floor. We kept our promise.

The new Republican controlled House has already shown its commitment to internal term limits. The Speaker is limited to four terms in that office, and committee and subcommittee chairmen are limited to three terms. Now we must take the next step and vote on term limits for every elected Member of the House.

I applaud the Republican leadership for devising a strategy that provides the best opportunity to secure the votes necessary for passage. The winner takes all procedure allows for Members to support the term-limit package they feel most comfortable with regardless of outside groups and member sponsors.

Forty years of Democrat rule in the House has created an institution less accountable to the people. Republicans are working to change this. The American people want to know that their representatives will serve their needs, not the Government's needs. Passage of term-limit legislation this week will bring Washington closer to the people it serves back home.

LINDA KAREN FRIEDMAN-LEVIN
BECOMES A CITIZEN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, every year thousands of men and women from all over the world become citizens of the United States of America. As they take the oath of citizenship, they acquire the rights of a citizen of the United States, as well as the responsibilities those rights carry.

Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1995, Mrs. Linda Karen Friedman-Levin will accept those rights and responsibilities of a citizen when she takes her oath of citizenship. I am confident that Mrs. Friedman-Levin will be as committed to fulfilling her duties as a citizen of our country as she has been in her perseverance in becoming a citizen.

Mrs. Friedman-Levin, the mother of Emma Jess and Dana Franci Levin, and wife of Alan Levin, was born in Montreal, PQ, Canada. I would like to extend congratulations to Mrs. Friedman-Levin and her family and welcome her as one of the newest citizens of the United States.

MS. ARCADIA XOCHIHUA

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Ms. Arcadia Xochihua, a resident of my district. Ms. Xochihua will become a U.S. citizen on Friday, March 31, 1995, at the age of 96. She will be the first person in San Jose and perhaps in the Nation to be naturalized under the new Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] regulations easing the process for the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about Ms. Xochihua. She was born on January 12, 1899, and immigrated from Mexico to the United States in 1923 at the age of 24. She has worked her entire life from processing fruit and vegetables in a cannery to owning and operating several restaurants in the area.

Ms. Xochihua has always been a vital part of the community. During the Depression and World War II, she helped people who were less fortunate than herself. During the Depression, she operated a small soup kitchen out of her house for those who needed a hot meal. She also provided clothes for women and children. Until about 3 years ago, she continued to provide room and board for destitute migrant farmworkers.

Though Ms. Xochihua never married and does not have children of her own, she is surrounded by her sisters and brothers who have provided her with many nieces and nephews.

Ms. Xochihua decided this year, on her 96th birthday, that it was important to her to become an American citizen. She has always been patriotic and loyal to her adopted country and wants to be called an American.

Mr. Speaker, the month of March has been dedicated to the late labor and human rights leader, Mr. Cesar Chavez and March 31 is Mr. Chavez's birthday. It would be a fitting tribute

to his dedication to social justice for all that Ms. Xochihua becomes a citizen of the United States of America on his birthday. I commend and applaud Ms. Xochihua for her loyalty and her commitment to our country and congratulate her on new citizenship.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL WOULD PROVIDE HUGE BENEFITS TO A PRIVILEGED FEW!

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, these Republican tax proposals are not equitable. They would disproportionately favor a privileged few upper-income taxpayers. Is that how the Republicans intend to waste hundreds of billions of dollars—helping those who have and ignoring those who have not?

The Republicans strenuously protest the claim that they are helping wealthy Americans with these tax cuts. But the facts shed doubt on their objections.

One-half of the total benefit of this bill and three quarters of the capital gains tax cut will go to those with incomes of \$100,000 or more.

The broken promise of partial refundability of the family credit means that families with incomes of \$20,000 or less will get only 2 percent of the benefit of that provision, and that is about all they will get from the total bill.

On average, those with incomes of \$200,000 or more would enjoy tax cuts of \$11,270, while those with incomes between \$30,000 and \$75,000 would receive \$760, a mere one-fourteenth of what the wealthy will get.

The Republicans have chosen to focus their largess on the very small number of Americans in the upper strata of the income range. Although they will receive one-half of the total benefits of this bill, the 13 million households with incomes of \$100,000 or more represent only 6 percent of our total population.

The Republican elitism will see to it that the privileged few will get huge tax cuts. This is the purpose for which they are willing to increase the Federal deficit.

Middle-income families will get small tax cuts, a bigger deficit, and a bleaker future for their children. The Republicans know this. They put forth this bill knowingly and without the interest or the commitment to help those who are shortchanged by it.

MY ONE WISH FOUNDATION, 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize the tenth anniversary of the My One Wish Foundation, an organization based in Milford, MA.

My One Wish, founded in 1984 by Anthony and Virginia Brenna, is a nonprofit group which grants wishes to terminally and chronically ill children. Over the past 10 years, this charitable organization has granted 42 wishes

to youngsters in the Milford area. The most recent wish was granted to an 18-year-old girl from Medway who wished for ceramic supplies and a kiln oven. The presentation was made at the foundation's tenth anniversary celebration, which was attended by more than 175 friends, relatives, and well wishers, including sixteen former wish kids.

The My One Wish Foundation operates with a staff of 25 volunteers and wishes are made possible through donations made by individuals and local organizations that sponsor events to benefit the program.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the My One Wish Foundation for its 10 years of service and dedication to terminally and chronically ill children in central Massachusetts. The caring shown by the Brennans and the volunteers at My One Wish has brought much joy to these youngsters and their families.

THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH
BARTHOLOMEW I

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1994, a provocation by Moslem militants in Istanbul, Turkey, took place against the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I, the spiritual leader of 250 million orthodox Christians worldwide including, 5 million residing in the United States. Three bombs were placed in the attic of the building where the patriarch lives and were found shortly before they were set to explode.

This episode is ominous, but is only one in a series of provocations against the patriarchate and the orthodox Christian community in Turkey.

Yesterday, I introduced legislation expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should use its influence with the Turkish Government, and as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, to suggest that the Turkish Government ensure the proper protection for the patriarchate and all orthodox faithful residing in Turkey.

Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues who believe in freedom of religion to cosponsor my legislation House Concurrent Resolution 50. The time has come for this Congress to speak out once and for all against Turkey's oppressive human rights record. Please sign on to House Concurrent Resolution 50, thank you.

WELFARE REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, March 29, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WELFARE REFORM

There is virtually universal agreement that the current welfare system discourages self-sufficiency, punishes work, and does not ensure that parents support their children. I agree that comprehensive overhaul is needed. But I opposed the welfare reform bill passed by the House. While it contains some good reforms, it guts programs important to the health and well-being of children. I instead supported another plan which more effectively addresses shortcomings in the system without punishing children.

House Bill: The bill passed by the House makes vast changes in welfare programs put into place over the past 60 years:

Assistance for Needy Families: It would replace Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) with a block grant to states. Eligible families would not be automatically entitled to benefits. No cash benefits could be provided for children born to unmarried women under 18 (until the mother reached age 18), nor for children born to families already receiving aid. Benefits would end if parents are not in a work program after two years, and there would be a five-year lifetime limit. Federal funding for this program would be \$11.8 billion less over the next five years than provided under current law.

Child Protection: The bill establishes a block grant to replace existing programs for foster care and child abuse prevention and treatment. After the first two years, states would not be required to spend any of their own money on these services. The funding guaranteed is \$2.7 billion less than under current law, and would not allow for increases in inflation.

Child Care: Child care programs would be consolidated into a block grant. Child care would no longer be guaranteed to welfare recipients who are participating in school, job training, or work, even though many would be required to do so.

Nutrition: The bill would eliminate the school lunch program (including nutritional standards) and supplemental nutrition for women, infants and children (WIC), and create two block grants—one for family nutrition and one for school-based programs. The new programs would receive \$7.2 billion less than under current law over the next 5 years. The bill would retain food stamps, but cap future spending.

SSI: The bill would end cash Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits for hundreds of thousands of children. Future cash benefits would go only to children in institutional care and those who would be placed in such care without assistance.

Child support: Under the bill, both the federal and state governments would create automated registries of child support orders and new hires. States would revoke driver's and professional licenses of parents who are delinquent in child support.

Assessment: I strongly support welfare reform that strengthens families, encourages productive work, and protects vulnerable children. But the House bill is deeply flawed. First, it slashes the amount of aid available. Payments to the poor are just a sliver of the federal budget. Two of the largest programs, AFDC and food stamps, account for only 2.7% of the budget. Some reductions are certainly in order, but nothing like the \$66 billion proposed.

Second, it will leave the poor without adequate help in terms of recession. Ending welfare's entitlement status means the program would be far less flexible and responsive to changing economic circumstances. There would be no extra money as need grows.

Third, it shifts enormous responsibilities to the states, and there are serious doubts about states' ability to meet them. We should certainly give states more flexibility, but the federal government still has an important role to play. The House bill sharply curtails important federal responsibilities on the one hand, while imposing many prescriptions that are costly to implement and inconsistent with the notion of allowing states to experiment.

Fourth, the House bill would allow savings from welfare cuts to be used to finance tax breaks mostly benefitting wealthy adults. Taking basic needs from children to help the rich goes too far.

Alternative Plan: I supported an alternative plan which does much more to promote self-sufficiency without punishing children. It would save \$25 billion over the next five years.

This alternative would require welfare recipients to sign a plan detailing what they will do to find private employment and what the state will do to assist them. Recipients would be eligible for up to two years of assistance in finding a job. This work requirement would take effect more quickly than the one in the House bill. Recipients who do not find a job after two years would be ineligible to receive AFDC, but states would have the option to provide a community service job or a job voucher which could be redeemed by a private employer who hires the individual.

The alternative would provide states more flexibility—for example, allowing them to restrict benefits for children born to parents already on welfare and to allow families to accumulate more assets while on welfare. It would further encourage work by extending Medicaid coverage for former welfare recipients and guaranteeing child care assistance.

The alternative bill retains entitlement status for foster care services. Child support enforcement improvements similar to those in the House bill are included.

The alternative maintains the current nutrition programs. In addition, it seeks to eliminate fraud in the SSI program.

I do not want a welfare system that relies on bureaucratic approaches, discourages work, and breaks up families. The bill I supported is the best hope for accomplishing reform while ensuring that the safety net for the poor is not torn apart.

HONORING ANTHONY W.W.
TANTILLO

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1995 the Supreme Council of the Royal Arcanum, the Grand Council of New York and the Claremont Council No. 1655 will be holding an investiture ceremony for 82d Legion of Honor member Anthony W.W. Tantillo.

Mr. Tantillo, a lifelong Bronx resident, is being honored for his many years of service and dedication to the Royal Arcanum. In addition, Mr. Tantillo has been an active member of the Columbus Alliance and the Sons of Italy.

I am sure that Mr. Tantillo's family, neighbors, and friends join me in congratulating him on this achievement.