

done. I wish Mark, Scott, and Coed Sports-wear all the best in the coming years.

WATER RIGHTS ARE PROPERTY RIGHTS

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1995

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, this House approved the Private Property Rights Act. The purpose of the legislation is to reaffirm clearly that the Federal Government cannot take or diminish the value of private property without paying just compensation.

Since March 3, opponents of private property rights have sought to discredit the legislation by claiming that it is intended to protect water subsidies. That is totally false.

The Private Property Rights Act would allow a farmer to seek compensation if he is denied the use of part of his farm because of Federal wetlands or endangered species laws. The act would provide exactly the same protection to a farmer who loses the use of part of his property because his water supply is reduced or eliminated by Federal environmental regulation. The compensation would be based on the economic loss resulting from the decreased productive capacity of his or her farm. It would not be based on the price of the water.

Unfortunately, the false perceptions regarding the water rights provisions of the Private Property Rights Act have been given undeserved credence by recent articles in the Wall Street Journal. I have written to the editor of this newspaper to point out the errors. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a copy of my letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 14, 1995.

Mr. ROBERT L. BARTLEY,
Editor, The Wall Street Journal, New York, NY.

DEAR EDITOR: As a conservative Republican Member of Congress, I take strong exception to Mr. David Frum's March 13 column "The GOP's Takings' Sell Out."

Mr. Frum takes the Republican majority in the House to task for allegedly opting to "break with its free-market convictions" by including water rights provisions in the Private Property Rights Act, which passed the House on March 3.

Mr. Frum completely misstates both the intent and effect of the Private Property Rights Act when he asserts that it "requires the federal government to compensate Western Farmers and miners should it ever be tempted to ask them to pay the market price for water they take from federal irrigation projects."

The provision has nothing to do with the price of water.

Mr. Frum is absolutely correct that "the removal of a subsidy is not an abridgment of a property right." The Private Property Rights Act does not protect water subsidies. What it does do is allow landowners to be compensated for economic loss when their "right to use or receive water" is abridged by the federal government.

The water provisions of the legislation are specifically intended to ensure that Western farmers can apply for compensation when the value of their property is significantly diminished by a federal action that denies them the water that they are entitled to receive (with or without a subsidy) under state

law or a binding contract with the federal government.

Farmland in the arid West isn't worth much without water. When a farmer's water supply is reduced or eliminated, the productive capacity—the value—of his or her property is reduced or eliminated. Throughout the West, the Endangered Species Act and more recent water project "reform" laws are being used by federal bureaucrats to deny water to agriculture. This is particularly true in my state of California.

The Republican majority in Congress is not abandoning its free-market convictions in the water policy arena. In fact, many of us believe that the federal government should get out of the water delivery business altogether by selling or transferring its water projects to local public agencies.

We would welcome Mr. Frum's thoughts on that endeavor, provided he gets his facts straight first.

Respectfully,

GEORGE P. RADANOVICH,
Member of Congress (R-CA-19th).

TRIBUTE TO HAZEL A. YOUNGER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Hazel A. Younger, a native New Yorker. She was born in Coney Island Hospital.

Hazel is particularly close to her family and feels that her strength comes from her Lord, and the encouragement offered by her mother, Mrs. Ella Garner, and her three sisters, Friedna, Edna, and Connie. Hazel is also the very proud mother of one son, Travis.

Hazel began her education with the goal of being a lawyer. However, midway during her studies, she developed a fascination with numbers and accounting became her career.

Presently, retired, Hazel serves as president of the board of directors of the cooperative in which she lives, P.E. Gorman Houses. She is a member of the Brookdale Hospital Ambulatory Care Services Community Advisory Board and Community Board 16. Hazel is also co-chairperson of Concerned Citizens of the 58th assembly district.

Because of her experience and eloquence, Hazel is often asked to speak at churches, community meetings, and A.A.R.P. chapters. She is known to be an articulate representative of the community, with direct access to local elected officials. I am pleased to commend Ms. Younger to the attention of my colleagues.

TRIBUTE TO RONALD E. HALL

HON. STEVE LARGENT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1995

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend, Ron Hall, who retired in April of this year as president and chief executive officer of CITGO Petroleum Corp. Ron has been president and CEO of CITGO for the last 10 years and retires with the respect and esteem of all who have known him.

A native of Illinois, Ron received a B.S. from Bradley University, and an MBA from Colum-

bia University. Southern Illinois University's College of Business and Administration awarded its first doctor of commercial science honorary degree to Ron in May 1988. Additionally, Ron is a member of the Bradley University Board of Trustees as well as a member of the University's College of Business Administration's National Council of Advisors.

In addition to Ron's professional and educational accomplishments, he always found time and energy to take part in civic and charitable activities in Tulsa, OK, such as serving as director of the Gilgrease Museum Association and of St. Francis Hospital, advisory director of the Tulsa Ballet Theatre and as a director of the Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce.

During Ron's tenure as president and CEO, CITGO has become a recognized leader in environmental stewardship, and through its corporate sponsorship of the Muscular Dystrophy Association, the lives of millions of people have been made better. CITGO is truly helping to make a difference in such areas as Tulsa, Corpus Christi, and Lake Charles with its active participation in the Adopt-a-School and Partners in Education programs.

CITGO may be losing a president and CEO but his lovely wife Jean will be gaining a ranch foreman down in Brenham, TX. I'm sure Ron will be looking forward to spending more time with Jean and their grandchildren. There's no doubt that once he has had his fill of bird hunting and fly fishing, we will see him involved with the community in some capacity. I do not believe a person of his energy and public spirit can stay away.

A SALUTE TO ANDY GUEST

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1995

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1995, in beautiful Warren County, Virginia, near the town of Front Royal, a group of Virginia's leaders headed by Governor George F. Allen gathered to dedicate a new State park in honor of House of Delegate member Raymond R. Guest, Jr.

"Andy" Guest attended the dedication in his honor at the park which will provide several miles of riverfront recreational area along the Shenandoah River. Having just won a 2-year battle over cancer and poised to return for another term to the General Assembly where he has served since 1973, Andy was cited for his hard work and many years of leadership on behalf of Virginia State parks and recreational activities.

Andy Guest has done so much to preserve this region which is the core of Civil War battlefields and the very heart of American history. When he is not in Richmond representing the people of Virginia's 15th House of Delegates district, Andy continues to live on his family farm near the banks of the famous Shenandoah River where he grew up. Nothing could be more appropriate and no recognition could be more deserved than to name a beautiful piece of Virginia along the serene but majestic Shenandoah River after one of Virginia's own first citizens: Raymond R. "Andy" Guest.

I join Governor Allen and all of Virginia in saluting Andy.

TRIBUTE TO RAY OJEDA

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1995

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Ray Ojeda, a good friend and the outgoing mayor of San Fernando. Under Ray's intelligent and firm leadership, San Fernando has strengthened its ties to the local business community, paving the way for better economic times in the city.

Ray also took charge in the aftermath of the Northridge earthquake, which destroyed or damaged many buildings in San Fernando. The mayor provided a steady hand, and worked hard to get San Fernando its fair share of State and Federal assistance.

A resident of San Fernando for 18 years, Ray epitomizes the definition of public servant. Prior to his election to the City Council in 1992, Ray served as a planning commissioner and as a member of the Kiwanis Club. In his public role he has always emphasized the importance of community pride, a message that has particular application in San Fernando, where a few years ago gangs and graffiti were all too common. The recent turnaround is a testimony to Ray's efforts.

With two children and several grandchildren, along with a passion for golf and hunting, Ray leads an active life outside politics. In addition, Ray is the owner of Ray's Window Coverings in San Fernando.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Ray Ojeda, businessman/politician/father/grandfather, who has worked tirelessly on behalf of San Fernando. The residents are indeed lucky to have had him as mayor, and to continue to have him on the city council.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF EMMANUEL COLLEGE OF BOSTON

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1995

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to recognize Emmanuel College of Boston on its 75th anniversary. Emmanuel College was founded in 1919 by Sister Helen Madeleine Ingraham and the Sisters of Notre Dame.

As the oldest women's Catholic college in New England, Emmanuel College's mission has been one of providing women with an outstanding liberal arts education rooted in Catholic heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the students, administrators, faculty, and alumnae of Emmanuel College a happy 75th anniversary and continued success in the future.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY DALY

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1995

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I was honored to address the Second Annual Service to Children Awards Dinner in Los Angeles, and to present to Nancy Daly the Lifetime Service Award.

Ms. Daly, the founder of United Friends of the Children, is one of the most remarkable, effective and persistent advocates I have ever known, and she richly deserves this great honor. I would like to share my remarks with the Members of the House.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY DALY

I am very honored to make some remarks this evening, because Nancy Daly is a woman who sends a powerful message—to Los Angeles and to America—about what it means to dedicate ourselves to children. And I speak as a member of a profession where proclaiming your concern about children is a requirement of membership.

My path and Nancy's have crossed many times, including our service together on the National Commission on Children with Senator Jay Rockefeller, where she was the leading proponent for family preservation programs. But we worked on the same issues for years before we ever met.

Fifteen years ago, after years of investigations and hearings, Congress enacted my bill to reform the national foster care and adoption laws, P.L. 96-272.

It was at that same time that Nancy went out to visit MacLaren Children's Center, never dreaming that visit would change her life's work or the lives of so many others in this city. While I was massaging my colleagues in Congress to vote for my bill, Nancy was shampooing the heads of foster kids at MacLaren, and deciding that this system needed change, and that she was the one to change it.

It was in that same year that Nancy founded United Friends of the Children, that stunningly successful volunteer organization working with the abandoned and neglected children of MacLaren, working to improve the children's resources, their educational development, supporting college tuition programs and providing critical transitional help from foster care to independence through creation of low cost housing for those emancipated from the system.

Throughout the 1980s, Nancy became one of the premier advocates for family preservation programs—efforts designed by agencies and the courts to provide intensive service to at-risk families to help them work through serious problems rather than fragmenting, at great cost to the children and often to the state as well. She has mobilized the formidable resources of the entertainment community on behalf of children's issues, and is a vigorous promoter of programs to assure that children have proper legal representation in the court system when critical decisions are being made about their placements, their rights and their futures. And she played the central role in the creation of the Los Angeles Department of Children and Youth to give young people an advocate in government even though they are too young to have a voice in its management.

Not bad for a volunteer.

As Nancy was creating and participating in these, and many more activities, I served as the first chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families in the Congress, a panel created by Tip O'Neill at my

urging because children simply were not receiving the special attention they merited in federal policy. Oh, sure there were educational laws and health laws, foster care laws and child care laws; but no one was looking out for the kids, not for the program or the bureaucracy or the politics: just the kids.

And that Select Committee did what it was supposed to do. We raised the visibility of children, we held up a mirror to the Congress and said, "Like 'em or not, these are America's kids." We travelled throughout this country for eight years, putting children on the Congress' agenda: children with disabilities, children without homes, children of violence, children with AIDS, children in gangs, children without food, children in poverty. America's future. America's "most precious resource." The subject of every politician's favorite photo op.

And I think many in Congress were truly shocked by what they saw: the millions of children, about to inherit this nation, who were growing up in Third World conditions, abused, hungry, violent, with little or no investment in society or even in their own futures.

The mission of the Select Committee, you see, wasn't to score political points, but—perhaps naively—to depoliticize children in the political debate: to make it clear to conservative Republicans, Yellow Dog Democrats and Bleeding Heart liberals alike that you can't lecture America's children into being good citizens, or productive workers or responsible adults if you ignore their most basic needs in their formative years.

Children really don't care if you're liberal or conservative, a hard heart or a bleeding heart. They don't care if you're a volunteer, a case worker, a lawyer, or a congressman. They know when they're hurting, when they're scared, when they're hungry, when they're confused, and all they want to know is, "Are you going to be there for me?"

And, I suppose, that is what is so terribly tragic about what is going on in Washington today. A new political leadership in Congress, which shows no evidence at all of understanding children or public policy towards children, is putting a torch to most of what Nancy and I, and many others in this room and across America, have spent our lives doing. And don't get me wrong: I have no particular concern if someone wants to rewrite the nutrition, child care, family violence, foster care, adoption laws I wrote in the '70s, '80s and '90s—if they want to make them better.

But let's not kid anyone: the new congressional leadership isn't about improving the system, they are about destroying it, and the children be damned.

How else do you explain proposals to throw infants off income assistance because of the mistakes of their mothers?

How else do you explain \$7 billion in nutrition cuts—exposing pregnant women, newborns and school children to serious deficiencies?

How else do you explain a punitive "welfare reform" plan that puts no one to work, but deprives five million people of basic assistance—300,000 right here in Los Angeles?

How else do you explain dissembling our foster care reforms with the result that children will be housed in unlicensed homes, with few if any services to them or their parents, with no legal representation or hopes for permanent homes?

I remember well in the early '80s when David Stockman came before the Budget Committee and I asked him how, in light of the uncontroverted evidence that the WIC program saved babies lives and money, too, he could justify slashing that program. And