

permitting States to decide whether to use Medicaid funds for abortions in the case of rape or incest.

This provision is cruel, unfair, and has no place in any legislation, but most particularly not in this already troubled omnibus appropriations bill.

States should not be given the option of providing coverage of these services under the guise of States' rights. States have the choice whether or not to participate in the Medicaid Program—they do not and should not have the option to pick and choose which procedures they will cover.

The provision in this bill clearly discriminates against victims of crime. It blames the victim and forces her to accept the responsibility and consequences resulting from the violent crime perpetrated against her. Indigent women who are victims of rape or incest have already been brutally assaulted once by their attacker—this provision will make them victims of a second brutal assault, this time by the Government that pledges to assist and protect them.

I urge my colleagues to protect the rights of poor and vulnerable victims and vote "yes" on the Lowey amendment.

CONGRATULATIONS ON 25 SUCCESSFUL YEARS

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor any friends at Southfield Christian School on their 25th anniversary celebration.

With a deep-seated commitment to a strong program of moral and character development, Southfield Christian has set new standards for excellence among Christian schools.

In fact, Southfield Christian was one of only two schools nationally to receive the prestigious Blue Ribbon Exemplary School Award from the U.S. Department of Education.

With a program emphasizing both academic excellence and a commitment to developing character and integrity, Southfield Christian has a solid track record of success.

More than 75 percent of their student body achieves honor roll status. The annual college acceptance average is over 95 percent and, in last year's senior class, 99 percent were accepted to colleges. And finally, nearly 77 percent of the students at Southfield Christian score nationally in the top quarter on national standardized tests.

Not only are they academically outstanding, the school and its student body is involved in the local community as well. The annual fall drive for the needy yielded more than 800 winter coats, hundreds of cans of food and more than 7,000 quarters—in honor of their 25th anniversary—for the purchase of children's Bibles.

With state-of-the-art facilities and a loyal, committed alumni, the future looks very bright for the next 25 years and beyond.

Strengthened by their commitment and resolve to install morals and values in our future leaders, I extend my heartiest congratulations on your 25th anniversary. I am very proud of Southfield Christian, their staff, and the student body. Keep up the great work.

SPEAKER PRINGLE'S STRAIGHT TALK ON WELFARE REFORM

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has talked a good game on welfare reform, particularly when the cameras were focused on him during the State of the Union Address. But his two vetoes of welfare reform legislation speak much louder than his crowd-pleasing rhetoric. As we, in Congress, continue to pursue an overhaul of the current system, the California legislature has moved ahead with its own welfare reform legislation, designed to restore work incentives and help people on welfare become independent and productive citizens.

The speaker of the assembly, Curt Pringle, has been a leader in California's welfare reform effort. In the March 4, Los Angeles Times, Speaker Pringle correctly pointed out that President Clinton, far from being a leader in welfare reform, is actually its major impediment. California and the other States cannot reform their welfare programs without Federal approval. If President Clinton had approved the legislation sent to him by the 104th Congress, California would not have to go through an extremely difficult and time-consuming Federal waiver process in order to implement its own reforms. California could be moving forward with its reforms right now.

Given the continued urgency of this issue, I would like to request that Speaker Pringle's excellent commentary be entered into the RECORD at this point.

[From the Los Angeles Times, March 4, 1996]

CLINTON ISN'T DOING CALIFORNIA'S POOR ANY
FAVORS

(By Curt Pringle)

President Clinton said, "I believe we should ship decision-making responsibility and resources from bureaucracies in Washington to communities, to states and, where we can, directly to individuals." When he makes statements like that about welfare reform, does he seriously expect us to believe him any more?

Since his campaign pledge in 1992 to end welfare, the president has blocked every serious reform effort presented. Last year he vetoed important congressional block grant legislation, for which he had earlier indicated support, which would have given state and local governments more flexibility and control over reform efforts. And last week before a Senate panel, Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala announced that the president will reject the National Governors Assn.'s bipartisan plan to salvage welfare reform this year.

The president's words of reform offer up hope, but his actions betray us at our most desperate hour.

California, like so many states, is hurting. Our social fabric is being ripped apart by federal welfare programs that discourage work, deprive citizens of self-respect and dignity, create long-term intergenerational dependency and compromise the well-being of our children. After \$5.4 trillion spent over the last 30 years for social welfare, we now realize that the federal government's failed "war on poverty" has actually been a war on the values of its own citizens.

We must replace the welfare system in California immediately, before we lose another generation of poor children. Unfortu-

nately, the Clinton administration is standing in our way.

In July 1994, California passed common-sense "family cap" welfare reform legislation to end the perverse practice of increasing payments to welfare recipients who have additional children. This practice usurps the role of husbands and drives men away from their families. But officials at the federal Department of Health and Human Services have denied the necessary federal waiver that would allow California to implement its law.

Our citizens are being held hostage by the federal welfare system, and there is nothing we can do about it.

How can we possibly move Californians into the work force when federal welfare programs pay them the equivalent of \$11.59 an hour not to work? That's 270% more than they can earn with a full-time, minimum-wage job. And how can we discourage teenage girls from getting pregnant and dropping out of school when Washington tells them that for as long as they don't work, don't get married and don't live at home, the government will provide them with free money, free food and a free apartment?

We must take matters into our own hands. California will soon pass the most sweeping welfare reform legislation in the nation's history. The plan will replace the current welfare system with temporary assistance that focuses on reuniting broken families and moving the abled-bodied back into jobs.

The plan also removes disincentives to marriage, work and self-responsibility by establishing flat grants, no higher than minimum wage, that do not increase according to family size. After all, it is unfair to tax low-income working mothers whose wages are not based on family size and use the money to subsidize welfare recipients who choose to have more children. Fairness and self-reliance will be the cornerstones of California's new welfare system.

But without federal approval, these reforms cannot be implemented.

The president says that states must be given more flexibility to do the things they want to without seeking waivers. But by blocking reform efforts in Washington, the president has proved again that he cannot be trusted.

California must be allowed to implement its welfare reform measures without seeking waivers.

We will fight destructive federal welfare programs all the way to the Supreme Court if necessary, until out citizens and families can once again set their own course for opportunity.

TRIBUTE TO JOEL VATTENDAHL

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend, Mr. Joel Vattendahl, who retired from the United Steelworkers of America in December 1995.

Throughout his career, Joel worked tirelessly on behalf of the working men and women of Wisconsin. Joel's career in the labor movement began in 1965 when he was appointed staff representative with the United Steelworkers. In 1981, he was elected to the position of director of United Steelworkers District 32. Joel effectively served in this position until June 1995. He announced his retirement in December 1995.

In addition to his outstanding work with the Steelworkers, Joel has played a crucial role in directing the course of Wisconsin's labor movement and has also been very active in a variety of local and community affairs. From 1981 until his retirement, Joel served as a member of the executive board of the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO. He also was a member of the Worker's Compensation Advisory Council and the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents. His outstanding efforts with these and many other organizations have helped to improve and maintain the quality of life for people throughout our State.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the working men and women of the State of Wisconsin, I would like to thank Joel Vattendahl for his three decades of service and dedication. I wish him a happy and healthy retirement.

COMMEMORATION OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Women's History Month. This is a time to remember that women in this country and all over the world have historically been subject to oppression. This is a time to remember that women in this country and all over the world have been fighting and overcoming this oppression within the context of their own cultural traditions. This is a time to mourn the oppression of the past and present and celebrate the empowerment of women in the present and in the future.

Let us remember that the same fundamental rights and freedoms held by men are also held by women, that women have the same rights to freedom of expression and religion, to individual autonomy and privacy, and to vote and hold government office; that women have the right to an equal education, equal opportunity in employment, and equal pay for equal work; and that women have the right to be free from sexual discrimination and harassment, sexual and physical assault, and spousal abuse.

I challenge my colleagues to remember and honor women who have made their mark on history, and whose work for recognition of women's rights and freedoms has benefited both women and men. These countless women include: Susan B. Anthony, Sojourner Truth, Belle Hooks, and Flo Kennedy, advocates for the rights of women and African Americans; Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, Lucretia Mott, Eleanor Roosevelt, Hillary Clinton, Gloria Steinem, Eleanor Smeal, and Dr. Homa Darabe, advocates for women's rights; and Margaret Sanger and Emma Goldman, advocates for education, autonomy, and responsibility concerning sexuality, reproduction, and birth control.

We should also remember and honor women civil rights leaders, such as Rosa Parks, Dorothy West, Dorothy Height, Juanita Jones Abernathy, LaDonna Harris, Loretta Armenta, Nadine Gardimer, Lani Guinier, and Fannie Lou Hamer. We should remember and honor other social reformers, such as Harriet Tubman, Jane Addams, Mother Jones, Dorothy Day, Clara Barton, Dorothy Dix, Helen Keller, Florence Nightingale, Mother Theresa, and

Marian Wright Edelman. We should remember and honor women scientists, such as Marie Curie, Margaret Mead, and Rachel Carson; and women educators, such as Mary McCleod Bethune and Maria Montessori.

We should remember and honor women writers, such as Jane Austen, Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Gertrude Stein, Virginia Woolf, Amy Chan, Alice Walker, Maxine Hong Kingston, Toni Morrison, Simone de Beauvoir, Bing Xin, and Taslima Nasrin; and poets, such as Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Emily Dickinson, Maya Angelou, and Juana Ines de la Cruz. We should likewise remember and honor women artists, such as Georgia O'Keeffe, Maria Martinez of San Ildefonso, and Frieda Kahlo.

And we should remember and honor women government leaders, such as Barbara Jordan, Bella Abzug, Shirley Chisholm, Geraldine Ferraro, Janet Reno, Dr. Joycelyn Elders, Wilma Mankiller, and Agnes Dill; and such international women leaders as Sylvia Kinigi, Prime Minister of Burundi, Lidia Geiler, President of Bolivia; Siramezo Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon; Corazon Aquino, President of the Philippines; Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, Benazir Bhutto, Prime Minister of Pakistan; and Mary Robinson, President of Ireland. We should also remember such international leaders as Wangari Maathai, Kenyan environmentalist; Aung San Suu Kyi, Burmese democracy activist and Nobel Peace Prize winner; Rigoberta Menchu', Guatemalan Nobel Peace Prize winner; Radhika Coomaraswamy, Sri Lankan academic and U.N. Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women; Gabriela Mistral, Chilean educator, poet, and member of the U.N. Subcommission on Women; Sonia Picado, Judge on the Inter-American Court of Human Rights; and Gertrude Mongella, Tanzanian government minister and organizer of the Fourth U.N. Conference on Women.

These are only a few of the many noted women of the arts, sciences, and leadership who deserve mention. In addition to these women, we should acknowledge and honor all the unsung women who work tirelessly for little or no pay in the home and in the charitable sector.

Women's rights has been on the international agenda since 1975, when the U.N. General Assembly declared 1975 the International Women's Year, and when 1976-85 was declared the U.N. Decade for Women. In 1985, a U.N. Conference on Women was held to evaluate achievements made and work still to be done to realize women's rights. Much progress has been made since 1975, but still much remained to be done.

Consequently, last September, in Beijing, China, the United Nations held the Fourth World Conference on Women. At that conference, women from all over the world came together. These women came from every continent, from every cultural and religious tradition, from countries of every economic situation, but these women all agreed that women's rights are human rights. They reached consensus on a Platform for Action that will be the cornerstone for realizing equal rights and freedoms for women throughout the world.

The Platform for Action recognizes that empowerment of women and equality between women and men are prerequisites for achieving political, social, economic, cultural, and environmental security among all peoples. It

aims at removing the obstacles to women's active participation in all spheres of public and private life through full and equal share in economic, social, cultural, and political decision-making. It promotes the principle of shared power and responsibility between women and men at home, in the workplace, and in the national and international communities. It advocates eradication of all forms of discrimination against women.

The Platform for Action calls for strategic action in the following areas of concern: poverty, education and training, health care, women-focused violence, armed conflict, economic structures and policies, the sharing of power and decision-making, advancement of women, promotion and protection of women's human rights, stereotyping of women in the media, natural resources and the environment, and discrimination against girls.

Realizing these goals and addressing these areas of concern will require a commitment by governments, international institutions, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector throughout the world. Let us all here in Congress commit to doing our part to help realize these goals and address these concerns in our country and in other countries. To this end, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the House in cosponsoring and supporting H. Con. Res. 119, a resolution to support the commitments made by the United States at the Fourth World Conference on Women, and ask the entire body to do so. Additionally, we should ask our colleagues in the Senate to do their part by immediately considering giving its advice and consent to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, now before the Senate. This Convention will do much to help realize women's rights around the world. It entered into force on September 3, 1981, and more than 80 nations are already parties.

Again, Mr. Speaker, on this day, it is an honor to pay tribute to women and celebrate Women's History Month.

URGING MEMBERS TO READ ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS IN BOLIVIA

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1996

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to enter into the RECORD this letter to Secretary of State Warren Christopher regarding human rights in Bolivia. Twenty-eight nongovernmental organizations from the United States wrote this letter to ask the United States Government to ensure that Bolivian antinarcotics police receiving United States assistance comply with Bolivian and international laws when carrying out arrests and that the United States support Bolivian measures to improve human rights.

I am particularly interested in this letter because it highlights the human rights situation in the Andean nations receiving antinarcotics assistance from the United States. I think it is important that we monitor how U.S. assistance is used to ensure that it is used for its stated purpose, and that it does not contribute to human rights violations in the Andean nations. Our commitment to support human rights around the globe requires congressional attention to this matter.