

Most people agree that returning children to their family is desirable. The disagreement occurs with respect to what constitutes "reasonable efforts." Critics say that states frequently put family preservation above child protection. They worry that too often children are reunited with parents who are still dangerous. In addition, critics charge that children are allowed to languish in foster care too long, denying them the stability and security they need to prosper.

Some suggest a different standard for decisions regarding family unification: the "best interests of the child." But concerns have been raised that this is as subjective as "reasonable efforts," and could swing the pendulum too far in the other direction, removing children too hastily from families. Some also argue that family preservation could work more often if only greater resources were available.

Congress has taken some steps to address these concerns. With my support, earlier this year the House passed a bill which clarifies that states do not have to make a "reasonable effort" to preserve families if the child has been subjected to "aggravated circumstances," like abandonment, torture, or sexual abuse; the child's parent has killed or assaulted another of his children; or a parent's rights to a sibling of the child have already been terminated. The bill requires that children's health and safety be of paramount concern in efforts to preserve or reunite families. The bill would also push states to make greater and prompt efforts to place children for adoption if they cannot be reunited with their parents. The Senate has not yet acted on this measure.

CONCLUSION:

The family is the best institution for rearing children, and most families do it very well. The question of what to do when parents fail their children is seldom a simple one. Some cases are clear cut, but many require difficult judgment calls.

Congress must ensure that states have adequate resources to protect children and provide abusive parents who want to change the help they need to do. Efforts to reunite abused children with their families are critical, but we must be willing to abandon those efforts if they are not working. Congress should also ensure that states have flexibility to respond to the unique needs of children and families in crisis. And we must all support the work of community organizations, churches, and other groups which seek to help foster healthy families.

TRIBUTE TO THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 1, 1997

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the tremendous work of the Small Business Committee on the Small Business Programs Reauthorization and Amendments Acts of 1997. As a member of this committee I can attest to the effort that went into this bill. I am especially pleased at the reauthorization of the Small Business Technology Transfer Program [STTR]. In 1992 there was a great need for STTR and I took the lead in supplementing the already successful Small Business Innovative Research Program [SBIR] with this effort to tap into the vast resources of innovation that exist at our universities and nonprofit institutions. This program has stimu-

lated much needed research in the science and technology sectors and has proven successful in developing the best ideas at our universities and federally-funded research centers and allowing them to be commercially viable. I thank Chairman TALENT and Congressman LAFALCE for their support.

This legislation provides much needed funds for worthy programs, such as the Micro-loan program, that help give a jump start to small businesses. Other valuable programs worth mentioning are the Certified Development Companies [CDC's], listed in title II. With this language the CDC's will be able to expand their program to admit more qualified CDC's which would alleviate the load for SBA. Many small business owners will see less redtape and can expect to see a more efficient system that will help expedite their paperwork.

In addition, the SBA reauthorization bill allocates funding to its microlending partners to provide added support for technical assistance for transportation and child care assistance. I applaud Congressmen BALDACCIO and FLAKE for their efforts and timeless energy dedicated to this provision in this legislation. The small business community was in great need of such a helpful program. In this day of two income families and single parents, child care assistance is a huge relief for parents who need to work and pay the bills.

Another important provision in the Small Business programs Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1997 is the Women's Business Enterprises. This legislation continues strong support for women's business efforts, including expanding the women's business center program, which provides seed funding for business training centers throughout this Nation and is one of the SBA's most successful programs.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few years the people of southern Illinois have suffered a great deal due to high unemployment, yet are undaunted. The 19th Congressional District continues to search for new industries and opportunities. Small businesses are critical to this effort. The people of Illinois and the Nation want to move on and capitalize on the many opportunities that await them. It is essential that we continue to provide the SBA with the resources to effect positive economic changes in this country. I congratulate the bi-partisan effort involved in crafting this bill, and urge my colleagues to support it.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SOOKY GOLDMAN

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 1, 1997

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. BERMAN and I ask our colleagues to join us in congratulating Sooky Goldman, who is being honored by the Maple Counseling Center in Beverly Hills at their 25th Anniversary Ball. We are delighted to join Sooky's family and friends in recognizing her extraordinary charitable contributions.

For the past 25 years, Sooky has been an exemplary leader in civic and philanthropic

work. Her efforts have been recognized by more than 30 organizations ranging from the Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce and YMCA to People Assisting the Homeless [PATH] and the Beverly Hills Police Department. In addition, Sooky created the William O. Douglas Classroom which has provided countless children from all over Los Angeles County the opportunity to experience the beauty of the Santa Monica mountains. She has a well-earned reputation for the tireless dedication and enthusiasm she brings to each project she undertakes.

The Maple Counseling Center in Beverly Hills, which provides low fee mental health counseling for nearly 500 individuals each week, depends greatly on its committed supporters. Its work is particularly needed in the current climate of scarcity of funding for mental health services. As a principal founder of the center, Sooky has enriched and broadened its mission of offering comprehensive and high quality mental health services to those most in need.

While Sooky is active in many causes, she has always placed a great importance on her family. She is fortunate to have a loving and supportive husband, Sam, three children, David, Joel and Kaye, and seven grandchildren. Despite her many commitments, Sooky has successfully managed to strike a balance between her public and private lives.

Our community owes a great debt of gratitude to Sooky, and we ask our congressional colleagues to join us in saluting her for her singular achievements. We wish her every happiness and success in the future.

PRESIDENT CLINTON HONORS NINA ARCHABAL AND MARTIN MARTY

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 1, 1997

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to recognize the distinguished work of Nina Archabal and Martin Marty and to congratulate them on their honor. This week, Nina and Martin were among 10 Americans to whom President Clinton bestowed the National Humanities Medal for extraordinary achievement in the humanities. On this the first day of October, the beginning of National Arts and Humanities Month, it is very appropriate that we celebrate those that enable many of us to enjoy and experience the arts and humanities.

As the director of the Minnesota Historical Society, Nina Archabal has renewed interest in Minnesota's heritage and infused it with new life. In the last 5 years, her energy and dedication has carried the Minnesota History Center in St. Paul from a dream to one of the Nation's premier centers for the preservation and presentation of history. By giving all groups the ability to express their unique histories, she allows Minnesotans to celebrate their diversity while transcending their differences in race, ethnicity, age, gender, or creed. Most recently, Nina was selected to serve on the American Folk Life Center board of the Library of Congress.

In these hectic times, it is very easy to lose sight of our cultural and social heritage. However, through the study of history we learn to

build on the strengths and traditions of our past to create a better foundation for our future. We realize how our past influences our present and informs us of our decisions and actions in the future. Individuals, like Nina Archabal, dedicate their time and energy to ensure that we will always learn from those that came before us.

Nina's enthusiasm has caught on in Minnesota. Under her leadership, the Minnesota Historical Society has thrived, boasting the largest membership of any State historical society in the Nation. I am personally grateful, as are the people of St. Paul and Minnesota, for the endeavors of admirable individuals, like Nina Archabal, who, through her diligent and spirited efforts has ensured that the heritage of Minnesota will remain alive and accessible for generations to come.

As a religious scholar, professor and author, Martin Marty has been instrumental in bringing religion into the lives of the American people. In this challenging time of balancing work and family responsibilities, more and more Americans are examining the role of religion, faith, and spirituality in their lives. Unfortunately, religion is often used to divide rather than unite individuals. Martin, through the establishment of the religion project at the University of Chicago, reverses this trend and uses religion as a vehicle for understanding among diverse groups and organizations. His values and spirit are instilled not only in his students but also in his son, Minnesota State Senator John Marty. Senator Marty has brought this same level of understanding, fairness, and inclusiveness to his work at the State legislature.

Mr. Speaker, dedicated and creative individuals such as Martin Marty and Nina Archabal are among our Nation's most valuable resources in retaining a positive and comprehensive perspective on our past and future.

I ask that the full text of an article from the St. Paul Pioneer Press be printed in the RECORD so that my colleagues can read about the achievements of these outstanding individuals.

[From the St. Paul (MN) Pioneer Press]

CLINTON HONORS MINNESOTAN FOR HER WORK ON STATE HISTORY CENTER—ARCHABAL AMONG 20 GIVEN MEDALS FOR HUMANITIES, ARTS ACHIEVEMENTS

(By Bill Salisbury)

WASHINGTON.—At a ceremony on the south lawn of the White House on Monday, Minnesota Historical Society Director Nina Archabal was in prominent company. She rubbed shoulders with the likes of actors Angela Lansbury and Jason Robards, jazz singer Betty Carter, bluegrass musician Doc Watson, theologian Martin Marty and author Studs Terkel.

They were among 20 Americans on whom President Clinton and first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton bestowed the National Humanities Medal and the National Medal of Arts.

When the president placed a humanities medal around Archabal's neck before a crowd of more than 1,000, it was in recognition of her leadership in helping develop the 5-year-old Minnesota History Center in St. Paul—one of the nation's premier centers for the preservation and presentation of history—and for her work in bringing history to life.

"She is a fireball who lets no one stand in her way when the issue is to preserve Minnesota's history," Clinton said. "In the state of Minnesota, she's a bridge builder between native peoples and other Minnesotans, helping them to share their stories. To America,

she exemplifies how tradition forms everyday life and shapes history.

"Just this morning," he added with a grin, "she told the president that it was high time he hightailed it out to Minnesota to see exactly what she's doing."

Archabal, 57, of St. Paul, has headed the Historical Society since 1986. It has the largest membership of any state historical society in the nation.

The National Endowment for the Humanities said in a statement that Archabal has helped transform meticulous scholarship into history programs meaningful to people. The endowment also praised her for helping Minnesota Indians tell the stories of their culture and traditions to native and non-native people.

After the ceremony, Archabal said: "This award is really for all the people of Minnesota. No one could do this alone, and I wish everyone could have this medal to wear because they deserve it."

What makes Minnesota unique, she said, is its deep, longstanding commitment to preserving a heritage that started with its territorial founders.

"The items we preserve and the stories we tell are not only about the Minnesotans we all know—the Hubert Humphreys and Charles Lindberghs—they are the stories of all the people that make Minnesota what it is today," she said. "That is our strength."

Another of the humanities medal recipients has a Minnesota connection. Marty, a renowned scholar of American religious history at the University of Chicago, is the father of state Sen. John Marty, DFL-Roseville, who attended the White House ceremony with other members of his family.

The senior Marty teaches and directs a public religion project. A past president of the American Academy of Religion, he is the author of 50 books and the senior editor of the weekly magazine *Christian Century* and the biweekly newsletter *Context*.

MICHAEL DUKAKIS SETS A GOOD EXAMPLE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 1, 1997

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, several very valuable commodities are unfortunately rare in politics these days—as they are in other aspects of our life. Among these prized entities are acts of graciousness, complete intellectual honesty, extremely lucid thinking, and, probably rarest of all, a willingness to go to the aid of a colleague being unfairly attacked, rather than to gloat secretly over his or her distress.

This makes the article written by former Massachusetts Gov. Michael Dukakis in the *New York Times* for September 29 both extremely rare and extraordinarily valuable. In this article, Governor Dukakis, who was during his many years in elected office a model of integrity, rebuts the unfair accusations that have been made against Vice President GORE and President Clinton involving telephone requests for contributions. I do have one correction—Governor Dukakis refers to a comment I once made about his resistance to any effort unduly to influence him on behalf of contributors by saying that I had referred to him as the only "true ingrate" in politics. In fact, my recollection is that I referred to him as the only example I could think of, of a "perfect ingrate", in

that he better than anyone I knew in high office was able to withstand the pressures that result from elected officials having to raise large sums of money from private individuals on a regular basis. Then, and now, I cited his rarity in this regard as the best argument for replacing our current campaign contribution system with public financing—a point Governor Dukakis himself makes in the article. But, like Governor Dukakis, I am prepared to settle for less than perfect reform and the current version of the McCain-Feingold bill seems to me to meet that definition, so I join him in supporting that.

But most important, I want to commend him for his willingness to use his own extremely well earned reputation for absolute integrity to come to the defense of Vice President GORE and President Clinton against some unfair accusations being leveled at them, and I therefore ask that his thoughtful, admirable article be printed here.

I RAISED MONEY FROM MY OFFICE. So?

I get an odd sort of flashback when I hear about the uproar over the Vice President's fund-raising phone calls. I can see him reaching for the phone, dialing the number, making his pitch. I can see it all because I've done it myself, under roughly similar circumstances.

When I was running for re-election as Governor of Massachusetts in 1986, I had two phones on my desk. One was white—the state phone. The other was red—the campaign phone, a separate line paid for entirely by my campaign committee.

Massachusetts had (and still has) a law much like the Federal one that's now in the news, prohibiting fund-raising inside a state building. Yet I made hundreds of campaign calls on that red phone, and it never dawned on me or anyone else that doing so violated the law.

It's not that I was cavalier about fund-raising—that's why I had the separate phone lines. I tried to set a very high standard for my gubernatorial campaigns when it came to raising money. (Barney Frank once said that I was the only true ingrate in American politics because I was so unresponsive to my contributors.) No PAC's. No corporations. No registered lobbyists involved in the fundraising process.

But the red phone never made my "no" list. That's because the Massachusetts law was not intended to prohibit such things, and neither are its Federal cousins.

Both were part of the civil service reform movement of the late 19th century that was intended to end wholesale political patronage, create a merit system and protect civil servants from being forced by their superiors or by party bosses to contribute to political campaigns. Al Gore was treading on none of that territory with his fund-raising calls.

What do his critics expect the Vice President (or the President, who may also have made such calls) to do? Go across the street to a pay phone? And what if the person is not in and calls him back at the White House? Is it a criminal offense for the Vice President or, for that matter, a member of Congress while at his or her desk to accept a call from a political supporter or contributor?

What troubles me about this kind of foolishness is that it is diverting our attention from the things that really need fixing. It's not where you make the phone calls that is the problem. It is the people and organizations that candidates are going after and the virtually unlimited sums of money that the soft-money loopholes permits them to raise.

Millions of special-interest dollars continue to flow into the coffers of both major