

years he was part owner and general manager of Jacobs Chevrolet, one of the largest and best known auto dealers in the Midwest.

The lessons Terry learned growing up in Illinois have been reflected in his daily activities. Not only is Terry a hard worker, he understands the importance of community and the need for everyone to work together toward a common goal. As a result, he treats everyone he works with throughout the day with respect and compassion. Terry is regarded as an invaluable resource by his friends and coworkers who depend on him for advice and support.

For the last 21 years, Terry has been actively involved in our community, dedicating a substantial amount of his time and personal resources to civic, charitable, humanitarian, and government causes. He has been active in the City of Hope, the Boys and Girls Club of San Fernando Valley, and the American Cancer Society, as well as many other important organizations.

Terry has been honored with several distinguished awards to recognize his accomplishments, such as the Spirit of Life Award by the City of Hope and the Free Enterprise Award by the San Fernando Valley Business and Professional Association. Most recently, Terry and his wife Carole were honored by the March of Dimes with the Premiere Parent Award.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in paying tribute to Terry York. He is a role model for the citizens of Los Angeles.

THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND PLAN— AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, this body has spent a good deal of time in recent years trying to come up with ways to balance the budget—much of it to no avail. The good news is that the Treasury Department announced that the end of the 1997 fiscal year brought the smallest budget deficit in ages—\$22.6 billion. The bad news is that Washington can claim little credit for this deficit reduction. The credit should go to American taxpayers prospering in a strong and dynamic U.S. economy and pumping more revenue into the Treasury than many Washington policy wonks predicted. Nevertheless, a balanced budget is finally in sight for the first time since 1969.

Now that Washington may soon see a budget surplus, a number of bills have been introduced in Congress in an effort to contribute to the debate on how that surplus should be spent. The leading bills propose to use part of the surplus to pay down the enormous Federal debt while using the rest to provide tax relief. I have cosponsored one of these bills and believe very strongly that we must protect the budget surplus from Washington's big spenders.

It is in this context that I would encourage Members to look at a bill I introduced earlier this year, H.R. 2329, the National Dividend Act of 1997. The proposal upon which this bill has been crafted has been around for some time,

and the concept has been favorably received by President Ronald Reagan, the National Commission on Economic Growth and Tax Reform—the Kemp Commission—and various congressional committees. The dividend plan has, over the years, enjoyed the support of a bipartisan and ideologically diverse group of Members. At one time, it was introduced by our former colleague Guy Vander Jagt and, most recently, our colleague BILLY TAUZIN introduced the plan. I was a cosponsor of these bills and now Mr. TAUZIN has joined me as a cosponsor of H.R. 2329.

The National Dividend Act of 1997 is the latest incarnation of a plan developed by John H. Perry, Jr., a businessman and philanthropist. Mr. Perry's idea was to give Americans an incentive to be involved in the Federal budget process by giving voters a National Dividend once the Federal budget is in balance. Much like a profitable business shares its economic successes with its shareholders in the form of dividends, the National Dividend will share the economic prosperity of a balanced budget and fiscal restraint with those Americans who participated in the democratic process which led to the balanced budget.

To accomplish this goal, the bill first establishes a cap on Federal spending at the current level for 5 years or until a surplus is finally achieved. Based on the current budget estimates, Congress could bring about a surplus as early as next year.

Next, the bill creates a National Dividend Trust Fund by setting aside tax dollars from the general fund of the Treasury eventually equal to the revenue raised by the corporate income tax as well as selected other excise and tariff revenues. Once the fund reaches 100 percent of the specified revenue, disbursements will be given in equal amounts to all registered voters in years in which the Federal budget is in surplus. If the budget is not balanced, revenues in the fund can be used to eliminate the deficit.

The bill also not only eliminates the tax on corporate dividends, but also the National Dividend. To keep a future Congress from abusing this program, safeguards have been built into the plan. First, the corporate tax rate will be frozen at its current level. Second, a two-thirds majority vote of both Houses will be necessary to increase taxes. Short of a declared war, a future tax and spend Congress will be restrained from raising taxes simply to finance the National Dividend Trust Fund.

I commend the National Dividend Act of 1997 to the attention of my colleagues and urge them to support the bill as we work to put the Nation's fiscal house in order.

BART BREAKS GROUND ON RAPID TRANSIT TO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the groundbreaking of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit [BART] Extension to the San Francisco International Airport [SFO]. The groundbreaking, which took place on Monday of this week, marked one of the most significant transportation milestones in

the bay area. It was my great pleasure to join the many residents and elected officials of the peninsula and the bay area who have worked hard to bring fast, efficient mass transportation to the San Francisco Airport. It was a great pleasure to participate in the festivities marking the long-awaited beginning of construction of this world-class transportation link for the entire bay area.

Mr. Speaker, the BART Extension to the airport will connect the 95 mile, four-county BART rapid transit system to the fifth busiest airport in the United States and the seventh busiest airport in the world. The 8.7 mile extension will consist of 7.5 miles of new mainline track, much of which will be underground, and 1.2 miles of track linking the system with the San Francisco International Airport. The BART Extension will expand commuter rail service on the peninsula in and out the city through three new stations in peninsula communities—South San Francisco, San Bruno and Millbrae—and a station at the airport. The BART Extension will provide fast and easy service for travelers directly to the airport for the entire bay area, including the east bay.

Mr. Speaker, the BART Extension to the airport is the cornerstone of BART's rail expansion program—the biggest bay area transit project since BART was built in the early 1970's. The project is also an excellent model for Federal-State cooperation in public transportation investment. Fully seventy percent of BART's expansion program is paid for by State and local funds.

The voters of San Mateo County have indicated their overwhelming support for the BART Extension at the ballot box in a series of referendum data back to 1980's when voters approved measures in 1985 and 1987 which allocated local funding through SamTrans to bring BART to the airport. Subsequent measures in 1992 and 1994 reaffirmed our region's support for a BART Extension to the airport and the willingness of our residents to contribute a fair share of those costs.

Mr. Speaker, the BART Extension will provide fast and convenient access for travelers and will help alleviate traffic congestion on neighboring freeways. Traffic on peninsula freeways near the airport and into San Francisco already exceed existing highway capacities, particularly during peak commute periods. The airport is already the single largest generator of traffic congestion—over 65 percent of air passengers and employees drive to the airport. The airport's own expansion program is expected to increase annual air traffic by some 70 percent by the year 2006. The extension of BART to the airport will provide much-needed effective mass transit alternative for travelers throughout the bay area.

Mr. Speaker, the BART Extension to the airport will also provide an important economic catalyst for San Mateo County and the entire bay area. The extension will create or sustain between 30,000 and 40,000 construction jobs and more than 12,000 permanent jobs once the extension is in operation. Construction will create new business opportunities for peninsula suppliers and vendors. When completed, the BART Extension will improve access to local businesses and retailers and will significantly enhance the region's important travel and tourism industry.

Mr. Speaker, the BART Extension will provide an effective transportation alternative for hundreds of thousands of bay area residents

to help provide relief from wasted time and energy spent tied up in traffic congestion. BART's expected ridership on the peninsula will eventually reduce close to 100,000 cars a day on neighboring freeways. Getting people out of their cars and off of freeways will help improve air quality in our region and will conserve fuel.

We have waited a long time on the peninsula for relief from the gridlock which exists on our freeways, Mr. Speaker. I have been a strong and consistent advocate since the 1950's for a mass transit system completely around the San Francisco Bay. I see the beginning of construction on the long-awaited extension of BART to the airport as a further important step in that direction. I look forward to the day when construction is complete and we will put this much-needed rapid transit extension to the airport into service.

CONGRATULATING JAMIE CLEMENTS ON HIS RETIREMENT AS LEGAL COUNSEL OF SCOTT & WHITE

HON. CHET EDWARDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Mr. Jamie Clements on his December retirement as legal counsel for Scott & White Hospital in Temple, TX. I Hope Members will join with me today to thank Mr. Clements for his contributions to Scott & White, his community, and the country.

During his adult life, Mr. Clements dedicated himself to the legal and medical professions. He also found time to devote countless hours to local causes and charities.

Mr. Clements was born in 1930 in Crockett, TX. He attended the University of Texas at Austin where he received both a B.A. in 1953 with the first of his three terms as a Texas House Representative. His Texas House service was interrupted when he went to serve his country in the U.S. Marines Corps. From 1956-58 he was an infantry platoon leader before moving to the 3d Marine Air Wing where he was a legal officer. In 1959, he returned to the Texas House where he served his third and final term.

For the next 35 years, Jamie Clements established himself as a prominent member of the State and national bar associations and a strong leader in the field of medical law. He served as chairman for the committee on Liaison with the Medical Profession for the Texas Bar Association. He is the founder and past president of the National Health Lawyers Association. Jamie Clements is a professor of medical jurisprudence at the Texas A&M University College of Medicine, a member of the Government's Committee on Organ Transplantation and is a former president of the Board of Trustee of the Presbyterian Children's Home and Service Agency of Texas. He capped his legal/medical career with his present position as legal counsel of Scott & White Hospital.

In addition to his contributions to the legal and medical professions, Mr. Clements was an active member of the Temple community. From 1964 through 1965 he was the president of the Temple Rotary Club. In 1969 he was

the chairman of the Temple Planning Commission and from 1970 to 1974 served as mayor of Temple. He went on to serve Temple as the chairman of the Law Enforcement Advisory Board, president of the Cultural Activities Center, a member of the Board of Directors of the Temple Industrial Foundation, and the president of the Temple Leadership Council.

On a personal note, I am grateful to call Jamie Clements a close, personal friend. He is a role model for all of us: a man of integrity, decency and compassion.

Let me also say that every accolade to Jamie Clements must also be considered a tribute to his wife of 35 years, Ann Trigg Clements. As a wife and a mother she has been a true partner in all of Jamie Clement's accomplishments.

Jamie and Ann Clements have made their community and our country a better place. They have personally touched the lives of all of us who know them and thousands of others who are the beneficiaries of their unselfish service.

I ask members to join me in wishing Jamie, Ann and their three children every success and happiness in the future.

JOHN MILTON GREGORY
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the students at John Milton Gregory elementary School located in the 7th Congressional district on Chicago's Westside. Recently, we conducted a town hall meeting on education with the student body at that school. I would like to thank Dr. Hazel Steward, education officer for the Chicago Public Schools [CPS], Mr. Artie Borders, principal at Gregory and Mr. Lafayette Ford, local school council liaison for the CPS, for their assistance. The meeting will be broadcast on Cable Access TV (channel 19) on November 19, 1997 at 2 p.m., and again at 7 p.m.

The Gregory students were informed, thoughtful, and articulate. They were genuinely concerned about the differences between inner city and suburban schools. The questions were, and I quote, "Why are suburban books newer than ours?" "Why are suburban desks newer than ours?" "Why is our equipment older?"; and "Why don't we have recess anymore?" These were big questions from young people that are intelligent enough to understand and recognize these differences. Gregory students were asking the same type of questions as Members of Congress.

In response to their questions, I had to tell the children at Gregory School that the majority in Congress was more committed to funding a \$21 billion weapons program to purchase nine B-2 stealth bombers than placing these resources where they are desperately needed; in our educational system. I had to tell the children at Gregory that the U.S. Air Force does not even want or need these bombers. I had to tell the children at Gregory that the average urban school needs \$1.7 million for repairs and upgrade, and we claim the title of being the richest country in the world. And I had to tell the children at Gregory that

the majority in Congress does not see the need to heavily invest in our Nation's future, our children. Anyone who does not understand why we should be investing in public education ought to tune in on November 19 and be enlightened.

INTRODUCTION OF "THE OSHA COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE ACT"

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to codify the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's [OSHA] consultation program. This is one in a series of bills which are intended to continue the process of changing OSHA.

More than 2 years ago, President Clinton, in response to our demands for changes in OSHA, promised to "reinvent" OSHA. One of the principal changes in that promised reinvention was "to give employers a choice between partnership with OSHA or traditional enforcement."

Unfortunately, OSHA's principal initiative for giving employers a choice, the so-called cooperative compliance programs has evolved into a program of targeted enforcement, as even OSHA now acknowledges.

In contrast, there are programs, operated by the States, which do give employers the choice of partnership or traditional enforcement. These relatively small programs have received some Federal funding since the 1970's. However, authorization for such consultation programs has never been made a part of the OSHAct, and, not incidentally, consultation has been one of the most underfunded and frequently ignored aspects of OSHA's program. In some states, an employer who requests consultation assistance must wait more than 1 year, sometimes 2 years, to receive it.

The lack of funding and recognition for the consultation and education programs is in contrast to their recognized importance toward meeting the goal of safer workplaces. In fact, in 1996 the \$32 million appropriated for consultation programs allowed States to conduct approximately 24,000 consultation visits, while the same number of Federal enforcement inspections—24,000—cost OSHA over \$120 million. My own company has participated in the North Carolina consultation program, and we have found that it truly is a way in which employers can work in partnership with OSHA and improve safety and health.

My legislation is based on the program in North Carolina, which operates with a combination of Federal and State funds. As is the case with the existing Federal funding, under the bill States would receive grants to provide both on-site consultation and other education and training activities. Employers who requested an on-site consultation or audit would not be subject to fines unless they failed to correct violations. Employers who request an on-site consultation and do correct violations may be exempt from OSHA general schedule inspections for 1 year.

The legislation specifies that not less than 90 percent of OSHA's compliance assistance funding should be used for the consultation