

The Technion, founded in 1924, is Israel's leading science and technology university. With this gift, the Technion will establish a premier business school with the unique combination of a Masters of Business Administration program, advanced technological education, and international management strategy.

Bill Davidson firmly believes that education is the best tool for promoting economic growth. To that end, he has focused enormous philanthropic efforts over the years. In 1992, he gave \$30 million to the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor to create an institute to assist nations around the world in making successful transitions to market economies. In 1994, a gift of \$15 million was made to establish a graduate school of Jewish education at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York City.

This latest gift to the Technion demonstrates Mr. Davidson's conviction that technology-based industries represent a tremendous opportunity for Israel to expand its economy, attract foreign capital, and, in turn, enhance its long-term economic security. The new Davidson school will allow the Technion to leverage its vast technological capabilities through targeted management education and research and thereby make a critical contribution in Israel's quest for economic independence.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Bill Davidson's generosity and vision in creating a remarkable new business school at one of the world's great scientific institutions. This gift will enrich the lives of countless people in Israel and around the world.

INTRODUCING THE INDIAN CHILD ADOPTION ASSISTANCE AND FOSTER CARE ACT

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will allow Native American tribes to better serve children who are in foster care or in need of adoption assistance.

My bill will reimburse tribes under the title IV-E Foster Care and Adoption Assistance Program for children placed by tribal courts. Currently, only States qualify for the Federal funds for adoption assistance and foster care. This means if a native American child is placed with a family by a tribal court, that family receives no additional financial support. If that same child was adopted or placed in foster care by a State court, that family would be provided with extra resources to care for that child.

Last year, the Congress was wise to pass bipartisan welfare reform legislation which preserved the entitlement status of the adoption assistance and foster care programs. These programs reflect our Nation's commitment to taking care of some of the most financially and emotionally needy children in our country. It is a tragedy that any child would be left out of our country's support system.

I hope that you will join me in working to pass this bill in the 105th Congress and provide equal and deserved financial assistance to thousands of Indian children.

A BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to fulfill the pledge I made to the citizens of southern Missouri to introduce and work tirelessly to pass an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that requires a balanced Federal budget. Over the course of the past several decades, fiscal irresponsibility has produced a Federal debt that is fast approaching \$5 trillion. That's trillion, with a "t." Mr. Speaker. A debt of \$5 trillion is a mind-boggling figure, but it can be placed in a much clearer perspective. A child born today immediately inherits nearly \$20,000 of debt, owed directly to Uncle Sam. The same is true for every American. The era of continuing annual budget deficits must end, and it is clear that the only way to restore conservative fiscal values to the Nation's budget is to pass the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

The stakes in this debate could not be more important. The fiscal future of the United States hinges on the ability of Congress and the President to make the difficult choices required to balance the Federal budget. It's more than debating trillion dollar figures. It's about making our economy stronger and providing every working American family with a better chance to make ends meet. A balanced budget will strengthen every sector of our economy with lower interest rates that will help families stretch each paycheck further. Home mortgages, automobiles, and a better education will become more affordable to every working family, making the American Dream closer to reality for all.

Mr. Speaker, I am committed to working with my colleagues in the new Congress to see that the balanced budget constitutional amendment is passed and sent to the States for ratification. A constitutional amendment is certainly no substitute for direct action on the part of the Congress. However, we have seen time and time again instances where those who object to conservative fiscal responsibility find convenient excuses to deny the American people a balanced budget. An unbreakable enforcement mechanism is clearly needed to ensure that those who would continue to spend our children's future further into debt are not able to do so.

I also want to make plain that the Social Security trust fund has no place in this debate. The independent trust fund is a sacred trust between generations and must never be used to balance the budget or hide the true size of the deficit.

Commonsense conservatives in Congress and the American people are committed to balancing the budget. I look forward to working throughout this session with all of my colleagues and the White House to pass the balanced budget constitutional amendment on a bipartisan basis. The obligations we owe to hard working American families, their children, and our Nation's future generations deserve nothing less than decisive action to preserve our future by balancing the budget. A constitutional amendment will ensure this outcome.

FAIR CLEAN AIR COMPLIANCE DOWNWIND FROM POLLUTERS

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that requires the Environmental Protection Agency to consider the downwind transportation of air pollution when determining a region's air quality compliance. This legislation is similar to H.R. 1582, which I introduced in the 104th Congress with the support of the county of San Diego.

In 1990, Congress amended the Clean Air Act to base the smog control requirements for each area on the severity of the area's pollution problem as indicated by the nonattainment area classification. The EPA has established five such classifications: marginal, moderate, serious, severe, or extreme. Under current law nonattainment status is determined without addressing air pollution transported from upwind areas.

Due to pollution blown downwind from the Los Angeles basin, San Diego was initially given a nonattainment classification of severe. San Diego was later reclassified to serious because the ozone design value, 0.185 parts per million, was at the lowest limit of severe. Had the design value been outside that narrow window, San Diego would have been forced to carry out excessively stringent and costly control programs to combat air pollution created and transported from elsewhere.

This situation affects many other communities, too. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me by cosponsoring this legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE A TAX DEDUCTION FOR EMPLOYER-PROVIDED EDU- CATION

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, Mr. LEVIN introduced legislation which makes permanent the tax deduction for employer-provided education. I am an original cosponsor of this legislation which would include graduate education. The Small Business Job Protection Act extended this deduction from December 31, 1994 until January 1, 1997. The provision only included graduate education until December 31, 1995.

The Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee worked to have graduate education included until January 1, 1997. Unfortunately, our efforts fell short. The legislation introduced is extremely important as it would make this deduction permanent and include graduate education.

We should do all that is possible to make education more affordable. Our economy is becoming more global and we need skilled workers in order to compete. Our job growth is occurring in fields which require high skilled workers. We need to provide employees and employers incentives to further their education.

Recently, the General Accounting Office released a report on this provision. This report backs up my belief that this provision of the

Tax Code is used in all fields of business. Large and small businesses take advantage of this provision.

As a former professor, I have taught many students who have benefited from this provision. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation. Hopefully, we can make this valuable deduction permanent. This is the type of legislation we should all be able to support.

IN HONOR OF ROBINSON SECONDARY SCHOOL'S DECA CHAPTER AND THEIR EFFORTS TO PROMOTE ORGAN AND TISSUE DONATION AMONG YOUTHS

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the work and dedication of the members of the Distributive Education Clubs of America [DECA] Chapter at Robinson Secondary School in Fairfax, VA. Along with the Washington Regional Transplant Consortium and the Coalition on Organ and Tissue Donation, the Robinson DECA Chapter has launched an educational campaign aimed at each high school across the Nation in an effort to promote organ and tissue donation among young people.

Promoting their national theme "Youth United, For A Second Chance At Life," the Robinson DECA Chapter was one of three groups organizing a rally of nearly 300 high school students, Members and Congress including myself and Senator BYRON DORGAN, organ and tissue recipients, and donor family members for an organ and tissue donation rally at the U.S. Capitol last month. The turnout and mood of the crowd was inspiring, and their presence represented the first giant step towards creating awareness among America's youth about the importance of becoming organ and tissue donors.

Currently, they are nearly 50,000 people on a national register awaiting organ and tissue transplants. Unfortunately, not every person in need of an organ or tissue is able to receive what they must have to survive; one American dies every three hours because of a shortage of donor organs. More than 50 people can be helped by a single donor but each year, 12,000 to 15,000 people die who are medically suitable to be organ and tissue donors. For these crucial reasons, we must focus our local and national efforts on educating young people and their families about the serious need to decide now—rather than wait until it is too late—on whether or not they will commit to becoming an organ and tissue donor. While there are many private sector organizations which promote public awareness of the need for organ donation, I am truly proud of the students of Robinson's DECA Chapter and their unprecedented effort to ignite the compassion and understanding of their peers.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in applauding the members of Robinson's DECA Chapter for their enthusiasm and diligent work in helping each other understand the necessity of deciding to become an organ donor and for aiding their fellow Americans who desperately need all of us to become organ and tissue donors.

THE POSTAL PRIVACY ACT OF 1997

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Postal Privacy Act of 1997. This legislation is intended to protect the privacy of each U.S. resident who files a change of address notice with the U.S. Postal Service. The bill is identical to a bill that I introduced in the 104th Congress.

Few people are aware that when they tell the Postal Service about an address change, the Postal Service makes the information public through a program called National Change of Address [NCOA]. NCOA has about two dozen licensees—including many large direct mail companies—who receive all new addresses and sell address correction services to mailers. If you give your new address to the Postal Service, it will be distributed to thousands of mailers. People always ask "How did they get my new address?" The answer may be that it came from the Postal Service. People who want their mail forwarded—and who doesn't—have no choice. File a change of address notice and your name and new address will be sold.

NCOA is a reasonable program because it saves the Postal Service and the mailing community money by making everyone more efficient. There are consumer benefits as well. I support NCOA, but it needs one small change. Individuals who file a change of address notice should be given a choice. They should have the option of having their mail forwarded without having their name and address sold to the world of direct mail advertisers and others who traffic in personal information. This is what the Postal Privacy Act will do. It will give people a choice. It will not end the NCOA program.

Who might be concerned about keeping a new address private? Anyone who has fled an abusive spouse does not want the Postal Service giving out a new address. An individual who files a change of address notice on behalf of a deceased relative will not want the new address sold. Imagine sorting through the affairs of a deceased family member only to receive a mound of unwanted mail offering new products and services to that family member from marketers who assume that the person has moved to a new home. Jurors in highly visible trials, public figures, and others may have a special need for privacy as might elderly people who may be more vulnerable to unwanted solicitations.

The bottom line is that everyone should have a choice about how his or her name and address is made available to others. You don't have to have a justification. It should be your decision. The Postal Service should not make this decision for you.

A few years ago, the Postal Service announced that it would provide some protection to individuals who have court orders protecting them against spousal abuse. This was a small step in the right direction, but it was not enough. Only those who have gone to the trouble and expense of obtaining a court order receive protection. Everyone should be entitled to the same option, but without the need for a court order. The Postal Service has demonstrated that it is possible to provide protec-

tion to people selectively. I want to extend the option to everyone.

There is nothing new about giving consumers a choice. The Direct Marketing Association, a trade association for the direct marketing industry, has been a strong supporter of opt-out procedures which give individuals a choice about what type of mail they receive. The association supports its own mail preference service that offers consumers an option. There is no reason why the Postal Service cannot do the same thing.

The Postal Privacy Act of 1997 is based on work done by the Government Operations Committee. Those who seek more information about NCOA should read Give Consumers A Choice: Privacy Implications of U.S. Postal Service National Change of Address Program (House Report 102-1067).

There have been several interesting developments since that 1992 congressional report. In 1996, the General Accounting Office investigated the NCOA program and found that oversight of NCOA licensees by the Postal Service was inadequate to prevent, detect, and correct potential breaches of licensing agreements. The report was prepared at my request, and it showed that the Postal Service's NCOA protections were poorly administered. GAO found weaknesses in the seeding program, in the audit of NCOA licensees, and in the review of licensee advertising. GAO also found that the use by licensees of NCOA data for the purpose of creating a new movers list violates the Privacy Act of 1974. This adds to findings in the Government Operations Committee report that the NCOA program is operating in violation of several laws. The GAO report is titled "U.S. Postal Service: Improved Oversight Needed to Protect Privacy of Address Changes" (GAO/GGD-96-119) (August 1996).

Another new development recently came to light courtesy of the Internet. An organization called Private Citizen recently suggested in an Internet privacy discussion group that there is already a way to stop the Postal Service from selling a new address. The change of address form allows consumers to indicate if a new address is permanent or temporary. If you check the permanent box, your first class mail is forwarded for a year and your new address is sold through the NCOA program. If you check the temporary box and indicate that the move is for 364 days, you will receive the same mail forwarding service, but the Postal Service does not sell addresses when a move is temporary. I verified with the Postal Service that this is correct.

There is even a bonus of sorts for those who check the temporary box. The Postal Service will not honor mailer ancillary service endorsements requesting a new address through an address correction requested endorsement. This is another way that the Postal Service releases new addresses of its customers to anyone who asks. Those who check the temporary box can evade this form of disclosure as well.

The Postal Service's treatment of the addresses of temporary movers suggests two interesting consequences. First, the existing system demonstrates that the Postal Service already can distinguish between addresses that are to be sold and those that are not to be sold. Arguments that giving consumers a choice will be difficult or expensive are false.