influenced by an intense desire to give back to her community, Ms. Britton Fraser has wholeheartedly pursued her goals.

In 1992, in the course of her career as a lawyer, Ms. Britton Fraser met and married Errol Fraser, a certified public accountant. The couple currently resides in Brooklyn where she is a court attorney for Judge Bernard Fuchs of the New York City Civil Court. She continues to pursue that the belief that ''justice is being served for all,'' but particularly for those who are poor and downtrodden in our community.

For these reasons, it gives me great pleasure to Salute Ms. Beverly Britton Fraser, a community hero. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Ms. Britton Fraser.

LET THE CHILDREN PRAY

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, prayer in schools has moved to the front burner in American politics, and for good reason. Today, in many communities across the country, children are forbidden to pray in schools. Not just forbidden to participate in organized prayer, which most constitutional scholars believe would violate the U.S. Constitution, but forbidden to pray voluntarily, which is well within every child's constitutional rights.

For this reason, I have introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives that would amend the Constitution to make it perfectly clear that voluntary school prayer is a fundamental right that all school children enjoy. The amendment, which is just 33 words, simply states:

Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit the inclusion of voluntary prayer in any public school program or activity. Neither the United States nor any State shall prescribe the content of any such prayer.

It is a sad commentary on the state of American jurisprudence that such an amendment is necessary. it should be obvious to all that the Government has no business, and no right, to prohibit voluntary prayer by anyone. Nevertheless, liberal activists have succeeded in propagating the idea that any school prayer violates the separation of church and state.

Nothing could be further from the truth. If anything, my amendment would restore a proper understanding of the church-state separation issue. School children would be permitted to pray voluntarily, but no Government entity could determine the content of such prayer—which is as it should be.

There are those in America who would like to see not only prayer, but all other religious expression banished from public life altogether. They will not succeed. Our Nation was founded on Judeo-Christian principles and values that have just as much right to expression in the public arena as the culture relativism so fashionable today.

It is amazing that in a time when civility seems to be breaking down all around us that school prayer could be regarded as a threat. On the contrary, it is the removal of moral influences from public life that has contributed to our Nation's social ills. By introducing a constitutional amendment to ensure the rights of school children to voluntary pray in school, I hope I have made a small contribution toward a restoration of the legitimate place of religion in society.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR CERTAIN PERSIAN GULF EVACUEES

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to provide for the permanent resident status for certain Persian Gulf War Evacuees.

During the Persian Gulf War, the United States decided to evacuate some 200 families, approximately 2,000 individuals, the majority of whom are stateless Palestinians, who had been living in Kuwait. The United States Government evacuated these families to the United States after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait but before the United States military intervention in that conflict, because the families all had American children and some had harbored American citizens during Iraq's occupation.

The families initially were given temporary protected status, and before President Bush left office he approved deferred enforced departure [DED] for the families. This status was continued each year thereafter by President Clinton. However, on December 31, 1996, the White House did not continue the DED status. Once in the United States, these families began making a life, including having additional children. The majority of the families have received permanent residency status. However, approximately 47 families have not received permanent residency status and have now suddenly found themselves faced with deportation. Kuwait will not accept them back into the country. Most of the parents hold Jordanian passports, but are not necessarily Jordanian citizens. Even if Jordan could accept them, Jordan is already burdened with tens of thousands of Palestinians who left Kuwait during the War. In addition, in Jordan the families will have no economic assistance, no jobs in an economy that is already burdened with unemployed people, and no health care for their children. This will all work to create severe hardship on the children who are American citizens and essentially will sentence them to a life of impoverishment.

These families are principally composed of professionals and technical people who are dependent upon no one for their support in the United States except by their own labor. They have maintained an excellent record of citizens training. They are a definite asset to this country.

Mr. Speaker, going through with the deportation would be an act of great injustice for a small group of people who did not ask to be evacuated here in the first place. But now that they are here, fairness would require that they be permitted to adjust their status so that they may continue to raise their American citizen children in this society.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation to allow this small group to adjust their status to permanent residents [immigrants]. Many of the families placed themselves at grave risk by harboring American citizens during Iraq's occupation of Kuwait—keeping them safe until they could leave or until American intervention could drive the Iraqi's out.

Deporting these few [47] families with American-born children is not the way for a grateful Nation to show its thanks. Enacting this bill, granting them permanent immigrant status, is.

CALIFORNIA CIVIL RIGHTS INITIATIVE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of five citizens given last night in a tribute to Ward Connerly, the chairman of the recent campaign for the California Civil Rights Initiative. These five people shared with us their own personal experiences dealing with racial preferences. I would like to recognize them for their courage in speaking out on such a divisive issue.

REMARKS BY JANICE CAMARENA

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Janice Camarena, and I am glad to be here to honor Ward Connerly.

The first time I called Ward's office, I wanted to find out how I could get involved in proposition 209, and I was very nervous. Here I was, talking to a man who was not only a University of California regent, but also the chairman of an initiative that would have a great effect on the future of my children. Later, after I met Ward for the first time, I just had to hug him—he probably thought I was crazy, but that was okay with me * * *

Over the last year and a half, Ward has gone from being someone I was nervous about talking with, to being a great speaker whom I respect, to being my mentor, my friend and a hero.

I met Ward at a very difficult time in my life. I was in the middle of a lawsuit I had filed against the State of California, challenging the racially segregated programs in our community college system. I had been kicked out of an English 101 class after meeting every requirement except one—my skin was the wrong color.

On the first day of class, the teacher told me and one other white female student that there was a problem, that there were a couple of students who did not belong, that the class was for African-American students, and that we would have to leave. I later learned that this class was part of something called the ''Black Bridge Program'' designed for black students only.

What happened at school affected not only me, but my two daughters as well. My first daughter was born when I was sixteen and her father is white. The following year, I married a Mexican man; he died two weeks after my second daughter was born. From the beginning, I taught my daughters that most people are basically good, that most people will judge them by who they are as individuals, and not by their color.

But when I walked into that federally-funded English class and was ordered to walk out of it, I realized that I had misled my children. I realized that my daughters would not be treated equally—not by their government, their public education system, their teachers or their counselors. And I wondered what kind of future this country held for my multi-racial children.

My daughters had asked me if discrimination is wrong, and I had always said yes, it is always wrong. After I was kicked out of class because of my color, my daughters had new questions—if discrimination is wrong, they asked, how come your school doesn't know that? If discrimination is wrong, they asked, how come our government doesn't know that? I told my daughters that I did not have the answers, but that I would find out.

The following semester, I enrolled in a non-segregated English class and decided to write my research paper on segregated programs. I found that we had two different segregated programs in our community colleges—the ''Black Bridge Program'' I mentioned before, and the ''Puente Program'' for Mexican-Americans. These programs were closed to everyone except black or Mexican-American students. I thought: About nine years from now, both of my daughters could be going to this same school, but one will be eligible for a special program and one will not—and only because my daughters have different colors.

I filed my lawsuit, and later I came to meet Ward Connerly and work on the CCRI campaign. On November 6, 1996 I got to tell my children what I had been longing to tell them for two and one-half years. I got to tell them that big people make mistakes, and that race-based policies were a really bad mistake on our government's part * * * but because as Americans we had stood and fought together, I told them, now their government, their public education system, their teachers and counselors had to treat them as they were created, * * * equally.

I owe a big part of that to Ward. If it were not for his courage and love for the human race as a whole, I would not have been able to tell my children that.

In the very short time I have known him, I have learned many things from Ward Connerly. I have learned the meaning of dignity and integrity. I have learned the value of freedom and equality. And I have learned never to take life, liberty and justice for granted. Most importantly, I have learned about the kind of person I would like to be someday.

To a man who has chosen to take up the fight and bear the burden for the sake of our children, for the sake of my children, I say: You have touched our lives and our hearts in a tremendous way. And you will always, always be a hero to me.

REMARKS BY DAVID ROGERS

Ward Connerly often speaks with reverence about early civil rights heroes, including Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, Jr., and it is right that he does so. Indeed, it is Mr. Connerly's frequent invocation of Rosa Parks that most captures my imagination, because she has long been a particular hero of mine.

Like Mrs. Parks, my friend Cheryl Hopwood, I and others were forced to sit in the back of the bus, and forced to sit there by deliberate, malicious and unconstitutional state action. The bus in question was the admissions process at the University of Texas at Austin Law School, and it was on this bus that I—not unlike many others here and all around the country—became a victim of affirmative action in the virulent form of racism.

In her struggle to integrate the buses of Montgomery, Mrs. Parks had the help of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. To its eternal discredit, the NAACP did not see fit to help me. Fortunately I had another, equally tenacious ally. His name is Steve Smith, and he is the determined, idealistic and extraordinarily competent young lawyer who took the place of the NAACP for me and my co-plaintiffs. Steve uncovered the secret machinations at the University of Texas that constituted what I have come to call affirmative racism.

Unlike the old segregationism, affirmative racism—the selective inclusion or exclusion of people on the basis of assigned race or ethnic group membership—operates behind a veil of secrecy, halftruths and even lies. In the law school admissions case, we plaintiffs were able to expose the race preferences of the Texas system, although we were not able to achieve appropriate monetary redress—or admission to the UT Law School according to individual qualifications based on merit rather than accidents of birth. Sadly, following a ruling in our favor in the fifth circuit, the university's appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court resulted in a vague statement of ''no genuine controversy.'' Meanwhile, the UT Law School replaced its affirmatively racist admissions process with one that has no objective standards whatsoever. So affirmative racism can still proceed under the cloak of vagueness.

Our exposure-without-victory experience demonstrates why initiatives like proposition 209—the California civil rights initiative—are so important to this nation's future. While all of us stand upon the shoulders of the giants who dismantled America's original racism, and are proud to do so, not a few invoke the legacy of Rosa Parks and Martin King to justify a perfidious agenda of deliberate race discrimination. Ward Connerly stands with the giants, and against the corrupt—and we should all stand with him against the corrupt, until even the University of Texas is colorblind.

REMARKS BY VALERY PECH

Good evening, I am glad to be with you.

In August 1989, the small family business that my husband Randy and I started lost yet another Federal highway subcontract on which we had submitted the lowest bid. We didn't like it, and we fought the decision. Six year later, in June 1995, the Supreme Court ruled against the quota-based decision-making used against us.

We celebrated our victory in Adarand vs. Pena, not least by recalling that above the entrance to the Air Force Academy near our home in Colorado Springs appear the words, ''Bring me men to match my mountains.'' Always blessed, America has been blessed most of all because it has always had men to match her mountains—men like William Pendley at Mountain States Legal Foundation, who argued our case, and men like Ward Connerly, who matches every peak of the majestic Rockies.

Randy and I are so thankful for what Ward Connerly has done—not just because he had the courage to take the discrimination issue to the people of California, but because of the manner in which he did it. I don't know what is the most impressive: The success at the ballot box, the victory over the politics of hatred and division, or Ward Connerly's mastery of the language in explaining it all. I don't know, so you take your pick. I will say only that the Bible teaches that if we speak without love we are only ''a clanging cymbal.'' Ward Connerly's words were always of love, even in an often hateful, vicious campaign.

Randy and I know what it is like to conduct such a campaign. During our long fight, the most insulting thing was the portrayal of Randy as a ''angry white man''—and not just because Randy is the most gracious, even-tempered and genuinely nice guy I ever met, although that's why I married him! The ''angry white male'' slogan was insulting because this battle was not Randy's alone. It never was and isn't now. It is our battle, all of us.

When we started our company in 1976, we had more women than men owners, all family except one close friend. We were told many times that we should be certified as a ''WBE'', a women-business-enterprise, and so qualify for our piece of the quota pie. We refused to do that because we believe quotas are wrong.

We didn't and don't want to be judged by the sex or race of the owners or operators of our company. We did and do want to be judged on the basis of the quality and timeliness of our work, and the reasonableness of its cost. A good highway guardrail is a good highway guardrail, regardless of the race or sex of its builder—that's what we believe.

The battle we fought was Randy's and my battle for yet another reason. Men, being men, bear the injuries and insults of the business world stoically. Women are not so similarly inclined. We women have seen the pain suffered when our sons and husbands are judged not by who they are and what they can do, but instead by their race—and we don't like it one bit.

If anyone is angry, it is we mothers and wives. As Ward Connerly has explained, the so-called political equation of people-of-color-plus-white-women, versus white-men, just doesn't add up.

In my heart I believe that the greater sisterhood of women of all colors rejects and repudiates racism, whatever its course, on behalf of husbands, sons, and daughters as well. As a mother, I am grateful to Ward Connerly for another reason. I paraphrase Mr. Connerly in saying that we will not pass racial guilt along like a baton, from our generation to the next. We will not do so because we have the example of how Ward Connerly conducted the CCRI campaign, and its success with the youth of California. Remember, in a mock ballot held before last November's election, California's high school students voted 60–40 in favor of CCRI. What a wonderful message of hope for this great country.

Mr. Connerly, you fostered that message of hope. Randy and I salute you, and we thank you on behalf of our children, Kendra and Ted. God bless you.

REMARKS BY STANLEY DEA

Mr. Connerly, ladies and gentlemen, good evening.

My grandfather came to Chinatown, San Francisco, from southern China in the 1890's. Later he moved to Arizona, where he was followed by my father in 1914 and my mother in 1939. Those early Chinese immigrants all encountered discrimination and bad treatment. However, my forebears believed that America's bright hope for opportunity and freedom far outweighed any setbacks and they had no thought of expecting—much less relying on—racial preferences or quotas to make their way. Despite ill treatment, in two generations my family caught up with everyone else, due to hard work, sacrifice and perseverance.

My family did not believe that equal opportunity means equal results. I grew up in a Chinese home, went through university, received a Ph.D. in engineering, and became a professional engineer. In 1977 I accepted an executive position with the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, or WSSC, a public water and wastewater utility in the Maryland suburbs. From 1977 to 1990, I was director of WSSC's bureau of planning and design, where I supervised approximately 250 employees. I saw WSSC's personnel and contracting policies escalate into preferences and quotas. I took an uncompromising stand for the principles of merit and equal opportunity for all.

In 1989, my department offered a promotion to a white female, the highest ranking candidate. She declined, and my superiors denied my request to re-advertise the position, to broaden the pool of candidates. When I then offered the position to the second-highest ranked candidate, a white male, I was suspended without pay for five days for alleged ''gross insubordination'' in not hiring a minority and not supporting the so-called affirmative action plan. After a hearing, the charge was reduced to mere ''insubordination,'' but WSSC did not change any of its discriminatory policies.

In 1990, I attempted to fill another opening, determining that the three most-qualified candidates were white males. Because I failed to recommend a minority or female, I was demoted. WSSC took away my office, secretary, company car and all supervisory responsibilities. I was moved to a specially created staff position, banished to the equivalent of corporate Siberia, solely because I refused to discriminate by using race and sex as the primary selection criteria.

In 1993, I filed a civil rights suit against WSSC, represented *pro bono* by the Institute for Justice and a private attorney, Douglas Herbert. I will always be profoundly grateful to Chip Mellor, the institute's president, to Clint Bolick, its litigation director, and to Douglas Herbert for the magnificent job done in representing my case, not only in Federal court, but also in the court of public opinion. The lawsuit alleges that WSSC's retaliation against me violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and infringed upon my first amendment free speech rights. It seeks an end to WSSC's quota system as well as reinstatement and damages. The suit is believed to be the first challenge to Government actions that punish opposition to quotas. The case was tried in September 1995; sixteen months later, a verdict is still pending.

Tonight we gather to honor an individual who has worked tirelessly to dismantle the machinery spawned by the false premise that we should use discrimination to cure discrimination—a man who knows that spoils systems based on race and sex imply that those favored are inferior and thus stigmatize competent people as incompetent. Ward Connerly knows that affirmative action doesn't work, that it is morally wrong, and that it must be abolished. He stands on the ledge of allegiance to ''liberty and justice for all,'' and on the principle of the Declaration of Independence, that ''all men are created equal.'' Because of his vision, heroic courage and leadership on proposition 209, he has endured and persevered against vicious *ad hominem* attacks. I am inspired and greatly honored to offer tribute to Ward Connerly tonight.

REMARKS BY LOU ANN MULLEN

Good evening. I want to share the story of our family because it shows how wrong it is when the government uses race to classify individuals.

My family is a so-called multi-racial family. We are often described that way, but I don't think of us that way. To me, we are just my family. It's government that highlights racial differences to keep families like mine apart. That is wrong.

In 1992 we are blessed with our little boy Matthew. When he was nine days old, the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services put him in our foster care, and each day we grew to love him more.

Matthew was, as they say, something else. He would look out the window and smile so big at his beautiful world, as if it were there for him alone to view. He made all our lives matter a little more than they had before. We told the social worker from the department that we wanted Matthew in our lives forever, but she quickly said: ''No, don't even think about it. He is black and he will go to a black home.'' The words still echo in my mind.

For the two years we had Matthew, the social worker and the department searched for a black home. At that time, Matthew's brother, Joseph, was in another foster home, In 1994 the state finally found a black home for both boys, a family that seemed to come from nowhere.

I'll never forget the day that Matthew had to leave. He took the world we had come to love with him that day, except for one treasured memory: His soft little handprint, which had graced his window so many times when he'd look out at his world from our home, the world he had come to know. That little handprint was all I had to hold on to, and I wouldn't let anyone wash it away.

Our family tried to return to our old life, but it wasn't the same without Matthew. After two and one-half months of grieving and wondering what he must be going through, our phone rang. It was the department, calling to say that Matthew's and Joseph's adoptive placement had broken up. The family didn't want Matthew and Joseph anymore, so the department put them back in foster care—but not with us!

We asked once more, ''Please! Let us adopt! Let us have Joseph, too!'' We were told: ''No, it would be in the best interest of the children to have a same-race home.'' If a same-race home weren't found, they said, they'd put Matthew and Joseph in a group home.

My pain was greater than any I had ever experienced in my life. I prayed and asked God to please make it stop. God answered, and led us to the Institute for Justice, which helped us stand up to the Department and made them consider us as an adoptive family. The department said they had to quote-review-unquote for application, but hopes grew really dim when we saw the boys on TV and in a newspaper ad stating ''Brothers need a loving home.'' The department advertised even though they knew we could give Matthew and Joseph a loving home.

The the foster family fell apart. The department needed a place to put the boys, and they called us . . . but they said they would place Matthew and Joseph only as a foster placement, not an adoptive one. We were happy to have the boys, but we knew that department was looking again for a same-race family. We held on to each day with the boys, fearing each would be the last. It was such a harsh punishment for simply wanting to be a family.

In April 1995, the Institute for Justice filed suit. Only then—finally—did the department agree to let us adopt.

I thank God every night for giving me the honor to be Matthew's and Joseph's mother, and for the people at the Institute for Justice. They gave a voice to our boys so that other children might one day look through their windows with a smile, secure that they have a family and love in all the colors of the world.

I am honored to be here tonight, and I am proud to honor a man who sees beyond color and who fights so that all of us can be heard as individuals. God bless you, Ward Connerly.

THE CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY ACT OF 1997

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to introduce the Child Passenger Safety Act of 1997 with my colleague from Maryland, Mrs. MORELLA. This legislation, put simply, seeks to save the lives of thousands of children across the country. Every day, parents, grandparents, and concerned citizens take the time and responsibility to place young children in child safety seats. Unfortunately, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA] estimates that nearly two-thirds of all child safety restraints are misused.

Because of this alarmingly high rate of misuse and the benefits that can be seen by the proper use of child safety seats, NHTSA commissioned a blue ribbon panel in 1995 to study this issue and make recommendations on ways to solve the problem of misuse. Impressively, safety experts, Government agencies, safety seat manufacturers, and several auto manufacturers sat down together with a common interest and concern, and explored options for communicating the issues of compatibility and proper and secure installation of child restraint systems.

Representing thousands of conscientious and responsible parents who place their children in safety seats every day, unaware of the risks and dangers that their children may face, I took great interest in this issue. I have worked closely with Congresswoman MORELLA for the past 2 years to raise awareness of the issue, encourage and support the auto manufacturers' voluntary efforts, and participate in education drives. In fact, I have attended two child safety seat check events in my district and the turnout by the public was most encouraging and impressive. I also attended the signing ceremony of a partnership between General Motors and the National Safe Kids Campaign last year which created a major, national grass roots campaign to educate parents about child passenger safety issues. General Motors, and now Chrysler, have voluntarily committed millions of dollars and considerable manpower to this cause and are to be commended for their efforts.

However, Mr. Speaker, resources are scarce and all of the concerned child safety organizations and consumer groups are stretched for dollars to sponsor safety seat check events. Therefore, this legislation would provide $7.5 million in fiscal years 1998 and 1999 to the Secretary of Transportation for the purpose of awarding education and training program grants to agencies and associated organizations on the local, State, and national level.

Mr. Speaker, NHTSA is to be commended for their leadership on this issue. We must support their efforts as they continue to develop guidelines under which there would be a single, uniform attachment system. In the meantime, we must commit the necessary funding to ensure that we inform and educate the public on how to best protect their children.

The number of children who die each year in motor vehicle crashes is truly devastating.