

GIRL SCOUTS WEEK

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to join with me in recognizing the 85th anniversary of the founding of the Girl Scouts of the USA by supporting Girl Scout Week, March 9–15. Today, Girl Scouts of the USA is the largest volunteer organization for young women in the world. Since its beginnings, Girl Scouts has been providing opportunities for girls from all segments of American society to develop their potential, make friends and become an active part of their community.

Founded by Juliette Gordon Low on March 12, 1912, the Girl Scouts have always emphasized self-awareness, values, education, and contribution to society. A recognition system in which members earn badges symbolizing accomplishment of a goal provides a framework in which girls can develop self-esteem and leadership skills.

In celebration of the thousands of dedicated adult volunteers who guide these young women toward success, as well as the 3 million scouts who have made important contributions to communities across the country, I urge my colleagues to join in recognition of Girl Scout Week. With our support and encouragement, the Girl Scouts organization can continue to grow and enrich the lives of countless young women.

 TRIBUTE TO NEGRO LEAGUE
HEROES FROM LINCOLN PARK

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the community of Lincoln Park, which celebrates its 106th anniversary this year.

Lincoln Park is a self-contained community within the city of Rockville, MD. As an African-American community, through the years it has managed to keep rich its traditions and history. Lincoln Park is unique not only for its heritage, but also for how the residents interact together. They have continued to work together as a community in the same manner that their ancestors did long ago. The effort to retain and continue the traditions of their history gives the community respect for their ancestors and a vision of hope for their descendants.

With the month of February designated as a time to celebrate Black History, it is only fitting that a community so rich in its African-American heritage would seek to share and explore its roots. Thanks to the hard work of founding president Anita Neal Powell and vice-president Deacon Leroy Neal, the Lincoln Park Historical Society held their 20th Annual Black History Program at Mt. Calvary Baptist Church on February 28. I wish to pay special tribute to Mr. Russell Awkward and Mr. Gordon Hopkins. These former professional Negro League baseball players will be speaking at the presentation on the topic, "Building Historical Dreams for Our Children." These two fine gentlemen are the only members of the Negro

League living in Montgomery County, MD. I also wish to honor Mr. Elbert Israel and Mr. Clarence Israel, also two former Negro baseball players from Rockville. Clarence Israel died in April 1987, and Elbert Israel passed away just this past October. The story of these men says a great deal about our history and the hopes and dreams for our children.

Russell Awkward grew up with the dream of one day playing for the New York Yankees. He got his professional baseball career started by playing for the Washington Royal Giants. As a player, Awkward had good speed and was a consistent hitter, usually batting first or second in the batting order. He went on to play for the New York Cubans and the Newark Eagles until he was called to military service with the U.S. Army.

Gordon Hopkins played second base for the Clowns for 2 years. He was good at getting the ball in play and was known for his ability to stretch hits into extra bases as well as for his exceptional range in the field. After the 1954 season he was drafted into the armed services, but still played baseball for the U.S. Marines.

Clarence Israel played in the Negro League in the 1940's. He was a decent hitter with good speed and what he lacked in power he made up in hustle. He was a second baseman with the Newark Eagles for 3 years from 1940 to 1942. He then signed with the Homestead Grays to fill an empty spot at third base for the 1943 season. In 1946, he was back with the Eagles and helped them to win the Negro National League pennant for the first time in 9 years. He played three games of the World Series that year and had a pinch hit single off Satchel Paige to help the Eagles win the title. He returned the next season to the Grays for his last year in professional baseball.

Elbert Israel, or Al, as he was called on the field, played with the Philadelphia Stars in the 1950's after the club joined the Negro League. His greatest contribution to the dream of black men in baseball, however, came in 1953 when he joined the class A minor league baseball team in Savannah, GA. Al Israel and four other black baseball players joined the South Atlantic League, the Sally League, as it was called. This league consisted of small towns in the deep South. These five players broke the color barrier in baseball in the most racially divided area of the country. The test for the racial integration of baseball rested on these five men in this class A baseball league.

The courage of these men and determination to follow their dream helped to make it possible for the next generation of African-Americans to enjoy America's pastime at all levels of the game. I hope that everyone will join me in honoring these men and women and wishing the whole Lincoln Park community a most happy and successful 106th anniversary.

 AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION PROVIDES IMPORTANT LEADERSHIP

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined several of my colleagues in

celebrating the 50th anniversary of a very important organization in the fight for a fairer America, Americans for Democratic Action. As examples of the vital role ADA has played and continues to play, I ask that two very thoughtful articles be printed here. One is by Jack Sheinkman, former head of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, who is now the president of ADA and a great fighter for social justice in our country. The other is an interview by Kenneth Adelman with one of the most important non-Members of Congress in history from the standpoint of people who have affected the course of this institution. Evelyn Dubrow, who recently retired as vice president and legislative director of UNITE, the successor union to the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers has an unparalleled record of accomplishment in fighting for the rights of working people. I believe that these two articles make an important contribution to our debate on public policy.

[From the Washingtonian, Jan. 1997]

MADE IN THE USA

(Interview by Ken Adelman)

The new session of Congress will be the first since the Eisenhower administration without Evelyn Dubrow treading the halls of Capitol Hill on behalf of garment and textile workers.

The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union sent her here in 1956, when the minimum wage was a dollar, and she's lobbied for everything from protection against imports to civil-rights legislation. Soon, she'll be stepping down as legislative director of the union, now called UNITE (Union of Needletrades, Industrial, and Textile Employees), but she'll stay on as special assistant to the president.

Liberal politics came naturally to Dubrow. Her parents were socialist immigrants from Belarus who raised four daughters and a son. Her father was a union man. Her sister Mary picketed the White House as an early suffragette. Sent to prison, she went on a hunger strike.

Dubrow grew up in New Jersey and studied journalism at New York University. After her graduation in the late 1930s, she pursued journalism and then union work, with a brief stint in Washington in 1947 to help organize the liberal Americans for Democratic Action and campaign for Harry Truman. She joined ILGWU in 1956 and was sent to Washington the same year. She's been here ever since, living on Capitol Hill to be near her work.

Among her many awards in the Lifetime Achievement Award from Citizen Action. Ladies Home Journal has named her one of the 75 most important women in America, and The Washingtonian has named her one of the region's most powerful women.

Dubrow is single but has loads of nieces, nephews, great-nieces, great-nephews, and now great-greats, whom she considers her children.

In her free time, she plays poker with a group of longtime friends. She also plays plenty of gin rummy, reads the classics—especially Dickens and Trollope—and used to adore going to baseball games.

In her office in the AFL-CIO building, one block from the White House, we discussed what she's learned.

Why is "lobbyist" such a dirty word?

I don't consider it a dirty word at all.

American citizens are constitutionally entitled to petition the government through their representatives for any purpose. The term "lobbyist" arose when members of Congress didn't have offices. So everyone seeing them had to meet in the House or Senate lobby.

Now as government grew, organizations found they had a bigger stake in what happens in Washington. So they hired people like me to represent their members. That's perfectly legitimate.

But lobbyists tend to work for, or even become, fat cats.

Well, I'm not. And I don't.

I work for more than 350,000 union members and 250,000 retirees. They're far from fat cats. They're hard-working citizens who can't trot up to Capitol Hill and meet their representative directly. However, they can and do write letters and call.

How has Congress changed in your time?

Members are much younger. Some, sadly, don't know much about the institution and haven't learned much.

Many of these young Republicans distress me. After the 1994 election, I even broke my own cardinal rule of going to visit each new member. I was so upset at their ignorance and small-mindedness about anyone in this country not like them.

They have less knowledge of the institution, of how to legislate or understand their constituency. They are narrow-minded on guns and the right to choose, affirmative action—oh, you name it!

Has the caliber of members declined?

Yes, it has. Some of these guys obviously decided to run for Congress because they were bored with what they had been doing.

Others run because they hate things. That's what bothers me most—the atmosphere of hate that's grown here. I was used to Republicans and Democrats opposing each other on issues but with some on each side voting for the other position. That happens less nowadays.

And, no matter what, members were friendly. They'd talk to each other. They'd kid one another. There was an overall feeling of being in this together. They'd disagree on issues but never be nasty about it.

Members need that civility. Every issue is different. An opponent one day will be your supporter the next. But there's been a big decline in civility—above all, a decline in respect for the government of the United States of America. That, to me, is saddest.

How do you expect the new Congress to differ from the 104th?

I suspect that it won't be as mean-spirited as it was in the last two years. I think the Republicans as well as the Democrats realize it's going to be important to produce legislation that will be helpful to the people of this country. The Republican leadership realized that their attempt to dictate what the legislative program would be in the 104th Congress didn't work.

I assume, along with everyone else, that there will be more cooperation. However, I see some evidence that members in the leadership of the Republican party still are determined to attack the Democratic leadership. I also think they are likely to try to attack the labor movement through legislation that would be detrimental not only to union members but to American workers generally—such as campaign reform to prevent the unions from raising money from their members, or compensatory-time legislation that would deprive workers of the chance to earn overtime pay.

What works best to persuade members of Congress?

Always be honest. Never play games. Never pretend you know everything about a bill or issue. You don't.

Use constituents, since they're always the best lobbyists. We succeed most when our union members contact their own representatives directly.

Folks at the grassroots, if they ever realized it and wanted to, could run this country. People really do have power. The smart con-

gressmen or senators assign a top staff member full-time to take constituent calls and read mail. Then the member can respond to constituents.

Many times over the years I've asked our folks to send me any correspondence from Congress. When doing so, many attach a note saying, "Please return this. I'd like to keep it since it comes from my member of Congress." That means a lot to them.

What should a lobbyist avoid?

Three things, which I call "my BAT."

One, don't Beg for votes. Second, don't Assume you know everything. And third, don't Threaten anyone by saying you'll work to defeat the guy or gal or anything like that.

Always remember why you're there. As a lobbyist, you're there to get votes. This means you approach anyone who has a vote, regardless of whether you're likely to succeed or not.

I rarely go into an office just to be there. I'm in to talk about an important issue.

I like to win because I'm convincing on the merits. But I know that sometimes a member will vote as a personal favor to me. I don't kid myself about that.

Many of these members I've known for a very long time. They know by now that I won't ask them to support something horrendous. That isn't my way.

I'm very conscious of time, which is their most precious commodity. Members are terribly busy so it's best to have the staff in there too. A good staffer knows the issue as well, if not better.

They'll often ask me to send background or briefing materials. A major part of my job is providing information they can use in the committee or even in floor debate.

When a new session begins, I go in to see new members and their staffs. I try to introduce myself to everyone in the office. Sometimes I'm successful in that, sometimes not. But at least I've made the effort.

So you really like Congress.

Oh, yes. This negativism towards the institution bothers me.

I think Congress is the greatest institution in the whole wide world. I'm corny enough still to be thrilled each time I see the Capitol—day or night. I think it holds the fate of America in its hands.

I do distinguish between the institution and the people in it. Nonetheless, I have great respect for members. Some who've disagreed with me are still people of great stature. A good number are first-rate historians or scholars.

Tell us the best three since you came here in 1956.

That's too hard.

Go on. Try.

Okay. The guy who did most for the people of this country was Tip O'Neill. He understood his job as member and then as Speaker, and he knew his people very well. Lyndon Johnson used his position as majority leader, vice president, and then president to pass many laws that were good for ordinary Americans. He was a consummate politician but still had faith in the people.

Third was my great friend Richard Bolling, who was a protégé of Sam Rayburn's but a great liberal. I worked with Bolling at Americans for Democratic Action and then here. He was a real student of government, especially of Congress.

Any Republicans you respected?

Oh, sure, Senator Charles Mathias of Maryland was a real statesman.

John Sherman Cooper was a great student of the issues. So whenever he spoke, he gained respect on both sides of the aisle.

Third, strangely enough, was Barry Goldwater. He was honest. He'd always give you a direct answer. When he was on your side, he'd fight all the way.

How good a Speaker is Newt Gingrich?

Good in that he sounds like he knows what he's talking about. He has a fine ability, as a former teacher, to express himself with great panache. In fact, he's rare—a Speaker of the House who's actually a good speaker. Now, what he says is something else again.

Why don't you like Newt?

I don't like him he's backed more proposed laws that would harm Americans than anyone I've seen here.

His Contract With America, his opposition to family and medical leave, to healthcare reform, to Social Security, and to the minimum-wage increase were unconscionable. All these laws are good for Americans, especially for the poor.

What most bothers me in his Republican Congress is how they make it seem a crime for anyone to be poor. Like the poor want to be poor.

Some of those folks on the Hill can't get it through their thick heads that, as representatives in a democracy, they should care about the people who most need their help.

As a staunch Democrat and liberal, you must be disappointed in Clinton.

No, I'm not. I always knew he as an economic conservative and a social liberal. Clinton cares about people and about education. He understands our need for good government programs.

But when it comes to economics, he's long been conservative. Remember, he came out of the Democratic Leadership Council. I know those guys over there. I've even worked with them. But I don't kid myself. They're not my brand of liberal.

So Clinton hasn't disappointed you?

He has in missing our passion for fair-trade laws. We've lost hundreds of thousands of jobs because we now must compete with countries that bring their products into America very cheaply.

NAFTA still burns.

It sure does. I tell my people that when we elected Clinton, we didn't elect somebody from the labor movement.

Well, there's never been a president we haven't been somewhat disappointed in.

How great a president is he?

He's been a good president so far. Maybe he can approach greatness.

Who were the best three presidents you've known?

Harry Truman was number one. He did more for the people than anyone. Truman understood better what America's all about. Though he came from the Pendergast mob, he was the most honest man I ever knew.

Then John Kennedy, who exuded concern and a complete grasp of what a president had to be. Kennedy didn't have time to do much, but he left a legacy of turning the US into a young and wonderful country. There were so many things we all had to do back then. And Kennedy had a sense of humor, which you need when you're president—or anything else for that matter.

Third was my great friend Lyndon Johnson. He passed the first civil-rights law and education measures. Johnson had deep respect for the labor movement and liked people of all backgrounds. He used his power to develop programs.

Who was the worst president?

Richard Nixon, without question. He came to the Congress after making Jerry Voorhis, really a very great member, seem like a Communist. Jerry Voorhis actually had an impressive record of fighting Communism from his socialist base.

Nixon did the same thing to Helen Gahagan Douglas when he ran against her for Senate. And what Richard Nixon later did to the institution of the presidency was dreadful.

What was your saddest day?

The day Kennedy was assassinated. I had a funny feeling right before that day. Adlai Stevenson had gone to Texas and told Kennedy, "Don't go. The atmosphere down there isn't good." So I woke that morning with a heavy heart. I was attending a conference, but all day long I thought about Kennedy. So when the news came. . . .

Gone was a leader in whom we all had great faith and hope, cut down before he had a chance to make his mark.

I had sad days whenever people tried to enact right-to-work laws, the whole business of 14B in the Taft-Hartley Act. They were trying to deny people their inherent right to belong to unions, a right given them in the National Labor Relations Act. The right to join together and do things for the common benefit is what democracy's all about.

I've been saddened by our inability to get equitable trade laws passed. I work for a low-wage industry with probably more immigrants and people of diverse backgrounds. They're just trying to make their daily lives a bit better.

Our fight isn't against the workers of other countries. We're against the sweatshops abroad, as we are here.

What episodes from your career will you best remember?

The day Speaker Tip O'Neill instructed the House doorman to give me a chair at the entrance to the House floor because I deserved it. That was a great moment in my life.

I remember fondly being up in Albany making a speech when I got a call at the airport from the White House. Juanita Roberts, President Johnson's secretary, said he was going to sign the education bill and would like me there, along with the president of my union. So I called our union president, Louis Styberg, and we arranged to meet in Washington.

We were there along with members of committees that had pushed the legislation through. After signing the bill, LBJ walked off the platform, pulled me up from my seat, and said, "This little lady is responsible for this bill." Now I don't think that was entirely true, but it sure was nice to hear.

Another happened right after I came down to Washington in 1956 to lobby an amendment to the Landrum-Griffin Act. The act, part of the whole Taft-Hartley approach to unions, among other areas outlawed the use of the secondary boycott. It should not have applied to the garment industry, where there is a direct relationship between the jobber (the main employer) and the contractor who manufactures the garment product. My job was to get the amendment to permit our union to be an exception to that section of the act.

John F. Kennedy, then a senator, agreed to introduce it in the Senate. One of his top staffers told me, "Ev, you're asking him to put his political head on the block."

I said, "Oh, come on. What are you saying? Massachusetts has plenty of garment workers affected by this. It won't hurt Kennedy one bit." And it didn't.

Barry Goldwater had been calling my boss, David Dubinsky, head of our union, who was a very great man. I told Dubinsky to let me see what Goldwater wanted. So I saw him and asked.

He said, "Look, Ev, my family knows the rag business. My sister and I spent a year in the garment district. I understand the problems there." So I called Dubinsky and told him to talk with Goldwater.

Later Dubinsky told me Goldwater said to him, "Hey, that's a smart little girl lawyer you've got down here." I said, "Did you tell Goldwater I wasn't a lawyer?" Dubinsky laughed and said, "No. If he thinks you're a lawyer, that's okay with me."

That began a wonderful relationship. Whenever I'd see Barry Goldwater after that,

he'd ask me: "Well, Ev, what are you on today?" I'd tell him, and most often he'd say, "Sorry, I can't vote with you on that one." We became very good friends.

What have you learned about how Washington works?

Washington's a special little enclave in the grand United States. Too many Washingtonians think they're running the country when they're not. The government still reacts more than it acts.

Here, more than elsewhere, personalities count. Personal relationships matter most. Technologies like e-mail and faxes and the Internet bring the rest of the country much closer to Washington, which is beneficial. Many members now must think of those they hadn't paid much attention to before.

In Washington you should never write off anybody. You'll be surprised where tomorrow's allies come from.

I've learned there's a lot of the patina of Washington social life; it's often who you know—not what you know—that goes a long way. Invitations from certain people mean a whole lot.

I've learned I don't know as much as I thought I knew. Living here's a very humbling experience.

Money plays too large a role here. I resent how much it costs to run for office nowadays. So many members or candidates must go out and beg to be elected.

That's why I've always supported public financing of campaigns. I've never been comfortable with forming PACs. Our strength should be in the people we represent and not the money we hand out.

The first year after a representative gets elected is spent trying to make laws. The second year is spent raising money to be re-elected. This means their productive time is cut in half.

Tell us three big lessons of life.

One is not to think that friends have to agree with you. A broad swath is great. Some of my friends think I'm loony and disagree all the time.

Get to know what this country's all about. I've studied the American Indians, as they fascinate me. I began working with the Congress of American Indians in the 1950s, teaching some of them how to organize their members, how to register, and how to vote. The Navajos have power now because they learned these skills early on.

Get to know our senior citizens. They're wonderful. They vote. They're interested. They'll call. They express themselves honestly.

I've learned that no one's as important as he or she thinks.

It's hard to accept that you'll have to get out of the picture and let somebody else take over some day.

I'm lucky to have lived so long and so well. I try to enjoy every day. So many people touched my life.

Other lessons of life?

My greatest lesson is not to take life so very seriously. You can make a difference, but never think you're Joan of Arc.

Great people came before you. Great people will come after you. If you have an opportunity to make any contribution, be grateful for that.

[From the *St. Petersburg Times*, Jan. 19, 1997]

LIBERALS WORK FROM THE VITAL CENTER
(Jack Sheinkman)

As President Clinton prepares to deliver his second inaugural address on Monday, the political landscape seems remarkably familiar to liberals.

A half-century ago, on Jan. 3, 1947, about 130 of the nation's leading liberals met at the

Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C., to discuss challenges which, in a broad sense, are similar to those faced today.

A hostile Republican majority controlled Congress. The president, Harry Truman, was a Democrat, but one whom many considered insufficiently liberal. A new American economy, marked by technological change, was emerging. In the area of race relations, America's reality failed to match its ideals. Abroad, the United States confronted a rapidly changing new world order.

Liberals who attended the meeting included former first lady Eleanor Roosevelt; theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, perhaps best remembered today as the author of the "Serenity Prayer"; historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr.; economist John Kenneth Galbraith; labor presidents Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers and David Dubinsky of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Sen. Paul Douglas, D-Ill.; and Hubert H. Humphrey, the mayor of Minneapolis, who in 1948 would be elected to the U.S. Senate and then as vice president in 1964.

Nelson Poynter, former editor and president of the *St. Petersburg Times*, also was present, as was Barry Bingham of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*.

Out of the meeting, Americans for Democratic Action, today the nation's oldest independent liberal organization, was born. In her syndicated newspaper column, "My Day," on Jan. 6, 1947, Mrs. Roosevelt declared that ADA was needed "to carry on the spirit of progress" in America. "We do not believe that what has been done in the past is the highest attainment that can be hoped for in a democratic nation."

The following year, in 1948, ADA led the successful fight for a strong plank in the Democratic Party platform defining the party's commitment to civil rights. It was only the beginning, as ADA also participated in the civil rights struggles in the South in the 1950s and 1960s. On May 4, 1963, after Sheriff Bull Connor turned police dogs and fire hoses on marchers in Birmingham, Ala., ADA leaders met with President John F. Kennedy in the White House and pressed him for greater federal action in support of civil rights. The moment was a turning point, leading up to Martin Luther King's March on Washington in August 1963 and passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Over the years, ADA pushed for increases in the minimum wage, full employment, Medicare, abortion rights, environmental protections, arms control and an end to apartheid. It also was distinctly anti-Communist in origin, and supported the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization early in the Cold War; but, in the 1960s, opposed the Vietnam War.

In the 1970s, the organization was attacked by Vice President Spiro Agnew and its members were included on President Nixon's infamous "Enemies List." In turn, ADA became the first national organization to call for Nixon's impeachment.

Though many Americans consider liberals to be heroes, we often are pointed as "pinkos," socialists, Marxists or worse. During the 1996 campaign, Bob Dole and other Republican candidates attacked Democrats as "liberal, liberal, liberal," they were singing an old song, one perfected by Joe McCarthy, Richard Nixon and Spiro Agnew in past elections; only this time it didn't play. Americans instead were looking to core values.

And, in fact, America's core values are liberal values. I believe that many Americans are more liberal than they themselves realize.

Let's look at some basic definitions. First and foremost, liberals believe in liberty, equality and opportunity for individuals. We

also believe in the Constitution, which created a national government to act for the common good, along with a Bill of Rights to protect the freedoms of ordinary citizens. We believe in the legacy of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, which includes a commitment to economic security for all Americans, and the need for American leadership within an international community.

Liberalism does not mean big government. Liberals instead want effective, efficient and caring government, and therefore have supported many of President Clinton's and Vice President Gore's "reinventing government" initiatives.

Liberals believe in a progressive tax system in which people (and corporations) pay a fair and equitable share relative to their benefits from our economic system. We also believe in rational budget priorities—including deficit reduction—but not necessarily a balanced budget as any kind of absolute, magical economic cure.

Since 1994, the Republican vision has been to dismantle the federal government and the liberal foundations that sustained America's progress over the past 60 years. It is a vision that would return America to 19th-century laissez-faire capitalism, leaving ordinary people and communities at risk.

It is a vision that is incompatible with helping Americans cope with rapid economic and technological change.

Although the economy has improved since 1992, Americans still suffer from a steady decline in their standards of living. Each year in the 1990s, real wages decreased among even the most highly educated workers. Fully 80 percent of American families were worse off in 1995 than in the 1970s. Nonetheless, from 1973 to 1995, there has been a 25 percent gain in productivity, with significant increases in profits for corporate America and increases in compensation for corporate executives.

Even though unemployment seems relatively low, unemployment rates for blacks and Hispanics remain at about 10 percent, almost double the rate for white workers. When discouraged workers and people working part-time due to economic conditions are included, the "real" rate of unemployment jumps to about 10 percent.

These economic trends represent not only economic hardship for individuals, but also the unraveling of America's social fabric: straining families, pitting generation

against generation, and worsening relations between races. As a nation, we increasingly are at risk of coming apart, rather than pulling together to build a common future.

In 1995, the Republican Congress sought to cut funds for Medicare, Medicaid and education. President Clinton successfully resisted; however, he acquiesced to giving the Pentagon billions of dollars that it had not requested, and the, after two vetoes, signed a welfare reform bill that eliminates assistance to many poor Americans, without doing anything meaningful to help them find jobs.

Last year, ADA was the first national organization to endorse President Clinton for re-election. In doing so, we called on liberals to join moderates and true conservatives to fight for the vital center of American politics. Our cry recalled ADA founder Arthur Schlesinger's 1949 book *The Vital Center*, which presented liberalism as middle ground between the rigid ideological doctrines of left and right.

As the president approaches his second inaugural, liberals can celebrate with him, but we still expect to disagree with him from time to time. Liberals who were not afraid to confront Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy, in order to move them toward a more forthright embrace of civil rights, will not hesitate to confront President Clinton and the Republican Congress whenever we disagree with them on vital policy matters. Just as liberals gathered in 1947 out of concern for America's future, we must do so again, 50 years later, to chart a course for the next 50.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SHELDON AND MIRIAM ADELSON

HON. BILL PAXON

OF NEW YORK

HON. SUSAN MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Molinari and I rise today to congratulate our dear friends, Sheldon and Miriam Adelson on the recent birth of their son, Adam. In addition to their distinguished public lives, Sheldon and Miriam

will now take on new private roles as parents, teachers, and role models for their son.

Sheldon Adelson has spent nearly half a century building a worldwide reputation as an entrepreneur and visionary businessman. He is not only one of the most influential leaders in today's convention, hotel, travel, and gaming industries, but has earned a reputation as a top executive in the computer industry. He is also active in the international business arena, particularly in Israel where he is involved in fostering trade, manufacturing, and software development for Israeli high-technology companies, and creating new forums that show the world the advantages of doing business with Israel.

Sheldon also has a long record of public and private support of the State of Israel. In addition to his numerous philanthropic activities for the Jewish community in the United States, he has shown his true dedication to building a strong and secure Israel.

Miriam Adelson has devoted her career to medicine, specializing in the fields of internal medicine and emergency medicine and most recently, chemical dependency and drug addiction. In 1986, Dr. Adelson was invited to be a guest investigator and associate physician at Rockefeller University in New York City where she studied chemical dependency and drug addiction. Her experiences as a witness to the devastating effects drug addiction has had on this country led her to commit herself to preventing and treating drug addiction in her homeland of Israel before it reached epidemic proportions.

She has shown her commitment to this cause by building the Dr. Miriam Adelson and Sheldon G. Adelson Clinic for drug abuse treatment and research in Tel Aviv, Israel's first drug treatment and research center in a hospital setting. This clinic opened in June 1993 and a second Adelson clinic is being built at the Poriah Hospital in Israel's Galilee region.

As new parents ourselves, we know the joy and happiness that a child brings to our lives. We again congratulate Sheldon and Miriam on the birth of their son and wish all of them the best of luck for the future.