

This act will reduce Federal power over the American workplace by removing those provisions of Federal law authorizing the collection of forced-union dues as a part of a collective bargaining contract.

Since the Wagner Act of 1935 made forced-union dues a keystone of Federal labor law, millions of American workers have been forced to pay for union representation that they neither choose nor desire.

The primary beneficiaries of Right to Work are America's workers—even those who voluntarily choose to pay union dues, because when union officials are deprived of the forced-dues power granted them under current Federal law they'll be more responsive to the workers' needs and concerns.

Mr. Speaker, this act is pro-worker, pro-economic growth, and pro-freedom.

The 21 States with Right to Work laws, including my own State of Virginia, have a nearly three-to-one advantage over non-right to work States in terms of job creation.

And, according to U.S. News and World Report, 7 of the strongest 10 State economies in the nation have Right to Work laws.

Workers who have the freedom to choose whether or not to join a union have a higher standard of living than their counterparts in non-Right to Work States. According to Dr. James Bennett, an economist with the highly-respected economics department at George Mason University, on average, urban families in Right to Work States have approximately \$2,852 more annual purchasing power than urban families in non-Right to Work States when the lower taxes, housing and food costs of Right to Work States are taken into consideration.

The National Right to Work Act would make the economic benefits of voluntary unionism a reality for all Americans.

But this bill is about more than economics, it's about freedom.

Compelling a man or woman to pay fees to a union in order to work violates the very principle of individual liberty upon which this Nation was founded.

Oftentimes forced dues are used to support causes the worker does not wish to support with his or her hard-earned wages.

Thomas Jefferson said it best, “* * * to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.”

By passing the National Right to Work Act, this Congress will take a major step towards restoring the freedom of America's workers to choose the form of workplace representation that best suits their needs.

In a free society, the decision of whether or not to join or support a union should be made by a worker, not a union official, not an employer, and certainly not the U.S. Congress.

The National Right to Work Act reduces Federal power over America's labor markets, promotes economic growth and a higher standard of living, and enhances freedom.

No wonder, according to a poll by the respected Marketing Research Institute, 77 percent of Americans support Right to Work, and over 50 percent of union households believe workers should have the right to choose whether or not to join or pay dues to a labor union.

No other piece of legislation before this Congress will benefit this Nation as much as the National Right to Work Act.

I urge my colleagues to quickly pass the National Right to Work Act and free millions of Americans from forced-dues tyranny.

THE BREAST CANCER PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1997

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join my colleagues Representatives DELAURO and ROUKEMA of New Jersey, in introducing the Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act of 1997. This legislation seeks to ensure that women and doctors—not insurance company bureaucrats—will decide how long a woman who has a mastectomy should remain in the hospital.

For any woman, learning that she has breast cancer is one of her most frightening experiences. Learning that she must have a mastectomy, a surgical procedure that will change her body and her life, can be devastating.

To have an insurance company dare to say to this woman, who is facing one of life's great crises, that she must leave the hospital whether she is healed or not, is the ultimate insult. It is something that we should not tolerate, and that we must not allow.

Every medical specialty organization in this country challenges the right of insurance companies to interfere in the decision of what treatment is medically necessary or appropriate for a patient. Whether that patient is a young woman giving birth to a baby, or a woman having surgery to treat breast cancer, the insurer has no right to be in the middle, between the patient and the doctor.

Representative DELAURO and I, along with many other Members, placed this issue on the table at the end of last session because we wanted every Member of this body to think about this matter before the convening of this new Congress. We have spent the past several months researching the best, most effective way to accomplish the goals we laid out last year. We believe this legislation does that. We have made sure that we do not preempt responsible State legislation and we have defined health plans to be consistent with the Kassebaum-Kennedy health insurance reform bill and with the MOMS bill I introduced last session, which provides for 48-hour maternity stays.

This legislation goes where many angels have feared to tread, into the hallowed halls of well-heeled industry that is trying to make cost, rather than care, the driving principle of our health care system. This legislation just says “no.” It says to anyone who is not the patient or the patient's doctor: “No, you may not dictate when a patient must leave the hospital.”

The devastation of breast cancer is too great. The difficulties, both physical and psychological, associated with mastectomy are too complex. This legislation seeks to ensure that insurance snafus and mindless refusals do not make these already difficult situations impossible.

TRIBUTE TO BOB JOHNSTON

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my constituents, CWO2 Robert G. Johnston, USA (Retired) who retired from The Retired Officers Association last November. In connection with his retirement, I had occasion to reexamine Bob's biography. I never realized it before but, in one way or another, Bob has spent his entire adult life in or working for the military and its people.

Born and raised in Atlanta, GA. Bob entered the Army as a draftee in January 1953 and rose through the ranks to the grade of chief warrant officer. His enlisted service included tours with the Leadership Committee of the Infantry School at Fort Benning, GA, the First Infantry Division at Fort Riley, KS, the Third Infantry at Fort Meyer, VA, and two tours with the U.S. Army Special Security Group in the Pentagon. He served overseas with the U.S. Embassy in London and the Military Assistance Command in Vietnam.

Upon appointment to warrant officer in the intelligence field in 1972, he received training in counterintelligence at the Intelligence School, Fort Huachuca, AZ. His subsequent service as a warrant officer included tours with the Pentagon Counterintelligence Force, as executive officer of the 902d Military Intelligence Group and personnel officer of the U.S. Army Special Security Group.

After retiring from the Army in November 1975, Bob joined the Retired Officers Association's Placement Service [TOPS] as a placement specialist. He assumed the position as Deputy Director in 1978 and became Director of TOPS in 1994. Bob's military awards include the Bronze Star, Meritorious Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and Army Commendation Medal with Oak leaf Cluster.

The officer placement service or TOPS as it is called is a unique enterprise and it requires a unique individual to run it. In essence, it is a job placement service for military officers from all of the seven uniformed services who are either retiring or being forced out as a result of the current force drawdown. The very heart of this operation is Bob Johnston in his 18 years of service as Deputy Director and then Director of TOPS, he has worked directly with active duty and retired officers and with civilian employers, plus executive search firms in assisting officers to find civilian positions for a second career. His reputation in this area is legend. In some significant way Bob assisted more than 200,000 officers in making a successful transition from the service to civilian employment; personally critiqued over 14,000 resumes; counseled over 10,000 officers; and rewrote the acclaimed “Marketing Yourself for a Second Career” publication which is distributed to over 50,000 service members annually. As the Director of TOPS for the last 2 years, his major achievements include the creation of a TOPS Job Bulletin that could be accessed from the Internet and thus, has TOPS poised to meet the technological challenges of the 21st century; and a significant increase in the number of employers and executive recruiters who come to TROA looking for TROA members to hire to more than 2,000 firms worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, as a final thought, the word leadership is often applied to those who do not deserve it. In Bob Johnston's case, just the opposite is true. He was a leader on active duty and in retirement continued to be a leader to his fellow officers, showing them how to cope with the challenges of a changing world. Bob has been a credit to his country, the Retired Officers Association and to the entire retired community.

Bob resides in Springfield, VA, with his wife Elsie. The couple has two grown daughters.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. McKEON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KILDEE and I have introduced a bill to extend the Higher Education Act of 1995. The Higher Education Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation we will be reviewing this Congress. The law enacted by this Congress which provides for the continuation of the Higher Education Act will establish Federal student aid policy for students and families through the year 2004. Our guiding principles will be: making college more affordable; simplifying the student aid system; and improving academic quality for students.

I am a firm believer that a postsecondary education is one of the keys to family security in this country. As parents, we all work hard in the hope that our children will have a better life and more opportunities than the prior generation. Unfortunately, it has become increasingly difficult for families to fulfill this dream.

Students and their families are worrying more and more about how they are going to pay for a postsecondary education. A recent General Accounting Office report notes that public 4-year colleges raised tuition 256 percent between 1980 and 1995, far outstripping the consumer price index and the rise in a typical family's income. Yet, college is no longer a luxury. Over the last decade, the earnings gap between youth with a postsecondary education and those without has continued to widen. New and advanced technology is dominating our economy and driving down the value of low-skilled jobs. At a time when a college education is no longer a luxury, families are finding themselves unable to save or borrow enough money to pay the bill.

As we begin our intensive review of the Higher Education Act and Federal student aid policy, we will be looking for ways to assist all Americans in their pursuit of an affordable, high-quality postsecondary education. Achieving this goal is critical to the survival and growth of this country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. GOODLING, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KILDEE and I have in-

troduced a bill to extend the Higher Education Act of 1965. As we are just beginning the review process, the bill we are introducing today does not establish new policy or direction for Federal student aid. The final bill we plan on completing this year will focus on three main principles: making college affordable; simplifying the student aid system; and improving academic quality for students.

The Higher Education Act is a complex piece of legislation. Our proposals for changing Federal student aid policy will be formulated only after open and bipartisan discussions with the Administration, the higher education community, students, parents and our colleagues in the 105th Congress.

In today's information based economy, the importance of obtaining a quality postsecondary education is at an all-time high. Parents across the country have recognized the importance of sending their children to college and they strive to ensure that their children will enjoy a better life.

It is in this area of higher education that the Federal Government can have a very significant impact. The fact is that the combination of Federal grant and loan aid for fiscal year 1997 is expected to exceed \$37 billion dollars. This is good news for higher education in this country. Unfortunately, the cost of a college education has increased at about twice the rate of inflation since the early 1980's, making a college education one of the most costly investments facing American families today.

That is why our review of the Higher Education Act and Federal student aid policy will focus on strengthening opportunities for students to obtain an affordable, high quality postsecondary education. The law enacted by this Congress which establishes new and continues old Federal student aid policies will take us through the year 2004. It will significantly impact the lives of millions of students and their families, as well as the future of this country. I look forward to working with all my colleagues as we undertake this review.

TRIBUTE TO SUPERVISOR DERAN KOLIGIAN

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Supervisor Deran Koligian. Mr. Koligian is a man of soil and a man of service to all of Fresno County. He truly exemplifies what it means to be a family farmer.

As noted in a recent article in the Armenian General Benevolent Union (UGBU) magazine, Supervisor Koligian, who is serving his fourth term on the Fresno County Board of Supervisors, is a native of Fresno. His parents left their native home land during the dark days of the Armenian genocide and relocated in Fresno. Koligian faced hard times like many other Armenians who were often the subject of discrimination and ridicule. As a result, life was not always easy for the Armenian families who lived on "the other side" of the railroad tracks.

Koligian's father and the rest of the family did not surrender to the pressure of being newcomers to the United States. Instead, the elders of the community instilled in the first

generation of U.S.-born Armenians a message to concentrate on their education, work hard, and set goals. The words were taken to heart by Koligian. After graduating from Central High School, Koligian went onto Fresno State College and completed a degree in accounting and business administration. At the conclusion of his formal education, he entered into combat as an infantryman in the U.S. Army during World War II.

Upon returning to Fresno after World War II, Koligian began a career in farming and became involved in serving the community. Koligian served on the Fresno County School Board Association, the Fresno County Equal Opportunity Commission, and the Fresno Planning Commission. He also served 12 years as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Madison Elementary School, and 12 years on the board of Central High School before his election to the Fresno County Board of Supervisors.

Koligian oversees services in Fresno County such as public libraries, public schools, the sheriff's department, medical services, and the planning commission. Additionally, he also works with the probation department, courts, housing and tax collection agencies within the county.

Mr. Speaker, through the years, Deran Koligian has epitomized the hard work and integrity that our forefathers believed would make the United States a great and prosperous nation. The end result is a man who has served his community with professionalism and a no-nonsense attitude. I ask my colleagues to join me and pay tribute to a man who in the midst of so much else today, serves the public with as much substance as the soil of the Fresno land that he farms.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ASSIST CONNECTICUT POLICE AND FIREFIGHTERS

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation on the single most important tax issue to roughly 1100 families in Connecticut.

This legislation would simply clear up a situation where erroneous state law has caused benefits that were intended to be treated as workmen's compensation to be brought into income on audit. In several states, including Connecticut, the state law providing these benefits for police and fire fighters included an irrebuttable presumption that heart and hypertension conditions were the result of hazardous work conditions.

In Connecticut, at least, the state law has been corrected so that while there is a presumption that such conditions are the result of hazardous work, the state or municipality involved could require medical proof. This change satisfies the IRS definition of workmen's compensation. Therefore, all this legislation would do is exempt from income those payments received by these individuals as a result of faulty state law but only for the three years—1989, 1990 and 1991. From January 1, 1992 forward those already receiving these benefits would have to meet the standard IRS test.