moves to traverse that course with all speed. The rebuilding of Haiti into a viable democracy with a strong rule of law and a vibrant economy will not be easy and certainly will take time. However, if the economy does not show signs of expanding, political unrest will rise. This slow pace could lead to a new wave of violence designed to undermine confidence in the Preval government and its policies. Any major law and order problem will have negative consequences for Haiti's stability and could throw Haiti back into a period of paralysis, upheaval and possible anarchy.

Lastly, we would be remiss if we failed to acknowledge the hospitality, hard work and cooperation of the U.S. Embassy in Port-au-Prince. Ambassador Swing and his team were confident that Haiti's chances for success were good despite the difficulties. Ambassador Swing's commitment and dedication were manifest in his willingness to give us as much time out his busy schedule as we needed. And his efforts to have us meet with U.N. Special Representative, Ambassador Ter Horst, Haitian Parliamentarians, and especially President Preval, were more than we expected. Ambassador Swing has been in Haiti longer than a normal posting but his presence, his expertise, his dedication and his relationship with the Haitian leadership are invaluable during these critical times. We also want to acknowledge Political Counselor Sue Ford Patrick for all the work she did in getting us to all of our meetings and for providing valuable insights to conditions in the country.

And finally, we wish to commend Colonel Stull, Commander of the U.S. Support Group, and his troops for the fine work they are doing in Haiti. The dedicated men and women of our Marine, Navy and Army contingents there are providing important humanitarian and civic assistance projects in addition to their normal security mission. Their mission in Haiti is often overlooked, and sometimes even questioned, but their presence is invaluable and a credit to their respective services.

KEY INDIVIDUALS STAFFDEL MET WITH WHILE IN HAITI

Government of Haiti: Mr. Rene Preval, President; Mr. Leslie Delatour, Central Bank Governor; Mr. Robert Manuel, Secretary of State for State Security; Mr. Pierre Denize, Director General, Haitian National Police; and Mr. Jean August Brutus, HNP Commissaire.

Legislative branch: Mr. Macdonald Jean, Senator; Mr. Jean Robert Sabalat, Senator; Mr. Alix Fils-Aime, Deputy; and Mr. St. Juste Momprevil, Deputy.

Representatives of the Council on Modernization of Public Enterprises (CMEP).

Representatives of the Haitian Private Sector.

United Nations: Ambassador Enrique Ter Horst, Special Representative to the Secretary General; and General Pierre Daigle, Commander, U.N. Support Mission on Haiti.

Representatives of the International Donor Group including the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Representatives of other Organizations in Haiti including: Adventist Relief and Development Agency; International Republican Institute; National Democratic Institute; and Inter-American Foundation.

United States Support Group: Colonel Stull, Commander.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector:

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Miller substitute.

Mr. MILLER has worked to meet the Republicans halfway in this effort to provide flexibility for working families.

I contend that H.R. 1 does not provide the flexibility that its sponsors claim it does.

Members on the other side of the aisle, trying to appeal to working mothers, claim that under H.R. 1, workers would work overtime and then take comptime whenever they need it—to take a child on a class trip, to tend to a sick parent, to volunteer time at their child's school. However, H.R. 1 also provides that an employer can deny comptime if taking that time would unduly disrupt that business. What good does it do to accrue comptime if your employer can prevent you from taking it when you want it?

Say Mrs. Smith wants to volunteer to be a chaperon for her daughter's class trip to the natural history museum next Tuesday. The employer says that taking leave Tuesday will unduly disrupt the business, but Mrs. Smith can take the time next Friday. What good does that do Mrs. Smith? Is that really choice?

Members on the other side of the aisle will claim that the bill does state that the employee has a choice, and that there are steps he or she can take if the employer wrongfully denies comptime. But if we are talking about the majority of workers today—who make less than 2½ times the minimum wage—we cannot truly state that these individuals have the resources to challenge their employer in court. Many need these jobs and would never consider threatening them even if they were in the right. Others who are bold enough to consider filing suit against their employer do not have the resources to hire an attorney and go to court.

Proponents of H.R. 1 point to the public sector, stating that comptime works well there. Let me tell you, I know of some Federal employees who opt for paid overtime, because they know they'll never get the opportunity to use their comptime when they want to. The public sector is not a business. We offer comptime there because it saves taxpayer dollars. The only reason private businesses will even consider offering comptime is that it saves money and will give employers the opportunity to have employees work longer hours.

Comptime is really a no-interest loan that employees give to their employers. Employees work the overtime, and then get paid later in comptime—if they get a chance to use it at all. Mandated overtime pay has been the law to penalize employers who make their employees work longer than the 40-hour workweek. That is why overtime is paid in time-and-a-half. This also provides a benefit to employees who choose to work longer hours for more pay. But employees get their compensation as overtime pay in the next paycheck—not a week later or a month later, when it is convenient for the employer.

During the markup, it greatly concerned me that Members on the other side of the aisle referred to comptime as a benefit. Comptime is compensation for time that the employee has worked. The employee has a right to that compensation—it is not something that the employer should have the power to delay or to alter.

Many workers in my district need that overtime pay—they count on it being in every paycheck. Comptime will not help them keep a roof over their heads, food on the table, or clothes on their backs. I don't hear the small businesses in the 31st District clamoring for the option of comptime—many cannot afford to have employees on leave at irregular times. So the only protection to ensure that employees are paid for the time they work is to have overtime pay protections.

Nevertheless, I support Mr. MILLER's substitute so that those businesses and those employees who want comptime can fairly participate in such a program. The substitute ensures that comptime is truly flexible, and that employees have true choice.

Mr. MILLER's substitute puts teeth into the penalties for employers who coerce their employees into taking comptime and who wrongly deny an employee's right to take comptime when he or she wishes.

This measure also prohibits employers from discriminating among employees when offering comptime. It mandates that when an employer chooses to implement a comptime program, he or she must offer that comptime to all similarly situated employees. Therefore, if an employer offers comptime to a particular employee, he or she must also offer it to all the other employees who are doing the same work, on the same schedule, at the same site.

Another very important provision in this substitute is that it allows the Secretary of Labor to require employers to post a bond to assure funds to pay for unused comptime. Thus, employees would be guaranteed to receive their comptime if an employer declared bankruptcy.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 1 and adopt the Miller substitute.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 1997

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today I with my colleague Representative BEN GILMAN, introduced a bipartisan bill to correct a fundamental unfairness to all Federal administrative law judges. The Administrative Law Judge Cost of Living Adjustment [COLA] Reform Act. Since 1992 administrative law judges have not received a cost-of-living adjustment like other Federal employees in the General Schedule and Senior Executive Service. Enactment of the legislation introduced today will remedy this unfair situation.

This legislation amends section 5372 of title 5, U.S. Code, and provides that the cost of living adjustment for administrative law judges will be adjusted by the same percentage and on the same date as the rates of pay for the General Schedule.

Through no fault of their own, ALJ salaries were included as a percentage of the Executive Schedule, which includes Members of Congress and Cabinet Secretaries. Since 1992 Members of Congress have prohibited themselves from receiving COLA's by appropriations bill riders that cover the whole Executive Schedules, including ALJ's. ALJ's in salary structure are more like other Federal employees hired at $75,000 a year and their average salary is about $89,000 a year, much less than Members of Congress or Cabinet Secretaries included in the Executive Schedule. The cost of the legislation is not significant, not even raising the $5 million point of order threshold under the Budget Act. In fact we estimate that the cost of the legislation is under $4 million.

As a matter of fairness, these Federal employees should receive pay adjustments at the same rate as other Government employees. The salaries of the younger administrative law judges are well below the pay level of Members of Congress. Many of the younger administrative law judges have fallen behind the rates of pay of their former Government colleagues. Senior Government attorneys paid under the General Schedule and the Senior Executive Service have received pay adjustments during the same period which has caused their rates of pay to exceed that of administrative law judges. The administrative law judiciary has traditionally recruited these senior attorneys as administrative law judges. The ability to recruit senior Government attorneys, experienced private practice attorneys, and to retain experienced administrative law judges is being impaired because of the disparity between the current pay of administrative law judges as compared with the pay of senior Government attorneys.

We believe that it is important to keep the Federal administrative judge corps competitive with other senior Government attorney positions. The Federal administrative judiciary must be able to recruit from the most able and experienced legal practitioners in both the private and public sectors, able to adjudicate complex and contested legal disputes. Adjudication of citizens' administrative claims by the Government is often the first contact the public has with the justice system. We want to ensure by passage of this bill, that the public has the quality and standard of service that justice deserves.

CONGRATULATING THE CANCER INSTITUTE OF NEW JERSEY

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 1997

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Cancer Institute of New Jersey on being designated as a clinical cancer center by the National Cancer Institute's Cancer Centers Program. This long-sought designation is a well-deserved honor and will mean much not only to the Cancer Institute of New Jersey but cancer patients throughout the State as well.

This designation, a tremendous advancement in health care for New Jerseyans, will allow clinical trials of new cancer therapies sponsored by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to take place in New Jersey for the first time. This is a major milestone for the 6-year-old center, which is part of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey's Robert Wood Johnson Medical School. The medical school will receive an $800,000 Federal grant to help support the center's operations. The designation places the Cancer Institute of New Jersey among the highest regarded cancer centers in the world.

The people of the State of New Jersey deserve the research and care provided by the Cancer Institute of New Jersey. They need to have convenient access to the newest advances in the prevention, diagnosis, and experimental treatment of cancer. Prior to the creation of the institute, New Jersey cancer patients seeking innovative care were forced to travel to either New York or Philadelphia. This was a particular burden for residents of the central portion of the State, which is an hour or more from either city. Such long travel distances are more than inconvenient—with frequent, repeated treatment sometimes needed, they can cause serious disruptions and hardships for the families involved. The opening of the institute has proven a major step forward for New Jersey cancer patients and its new designation as a cancer center brings New Jersey cancer treatment to the state-of-the-art.

The need for the institute is great. New Jersey has nearly 8 million citizens and cancer statistics ranking it as the third highest State in the Nation for estimated cancer deaths and the eighth highest for new cancer cases.

With 120 investigators, the Cancer Institute's clinical care and basic research programs include bone, bone marrow transplantation, gastrointestinal, genitourinary, gynecological, head and neck, leukemia/lymphoma, melanoma/sarcoma, and pediatrics.

The institute becomes one of more than 50 cancer centers designated across the country that engage in multidisciplinary research efforts to reduce cancer incidence, morbidity, and mortality.

The Cancer Institute of New Jersey is a partnership of UMDNJ, Hackensack University Medical Center, New Brunswick Affiliated Hospitals, St. Peter's Medical Center, and Atlantic Health System.

I know personally the tragedy of cancer: My husband, Richard W. Roukema, M.D., and I lost our son, Todd, to leukemia in 1976 at the age of 17. At that time, bone marrow transplants and other techniques that offered hope were only in their experimental stages. Since then, many advances have been made that have spared thousands of other parents the heartbreak we faced. It is thanks to the brilliant researchers and physicians at institutions such as the Cancer Institute of New Jersey that hope can be maintained.

Today, we are within grasp of a cure for many forms of cancer but much research remains to be done. I thank God for those who are willing to labor toward this goal and pray that with their help a cure can be found and that no child will ever again have to suffer from this terrible disease.

SALUTE TO THE CINCINNATI BURNS INSTITUTE

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 1997

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Shriners Hospitals for Children and the Cincinnati Burns Institute for their continuing commitment to the treatment and care of burn-injured children in the Cincinnati area, and to congratulate the Shriners on their 75th anniversary. We thank them for the vision and service that they have so generously given to the Greater Cincinnati community.

The Shriners Hospitals for Children is a network of 22 hospitals, 19 orthopedic units, and 3 burns institutes, offering specialized medical care to children up to the age of 18. The Cincinnati Burns Institute is one of the Shriners Hospitals specializing in acute and rehabilitative care of children suffering from burn injuries. As a regional referral hospital, the Cincinnati unit serves children who live within a 1,000-mile radius of Greater Cincinnati.

The mission of the Shriners is to minimize the devastation of burn injuries and enhance the patient's potential and quality of life. The Shriners provide family-centered and holistic pediatric burn care of the highest quality. And, by providing all medical care to patients at no cost to them or their parents or a third party, the Shriners Hospitals and Burns Institutes not only care emotionally for their patients, but financially as well. Through public education and prevention efforts, the Cincinnati Burns Institute, along with the Shriners, has been instrumental in raising public awareness in the management of pediatric burns.

The leadership of these truly dedicated organizations is an asset to our community and to our Nation. All of us in Cincinnati congratulate the Shriners Hospitals for Children on their 75th anniversary. We are grateful for all they have given to Greater Cincinnati.

AMERICA'S FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 1997

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for America's Federal credit unions on behalf of at least 35,000 people residing in the Second Congressional District who depend on them to receive financial services. As you may know, the original legislation that created Federal credit unions in the 1930's required that their members share a ''common bond of occupation or association.'' Over the years, this statute has been interpreted in a fashion that allows employees from many different companies to join the same credit union. However, in the 1994 Federal District Court case of National Credit Union Administration versus First National Bank & Trust and its subsequent appeals, it was ruled that credit unions must have a ''single common bond of occupation.'' In other words, all the members of the credit union must work for the same employer.

Although the Supreme Court has decided to hear this case, credit unions all across the Nation have been forced to cease accepting new