

positive byproduct has been the creation of over 150 new full-time jobs.

Furthermore, participating businesses also benefit by paying no sales tax on most tangible personal property and services and receiving credit against corporate business tax. In addition, qualified retail businesses may collect sales tax at half rate—3 percent on most taxable sales of tangible property. Hillside UEZ has been so successful that it has helped to attract at least nine new businesses into Hillside since its inception.

Programs like the Hillside UEZ help areas to raise their own infrastructure funds and hence do not rely solely on Federal dollars. This project has accumulated over \$500,000 through the collection of the 3 percent sales tax, and at least 90 percent of these funds will be utilized for infrastructure and program improvements within the designated UEZ area.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring this project from my district to the attention to the House, and I am sure that my colleagues will join me in applauding the accomplishments of the Hillside Urban Enterprise Zone.

#### PROFILE OF FRAN QUIGLEY

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday May 1, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the attached article from the Indianapolis News into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Indianapolis News, Apr. 24, 1997]

FROM THE OUTSIDE IN

(By Nelson Price)

Just about any way you look at it, he's an unusual chief of staff for a member of the U.S. Congress.

Fran Quigley lives in Indianapolis, not Washington, D.C.

He's a young, white man who works for an African-American woman, the first elected to the House of Representatives from Indianapolis.

He was a stay-home dad for two or three years.

Before that his most spectacular case as an attorney involved a class-action lawsuit against the Center Township trustee's office.

Ironically, Quigley, 34, met U.S. Rep. Julia M. Carson, a Democrat, when she was elected to the office he was suing on behalf of the city's homeless.

And Quigley, who comes from a large Catholic family long involved in social work and social-justice issues, is a lifelong political outsider and advocate for the disenfranchised.

Yet here he is in a fourth-floor office Downtown, serving as the top staffer for a politician.

"I've always been on the outside," Quigley says. "I'm sure I'll go back to being on the outside. This is an exception because Ms. Carson is an exception, a politician who personifies social-justice issues and who lifted herself out of poverty, racism and sexism."

His move from the outside "in" was baptism by fire. During Quigley's first day on the job, Jan. 3, Carson underwent open-heart surgery in Methodist Hospital.

The crisis came just four days before she was supposed to take the oath of office. But Quigley, a brown-haired, preppy-looking man, stresses that he never was a de facto congressman.

"Ms. Carson was in intensive care, but somehow managed to finagle a phone in

there with her, which I'm told is unheard of," Quigley says. "Almost from the beginning, she was leaving phone messages for me starting at 5:30 in the morning."

Carson, 58, whose 10th Congressional District includes much of Marion County, arrived on Capitol Hill in early March.

Quigley remains in Indianapolis, overseeing five staff members here and five in Washington.

A congressional chief of staff based in a politician's hometown rather than in Washington is unusual. Quigley, who travels to the nation's capital about once a month, says Carson preferred the arrangement as a grass-roots way to deal with constituents. (U.S. Rep. Lee Hamilton's chiefs of staff usually have lived in Indiana.)

"Julia has a great find in Fran," says Richard Waples, an Indianapolis attorney. "He's an intelligent, caring person with a great, big heart."

Waples, then a lawyer for the Indiana Civil Liberties Union, teamed with Quigley, a public defender, to bring the class-action lawsuit against the Center Township trustee in the late 1980s.

#### BATTLED TO GET SERVICES

They sought a major expansion of the trustee's services to the homeless and won a blockbuster court ruling against then-Trustee Bill Smith. Then, as Quigley tells it, the lawyers battled daily to get the services provided to their clients. In the midst of the conflicts, Carson was elected trustee in 1990.

That set up Quigley's first encounter with his future boss, a meeting he assumed would be adversarial.

"It was anything but," he says. "Ms. Carson told me, 'Look, I've got a \$17 million debt to deal with in this office. I don't want to have to pay a lot of lawyers. If your clients have problems, come directly to me.'"

"Then she backed up what she said."

Quigley's efforts on behalf of the homeless are par for the course in his family. He grew up as the eighth of nine children in a household known for community involvement.

#### A FAMILY OF VOLUNTEERS

His father, Bill Quigley, has volunteered extensively for the Cathedral Food Kitchen, the Catholic Youth Organization and the St. Vincent de Paul Society; Bill Quigley received The Indianapolis Star's Jefferson Award in 1989 for his charitable activities.

Fran's mother, also named Fran, is a retired physical therapist. She is active in a Catholic group that promotes peace and has volunteered for many of the same organizations as her husband as well as Christ the King Catholic Church.

"I don't think we ever preached community involvement, at least in terms of verbalizing it," Mrs. Quigley says. "We just always tried to help our community and church. Frankly, we've learned as much about what the world needs from Fran and our other children as they have from us."

The younger Fran says his influences include his older brothers Bill Jr., a lawyer involved in social causes in New Orleans, and Tim, who headed up the Indianapolis Peace and Justice Center before moving to Kansas a few years ago.

Tim Quigley also was a stay-home dad for a while. So was one of Fran's brothers-in-law. With them as role models, the decision to stay home after his son was born seemed natural, Quigley says.

"It was the hardest job I ever had," he recalls, "but also the best."

Now, his wife, Ellen White Quigley, cares for the couple's two children while working part-time as an attorney. Their children are Sam, 5, and Kate, 3.

"Ellen and the kids have a 'stay-at-home' fun day each week," says Quigley, whose de-

votion to his family comes across in conversation. "I'm jealous when I leave in the morning to go to the office."

#### TAUGHT POVERTY LAW

Quigley didn't go directly from his home to the Carson campaign. In between was a stint at the Indiana University School of Law-Indianapolis. He taught a clinic on poverty law, overseeing students as they helped needy clients; Quigley is on a leave of absence to serve as Carson's chief of staff.

When Carson announced her candidacy last year, Quigley signed on as a volunteer. That led to the job offer after Carson defeated Republican Virginia Blankenbaker last November.

"I never would have predicted Fran would be in politics," his mother says. "One of his attributes—and I do think it's an attribute with Fran—is that he's very frank. He never says anything he doesn't believe. Many people in politics say what the listener wants to hear."

Cause-oriented as ever, Quigley says he and Carson have been talking about possible "community outreach" efforts for the office. They hope to establish "office" hours at libraries and community centers to be more accessible to the elderly, veterans and others.

"She's very driven, and she's not in office by accident," he says of Carson. "She's the smartest 'people person' I've ever known. Ms. Carson can meet someone and 'read' them instantly—correctly."

#### EXCESS DEFENSE SPENDING DISTORTS BUDGET BALANCING PROCESS

#### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1997

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as budget negotiations go forward, it is clear that the insistence on the part of many in both Congress and the executive branch on maintaining a military budget far beyond what is genuinely needed for American security threatens severe social hardship within the United States, and elsewhere in the world. The price of exempting the Pentagon from the budget discipline that is necessary to reach a balanced budget in the year 2002 is devastating cuts in the whole range of civilian programs—from health care and environmental protection within the United States through aid for local law enforcement in our communities onto economic assistance to fight poverty disease and nuclear proliferation overseas.

The New York Times editorial on April 30 addresses this issue in a forceful, lucid and persuasive fashion. I am inserting this editorial here:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1997]

#### A CHANCE TO SHRINK THE PENTAGON

With foreign military threats receding and pressure to balance the budget building, the Clinton Administration and Congress have a rare opportunity to reduce Pentagon spending to more reasonable levels. Maintaining American military superiority is vital, but it does not require an annual Pentagon budget of \$250 billion.

Making reductions must begin with recognition that cold-war benchmarks are misleading. Arguing that a 1998 Pentagon budget of \$250 billion is dangerously diminished because it falls 40 percent below the 1985 level

is tomfoolery. It dodges the essential point that most defense spending from 1947 to 1992 was devoted to dealing with the Soviet Union and its allies, a threat that no longer exists.

Politicians should also recognize that Pentagon spending is a significant force only in communities with large defense manufacturers or military bases. Pentagon spending is not the flywheel of prosperity in a \$7 trillion national economy.

Certainly, the United States cannot be complacent about its security. Iraq remains a threat to American interests in the Persian Gulf region. North Korea, strained by famine and heavily armed, could seek relief by renewing hostilities on the Korean Peninsula. China aims to be a military power in the decades ahead. Terrorism is a constant danger, and the need to send American troops abroad in peacekeeping roles is likely to grow. But no current or near-term peril comes anywhere close to the former Soviet threat.

The Pentagon is examining military requirements as part of its Quadrennial Defense Review, but do not expect much creative thinking from this exercise. The generals should be redesigning the American military to meet the threats of a new era, an exercise that might well slash budgets and discard the principle that America be able to fight two regional wars simultaneously.

That principle has justified an Army of 495,000 active-duty troops and a Navy with 12 aircraft carriers, just one less than the cold-war fleet. Scaling back to a more realistic one-war doctrine, plus sufficient air power to pin down an enemy elsewhere, would save \$10 billion to \$20 billion a year, even with more spending on stealth aircraft. Closing and consolidating bases and other support operations would produce additional savings.

Instead of looking seriously at these options, the generals are trying to determine how little they can cut within the Administration's five-year budget plan for the Pentagon. Under that plan, the budget would grow steadily, reaching \$278 billion in 2002. It includes a whopping 40 percent increase in spending for new weapons.

It would be interesting to see where planning would lead if it were not governed by the Clinton Administration's escalating Pentagon budgets and the military's exaggerated threat assessments. It is not unreasonable to believe that American security can be adequately protected for considerably less than \$240 billion a year.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION REVIEW ACT OF 1997

**HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 1, 1997*

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Cost of Higher Education Review Act of 1997. Representative McKEON and a bipartisan group of Members of this body have introduced this bill because we all share a common goal—we want college to be affordable for students and families across the country.

The current crisis in college affordability has been documented in various newsstories, as well as by the General Accounting Office in its report titled, "Tuition Increasing Faster Than Household Income and Public Colleges' Costs." Among the facts and figures contained

in the report is the simple reminder that paying for a college education is one of the most costly investments facing American families today.

Certainly, students and parents are well aware of this simple fact. At the field hearings held by the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training, and Life-Long Learning chaired by Representative McKEON, one consistent theme from students and parents is the reality that paying for college is a huge financial burden, and for some, it is simply out of reach.

Recent reports indicate that colleges have begun moderating their tuition increases and I am encouraged that the current rate of increase in tuition and fees is a vast improvement over prior years. I am also encouraged by the individual efforts of some college presidents who are restructuring their campuses in order to become more efficient and less costly, and sharing resources in order to control costs. But I think more can be done. Annual tuition increases of 5 to 6 percent continue to exceed the CPI rate of inflation and I think students, families, and taxpayers deserve to see a greater effort on the part of colleges to reduce those tuition increases.

The Commission established by this bill will review the cost controlling practices currently employed on some college campuses, as well as the underlying factors which impact tuition prices. Their analysis and recommendations for actions on the part of colleges, the administration, and the Congress will be vital to our goal of keeping college affordable for all Americans.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join in support of this legislation.

#### CITIZENSHIP USA

**HON. RON PACKARD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 1, 1997*

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] has tested me time and again. Today, my patience has run out. My district in southern California has one of the largest concentrations of illegal aliens. INS claims to be working to remedy this problem. They are failing miserably.

This morning, I learned that the Citizenship USA Program, which is run by the INS, has failed to properly screen nearly 180,000 aliens. These aliens were hastily naturalized without adequate background checks. Many more submitted the fingerprints of another person to avoid triggering a hit by the FBI. How many criminals has the INS allowed to become U.S. citizens? How many criminal aliens are lurking in our neighborhoods and preying on our children?

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I helped introduce legislation drafted by my colleague ELTON GALLEGLY. This bill would expand a pilot program currently operating in Anaheim and Ventura County, CA, which requires a 24-hour presence of INS agents at local jails in 100 counties with the highest concentration of illegal aliens.

Currently, our local law enforcement officials do not have the power to deport these criminal illegal aliens. This bill will place the proper authorities in the hands of our communities in

order to send these criminal illegal aliens back over the border for good. In addition, because those who committed crimes are more likely to break the law again, this bill will pick up those who slipped through the cracks of the Citizenship USA Program. It is my hope that the INS will now correct the wrongs they have committed against law-abiding U.S. citizens. The INS must take appropriate action to deport those who are found to have submitted falsified documents to gain U.S. citizenship. It is the right thing to do for the safety of our children and the security of our neighborhoods. We must rid our streets of these criminal aliens.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION REVIEW ACT OF 1997

**HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 1, 1997*

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Cost of Higher Education Review Act of 1997.

In today's technology and information based economy, getting a high quality postsecondary education is more important than ever. For many Americans, it is the key to the American dream. As Chairman of the Subcommittee with jurisdiction over Federal higher education policy, I am responsible for the programs which provide Federal help in getting this education. However, my interest in higher education goes well beyond the role I play as Chairman. I am a parent and a grandparent. I know students who are pursuing or will pursue a postsecondary education. I have constituents, students and parents, who are worried about their ability to afford a college education.

Historically, the cost of getting a postsecondary education has increased at a rate slightly above the cost of living. However, a recent GAO report tells us that over the last 15 years the price of attending a 4-year public college has increased 234 percent, while the median household income has risen by only 82 percent, and the CPI only 74 percent. A recent survey of college freshmen found that concern over college affordability is at a 30-year high. Parents and students across the country are understandably worried about the rising cost of a college education. In order to control the cost of obtaining a college education, parents, students, and policy makers must work together with colleges and universities to slow tuition inflation, or for many Americans, college will become unaffordable.

This is not to say that there are not affordable schools. There are still some affordable schools and there are college presidents who are committed to keeping costs low. There are schools that are trying very innovative things to reduce tuition prices.

However, the trend in college pricing is truly alarming. This trend is especially alarming in that it only seems to apply to higher education. There are many endeavors and many businesses that must keep pace with changing technologies and Federal regulations. However, in order to stay affordable to their customers and stay competitive in the market, they manage to hold cost increases to a reasonable level.

The legislation I am introducing today will establish a commission on the cost of higher