

his own side) and by whom they rely on for regular counsel. Legislators who limit themselves to a narrow circle of advisers from any part of the spectrum usually limit the breadth of their knowledge and vision.

(3) They do their legislative homework and develop expertise on at least one issue.

A legislator earns respect from his fellow lawmakers by providing them with a superior understanding of certain types of legislation, even if the subjects are not of greatest importance to other members. Because legislators deal with so many issues, each has the opportunity to become an expert. It's an opportunity the showboaters pass up, but which pays off at crucial times and becomes the source of mutual trust and reliance in legislative bodies.

(4) They are not obsessed with obtaining credit from the media and the public for presumed legislative accomplishments. Obviously, elected officials need to receive some credit in order to be seen as effective back home. But for that very reason, the legislator who shares credit builds trust and respect among his colleagues. This kind of credit in politics is like financial credit in a bank; it's there when you really need it.

Most legislators especially develop a distaste for fellow members who continually seek praise when it is not deserved. It may not count against them in the media, but it does count against them in legislative negotiations.

(5) They realize that changes often come in a series of small steps.

I'm talking about the art of compromise, of course. Political and social principles are extremely important, but of little benefit if they can't persuade people on their own. Obtaining desired legislation by increments is usually more realistic under the American system than it is, perhaps, in systems without so many checks and balances and where laws can be fundamentally changed all at once. Legislators who insist on having everything their own way may look noble on television, but they carry little weight with their colleagues and generally get little of consequence done.

(6) They know how to work in a bipartisan fashion on most issues and respect the sincerity of those who oppose their point of view.

The effective legislator, like an effective person in any field, is able to discuss issues without personal rancor, and to realize that he or she may not possess the final truth in all matters of public policy.

Respect is the basis of civility. It lubricates the legislative process and removes unnecessary friction.

There's wisdom as well as kindness in this attitude of humility. An honest legislator will admit that much legislation, once it is implemented, may turn out to lack the perfection its authors claimed for it and will have to be modified or even repealed. Don't denounce your critic too harshly. History may prove him right!

(7) On issues where dramatic differences of opinion exist, they are intellectually capable of understanding their opponents' positions and arguments.

This is hard to do, or at least to do well. The common tendency is to parody the arguments of an opponent or put words in his mouth. But even if the public cannot always see it, other legislators know when a colleague is representing an opponents' case fairly. When it happens, even though minds may not change, attitudes are changed. An honest debater wins points of respect. It adds to the credit in his bank!

(8) They refuse to take themselves too seriously.

Politics is a serious business, but keeping a sense of humor is essential to keeping a re-

alistic sense of proportion, and that actually helps the serious business proceed. For many elected officials, periodic re-election and growing seniority make them imagine that they not only are gaining in experience but in virtue. Arrogance and acute self-centeredness hurt effectiveness. An ability to laugh at yourself has the "serious" result that it disarms your opponents!

(9) They understand that you become more effective by listening, questioning and learning, rather than just talking.

Almost all politicians, in or out of office, like to talk, naturally.

However, that does not mean that they have a lot of patience for other politicians who abuse the privilege. They do notice the person who studies carefully, gives evidence of sincere intellectual curiosity and works hard.

(10) They demonstrate their integrity by admitting their imperfections.

Nobody's perfect and little is more annoying than some politician who pretends otherwise—especially with his colleagues, who definitely know better. In fact, if you were perfect, you'd be smart to hide it.

Admitting your were wrong on an issue, not knowing the answer to every question and even changing one's mind in the face of facts are signs of personal security and strength, not of weakness. Such occasional admissions (which obviously should not be calculated) demonstrate to colleagues genuine character and encourage trust. Any observer can tell you that most legislators do not have all of these characteristics, and I would be the first to confess that in my 24 years as a legislator, not all of them were part of my own makeup.

Effective legislators don't need to have them all, but they do need to have a majority etched in their personality, and usually long before their election.

Other factors will help develop character, including experience, analytical powers that improve personal judgment, and the courage to stand up and be counted when the political risks are high.

Oddly, however, many of our most effective legislators have great difficulty being elected to higher office. Why is this so? Regrettably, just as a good "show horse" does not necessarily result in a good "work horse," the opposite is also true. The very humility that makes for trust within a legislative body, enabling quiet influence for good, is the vulnerability a rival can exploit at campaign time. The courage of one's conviction that the history books are likely to praise is perceived as mere stubbornness in the eyes of an offended interest group.

That is why it is increasingly important for voters, and the media that inform them, to consider the quiet, behind-the-scenes merits of effective legislators and other elected officials. The character issue is really about the age-old search for someone who would be "good" in office. The implication is that character and effectiveness usually go hand in hand. So don't just take the word of a campaign ad, television sound bite, or even a news column, as to who is likely to do the best job in office.

Check with a legislator's colleagues and the people who work with him or her. If we want effective people in office, we need to learn how to do a better job of figuring out which ones they are.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of personal observations about Joel Pritchard.

When I ran for Congress, I had never run for any office before. I was not really all that involved in politics and I did not know Joel very well at the time, but I can remember when a re-

porter first asked me who I would like to be like in Congress and who was my hero, what sort of model would I like to follow, Joel Pritchard was the first person I thought of. He had that reputation throughout our State, even among people who did not know him.

After I was elected, Joel took a personal interest in me and we saw a lot of him in our office in Washington, DC. He would come back and talk to me and talk to the staff. Every once in a while he would give me gentle advice on the right way to deal with things, and frankly he gave me an example of a really excellent way to conduct myself in the job that I have. I have the seat that he had for 12 years.

I would like to say, Madam Speaker, in closing, that he set out a very admirable path for those of us who are in this business. It is a path that frankly will be harder for me to follow, and I think harder for all of us in this House to follow, now that Joel is no longer with us. We will miss him very much, perhaps more than we know. I just hope we can all be worthy of his example.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN N. STURDIVANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I came to speak about the loss of a leader in the Washington Metropolitan Area and in our community, but as well in our Nation. I came to the floor and I heard the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE] speak about Joel Pritchard. I had not heard that he died.

Madam Speaker, I had the opportunity to serve with Joel Pritchard. He was a Representative, as has been said, of great integrity and great substance, a very decent human being who believed that partisanship came long after principle. He was a delight to serve with, and I am sorry to hear that he has passed away.

But as I will say about John Sturdivant, Joel Pritchard was someone who made this House a better place because of his service.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak about a very good friend of mine, John Sturdivant, president of the American Federation of Government Employees. John Sturdivant died just a few days ago of cancer. I had the opportunity to talk to him about 3 or 4 days prior to his death. Even at that time, he was talking about his beloved members of the American Federation of Government Employees, was talking about how he could fight for and work for ensuring that they had an opportunity to earn sufficient funds to create for themselves a decent life and to provide well for their families, their husbands, their wives, their children.

Madam Speaker, his death leaves not only the American Federation of Government Employees, not only government employees generally, but our Nation bereft of an individual who fought tirelessly on behalf of our Nation's civil servants and on behalf of efficiency and effectiveness in our government.

As president of AFGE, John Sturdivant represented over 700,000 workers throughout the United States during one of the most difficult periods facing civil servants in this country's history. He was deeply committed, Madam Speaker, to the belief that today's civil servants constitute the answer, not the problem, to making our Government operate more smoothly and efficiently. The thousands of workers he spoke for could not have had a more committed, more knowledgeable, more passionate advocate of their interests.

Madam Speaker, I knew John Sturdivant well. He was my friend. He worked very hard to shift public opinion of civil servants from the incorrect perception of inactivity and non-performance to the truth of a dynamic and hard-working national resource.

Madam Speaker, I will be speaking at John Sturdivant's funeral next week, and I will remember him as a good human being, as an American who cared about his country, as a person who utilized his talent to the fullest, not simply for himself or for profit or for gain, personal gain, but for the welfare of the country he loved and the welfare of his members.

He was at times a person of great passion and even anger, but that anger and passion was directed at correcting and righting wrongs that he perceived.

I know that he dealt with the President, with the Vice President, and with so many of us in the Congress of the United States as an advocate of policies that would reward our personnel based upon their effort and their talent and their accomplishments.

He will be difficult for AFGE to replace. He will, like all of us, be replaced. None of us are indispensable. But all of us hopefully can be remembered as making a special contribution, a contribution of significant worth, a contribution emanating from a sense of our country's needs and the needs of our fellow men and women.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for this time to remember a good and decent American, John Sturdivant, President of the American Federation of Government Employees.

□ 1315

THE BRAINLESS TAXMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Madam Speaker, it is not often that I bring a whole lot

of levity to this House, but sometimes we have to make sure we maintain our sense of humor in order to make sure we maintain our focus.

Madam Speaker, this is Halloween and there will be many scary stories that are told today. One of the scariest stories that I heard that I remember when I was a child was the tale of the headless horseman. But in keeping with that theme today, let me tell you a true story. I call it the tale of the brainless taxman. As I said, this is really a true story and it involves one of my constituents.

My constituent, a respected Idaho jurist named Robert Huntley, carefully paid his taxes every year and when I said he is a respected Idaho jurist, he is a former justice of the Idaho Supreme Court. He is a careful man. He is a law-abiding man. He thought that he was safe, by paying his estimated taxes as required, from the clutches of the brainless taxman. But last year he made a mistake. The good judge underpaid his taxes by 39 cents. Out of nearly \$75,000, the good judge underpaid his taxes by 39 cents.

Now, that is an error of about one two-hundred thousandths of the tax burden. It is also less than one-half dollar. It seems to me that it could have been rounded down to a zero, but that would have been reasonable. And the IRS is not reasonable and we all know that from the horror stories that we have heard across this Nation.

So what did the brainless taxman do in this case? Well, he pointed a bony finger in the direction of the judge and told him that he owes 39 cents in back taxes plus \$123.71 in penalties plus 1 cent in interest on this egregiously delinquent bill.

Now, Madam Speaker, the brainless taxman assessed penalty and interest of \$123.71 for an error of 39 cents on former Justice Robert Huntley.

In case you are wondering, in order to calculate 39 cents as a percentage of his tax bill, you have to go back six decimal places. No wonder Americans are scared to death of the brainless taxman. Madam Speaker, let us drive a stake through the heart of this monster once and for all. Let us not just wound him, let us drive a stake through the heart of this monster.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD copies of Justice Huntley's letter that was sent to me and his tax bill. I have properly redacted the good judge's Social Security number.

GIVENS PURSLEY & HUNTLEY LLP,
BOISE, ID, JULY 21, 1997.

Hon. HELEN CHENOWETH,
Longworth House Office Bldg.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHENOWETH: I write you to give you a document which will instill pride in the bureaucracy of our government, namely the IRS. Enclosed is a notice I have received advising that I underpaid my quarterly payments by \$.39 cents and thus I am being assessed a penalty of \$123.70 and interest of \$.01 (one cent).

It is great that the IRS expends its energy ferreting out us substantial tax avoiders.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. HUNTLEY, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Ogden, UT, July 14, 1997.

Robert C & Elfriede M. Huntley.

REQUEST FOR TAX PAYMENT

According to our records, you owe \$124.10 on your income tax. Please pay the full amount by Aug. 4, 1997. If you've already paid your tax in full or arranged for an installment agreement, please disregard this notice.

If you haven't paid, mail your check or money order and tear-off stub from the last page of this notice. Make your check payable to internal revenue service and write your social security number on it. If you can't pay in full, please call us to discuss payment.

TAX STATEMENT PAYMENTS AND CREDITS

Tax withheld	\$.00
Estimated tax payments	- 45,041.61
Other credits00
Other payments	- 29,804.00
Total payments & credits	- 74,845.61
TAX	
Total tax on return	74,846.00
Less: Total payments & credits	- 74,845.61
Underpaid tax39
Penalty	123.70
Interest01
Amount you owe	124.10
Subtract payments we have not included above	
Pay this amount (use tear-off on last page)	

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Madam Speaker, recently I have introduced H.R. 2663, the Native American Housing and Self-Determination Act amendments, to strengthen the Native American housing bill passed in the 104th Congress. Since the passing of this legislation, we have become aware of abuses and mismanagement in the Department of Housing and Urban Development and their Native American Housing Program. Throughout the events leading up to the disclosure of abuses, it is evident that HUD has been slow in acting, slow in responding, and slow in taking corrective measures.

Consequently, Federal funds which should have been spent on low-income tribal members were spent for extravagant housing or projects not approved by the grant. Where was HUD when these abuses were occurring? Why was not HUD watching for abuses?

These were some of the questions at a joint hearing held by the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs earlier this year. In reality HUD could have done considerably more to prevent the abuses from occurring in the first place. HUD could have imposed greater sanctions and HUD could have stopped construction of some of the projects.

My legislation will strengthen the new law by requiring greater public accountability, increasing auditing capabilities, and ensuring that Federal funds are used appropriately. Currently, the law allows the Secretary of HUD to waive the submission of a