

and bonds, and Forward Funds, Inc., which focuses on investing in domestic and foreign equities and bonds with a \$230 million investment portfolio.

Leo McCarthy is also the Vice Chair on the Board of Open Data Systems, a private firm which creates software aimed at facilitating the accurate recording and processing of building permits and other development documents used by local governments. All of these private sector businesses have subsequently benefited from his active and enthusiastic involvement as a board member. In 1995, Leo McCarthy became President of the Daniel Group, a law partnership which focuses on international trade and market investment.

With all these responsibilities, Leo McCarthy has continued his public service. Appointed to the National Gambling Impact Study Commission by the U.S. Senate Democratic Leadership, the Commission has undertaken a two year study of the impact of all forms of legal gambling in the United States at the order of the President and the Congress.

Leo McCarthy and his wife Jacqueline have been married for over 40 years. They have four exceptionally talented children, Sharon, a fifth grade teacher, Conna, an attorney, Adam, an import-export businessman, and Niall, an attorney, and they are the proud grandparents of eight.

Leo McCarthy's life of leadership is instructive to us all. His dedication to the ideals of both democracy and public service stand tall. I am especially blessed to have him as a mentor, a colleague, and a friend. It is fitting that the San Francisco Law School has chosen to induct him into its Hall of Fame and I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join me in honoring a great and good man. We are indeed a better country and a better people because of him.

---

DOROTHY'S PLACE HOSPITALITY CENTER

---

**HON. SAM FARR**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, November 8, 1999*

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the millionth meal served by Dorothy's Place Hospitality Center. Founded in 1982 by Robert Smith and operated by the Franciscan Workers of Junipero Serra, Dorothy's Place is a local soup kitchen in Salinas that has provided food and support daily to the hungry and the homeless.

Dorothy's Place Hospitality Center has for more than seventeen years provided meals as well as support to the less fortunate members of Salinas County during times of need and hardship. The staff and volunteers have graciously extended themselves through commitment and generosity to our local poor. Dorothy's Place is a great community resource deserving of praise and thanks for the humanitarian spirit and service that it has provided for so many years.

It is with great pleasure that I commend Dorothy's Place Hospitality Center for serving its millionth meal. For its exemplary record of service to the poor and hungry, I would like to extend best wishes for success in the future as this establishment continues to make invaluable contributions to our community.

JAPANESE "COMFORT WOMEN"

---

**HON. LANE EVANS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, November 8, 1999*

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about one of the great injustices, one of the most flagrant violations of human rights.

During World War Two, the Japanese military forced hundreds of thousands of women to serve as sexual slaves. Euphemistically known as "comfort women", they were predominantly Korean women and girls abducted from their homes and forced to serve Japanese soldiers. This government-sanctioned program created untold numbers of comfort stations or military brothels throughout Japanese-occupied territories in the Pacific Rim.

For decades after the war, the Japanese government denied the existence of "comfort women" and the comfort stations, but in 1994, their position changed. The Japanese government admitted that "the then Japanese military was directly or indirectly involved in the establishment and management of comfort stations and the transfer of "comfort women [and] that this was an act that severely injured the honour and dignity of many women".

In 1993, international jurists in Geneva, Switzerland ruled that women who were forced to be sexual slaves of the Japanese military deserve at least \$40,000 each from the state treasury as compensation for their extreme pain and suffering.

Mr. Speaker, the Japanese government has a legal as well as moral responsibility to face its history. To continue to indignantly brush away these women's claims adds insult to injury.

Stripped of their dignity, robbed of their honor, most of them were forced to live their lives carrying those horrific experiences with them covered under a veil of shame. I don't think they should do so any longer.

I believe the Japanese government must do whatever can be done to restore some dignity for these women.

The German government has formally apologized to the victims of the Holocaust as well as other war crimes victims and has gone to great lengths to provide for their needs and recovery, but the Japanese government has yet to do so.

That is why, in the strongest possible terms, I call upon Japan to formally issue a clear and unambiguous apology for the atrocious war crimes committed by the Japanese military during World War II and offer reparations no less than \$40,000 for each of the "comfort women". The surviving women are advanced in age, and time is of the essence. They have waited so long. They should wait no longer.

Critics may ask why we should even dredge up something that happened so long ago and halfway across the world?

Let me turn the critics' attention to the U.S. Constitution. It reads: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights . . ."

Mr. Speaker, this nation was an experiment. An experiment to form a new system of government. A government based on the then-radical concept that we all have certain God-given rights that should not be violated—each and every one of us in this world. It matters

not that injustices were committed against women and girls in East Asia over fifty years ago or fifty minutes ago. There is no statute of limitation on crimes against humanity. When human rights are violated, the international community must act because we have a moral responsibility to do so.

Even today, we sometimes turn a blind eye to human rights. We sometimes take them for granted. We sometimes stay silent. But we shouldn't.

Two hundred years ago, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "the laws of humanity make it a duty for nations, as well as individuals, to help those whom accident and distress have thrown upon them."

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe we have a duty. We have a duty to help those who need our help. We have a duty to stand up for those who cannot stand up on their own. We have a duty to speak up for those who have no voices and to do what is just and what is right.

So, let us do what is just and what is right for the "comfort women" and other victims. Let us speak out for them. Let us stand up for them. Let us lend them our strength.

We must act and we must speak out, because in the end, people will remember not the words of their enemies, but the silence of their friends.

We must not remain silent.

---

MEDICARE, MEDICAID, AND SCHIP BALANCED BUDGET REFINEMENT ACT OF 1999

---

SPEECH OF

**HON. JERROLD NADLER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 5, 1999*

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to explain my vote against H.R. 3075, the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Balanced Budget Refinement Act. This bill makes several important restorations of cuts that were made to the Medicare program in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. However, this bill also includes a provision that would hurt New York City's teaching hospitals and render meaningless the other positive measures in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, America's hospitals are hurting and they need relief from the mammoth cuts made by the Balanced Act. I was one of the few lawmakers who voted against the Balanced Budget Act because I knew it would have these consequences. We should not be surprised that cutting over \$200 billion from Medicare would cause the quality of care to suffer in many hospitals. In New York State alone, it has been estimated that hospitals have lost over \$550 million so far and could face up to \$3 billion more in cuts over 5 years without new legislation. H.R. 3075 would make a small, but important, down payment toward restoring those cuts.

However, it is shameful that in the name of providing relief, this bill would create even more pain for New York. At the last minute, a provision was added to change the methodology by which Medicare reimburses teaching hospitals for their direct medical education costs from one based on actual cost to one based on national average costs. This would shift over \$45 million a year from New York

State, where costs are well above the national average, to other parts of the country. In my district alone, teaching hospitals would lose almost \$12 million in the first five years this provision would be in effect. Teaching hospitals help train the next generation of physicians. It would be unwise to shortchange this investment for the future.

It is unfortunate that this provision was inserted at the last minute during the final negotiations, from which Democrats were frozen out. In addition, H.R. 3075 was brought up under suspension of the rules, allowing little debate and no opportunity to offer an amendment to rectify the situation.

America's hospitals need relief from the deep cuts made in 1997. I hope that we will find a way to do this without pitting states against each other.

**H.R. 3196—FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL**

**HON. MIKE McINTYRE**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, November 8, 1999*

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, for the record, this is to clarify that the "no" vote I cast on November 5, 1999, against the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill is by no means an indication that I am opposed to foreign aid for Israel, India, Greece, or Cyprus. Indeed, my voting record with regard to aid for these countries clearly exemplifies my strong support for them. Our country should value our relationships with these and other nations who are allies and partners for peace. In fact, I voted for the Young Amendment to the Foreign Operations bill because it is critical to our national security interests that we provide assistance to implement the Wye River Accord between Israel, the Palestinian Authority, and Jordan. The reason I voted against the Foreign Appropriations bill is because we, as a Nation, have an obligation to take care of our own families first and provide them with the aid they need especially in times of dire emergencies. The citizens of North Carolina are facing an imminent crisis in the wake of three major hurricanes that must be addressed immediately by Congress with the passage of an emergency relief bill. Until that happens, it is improper for us to place the needs of other countries ahead of the needs of our own taxpayers.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 900,  
GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY ACT**

SPEECH OF

**HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, November 4, 1999*

Mr. LaFALCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on S. 900, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Financial Modernization Act of 1999.

In July, the House passed its version of financial modernization (H.R. 10), with a broad bipartisan vote of 343–86. The Senate passed a partisan product (S. 900) by a narrow margin of 54–44, a bill which the White House in-

dicated it would veto because of its negative impact on the national bank charter, highly problematic provisions on the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) and its nonexistent privacy protections.

The conference report necessarily represents a compromise between the two versions. But it is a good and balanced compromise. It effectively modernizes our financial system, while ensuring strong protections for consumers and communities. As a result, the Administration strongly supports the conference report.

There are clear gains for our financial services system, for consumers and for communities in this bill if it is enacted. There are clear losses if it is not.

Without this bill, banks will continue to expand into securities and insurance business as they have been doing for some years under current law. However, they will do so without CRA coverage; without privacy protections; without the regulatory oversight and regulatory protections enhanced in this bill; and with artificial structural limitations that will place the U.S. financial services industry at a clear competitive disadvantage. Without this bill, commercial firms will continue to move more and more into the banking business, with no real limitations.

I would like to review the major provisions of the bill and the intent of those provisions.

**FINANCIAL MODERNIZATION**

This bill permits the creation of new financial services holding companies which can offer a full range of financial products under a strong regulatory regime based on the principle of functional regulation. Banks currently engage in securities and insurance activity under existing law and court interpretations of that law, including the Bank Holding Company Act, the Federal Reserve Act, the National Banks Act, and various state laws. This conference report ensures that such activities will occur, in the future, with appropriate regulatory oversight based on the principle of functional regulation. The conference report also provides for appropriate "umbrella" authority at the holding company level by the Federal Reserve, and essential consumer and community protections.

The conference report, in contrast to the Senate bill, clearly preserves the strength of the national bank charter by giving institutions a choice of corporate structure through which they can conduct their business consistent with the original House product.

I would like to clarify the intent of this legislation as it pertains to the market-making, dealing and other activities of securities affiliates of financial holding companies. Currently, bank holding companies are generally prohibited from acquiring more than five percent of the voting stock of any company whose activities are not closely related to banking. The Federal Reserve has determined that a securities affiliate of a bank holding company cannot acquire or retain more than five percent of the voting shares of a company in a market-making or dealing capacity. In addition, for purposes of determining compliance with this five-percent limit, the Federal Reserve has required that the voting shares held by the securities affiliate be aggregated with the shares held by other affiliates of the bank holding company.

I would like to make clear that, by permitting financial holding companies to engage in underwriting, dealing and market making, Con-

gress intends that the five-percent limitation no longer apply to bona fide securities underwriting, dealing, and market-making activities. In addition, voting securities held by a securities affiliate of a financial holding company in an underwriting, dealing or market-making capacity would not need to be aggregated with any shares that may be held by other affiliates of the financial holding company. This is necessary under the bill so that bank-affiliated securities firms can conduct securities activities in the same manner and to the same extent as their non-bank affiliated competitors, which is one of the principal objectives of the legislation. The elimination of the restriction applies only to bona fide securities underwriting, dealing, and market-making activities and does not permit financial holding companies and their affiliates to control non-financial companies in ways that are otherwise impermissible under the bill.

The Conference Committee agreed to make the effective date of implementation of Title I, except for Section 104, 120 days from the date of enactment. We reached this decision to provide the regulators with an opportunity to implement this legislation effectively. It is the intent of the Conference that Title I become effective 120 days after enactment even if the agencies are not able to complete all of the rulemaking required under the act during that time.

In addition, it should be noted that in some instances, no rule writing is required. For example, new Section 4(k)(4) of the Bank Holding Company Act, as added by Section 103 of the bill, explicitly authorizes bank holding companies which file the necessary certifications to engage in a laundry list of financial activities. These activities are permissible upon the effective date of the act without further action by the regulators. The Conference recognizes, however, that refinements in rulemaking may be necessary and desirable going forward, and for example, have specifically authorized the Federal Reserve and the Treasury Department to jointly issue rules on merchant banking activities. If regulators determine that any such rulemaking is necessary, the Conference encourages them to act expeditiously.

**COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT (CRA)**

**DISCLOSURE AND REPORTING OF CRA AGREEMENTS**

While I support the general concept of disclosure, the so-called "sunshine" provision could be pernicious because it could cast aspersions on the many constructive partnerships between banks and community groups that are helping to bring thousands of communities and millions of Americans into the financial mainstream.

Fortunately, however, the bill now substantially limits the scope, reporting requirements, and penalties for violating the disclosure requirements.

The "sunshine" amendment applies only to agreements that would "materially impact" a bank's CRA rating or a regulator's decision to approve a bank's application. Few if any agreements with major banks would have so large an impact. Indeed, it would neither make sense nor be workable to require annual reports for every contract between a bank and every community partner merely because they had discussed how to best meet CRA requirements. In addition, grants and cash payments under \$10,000 and loans under \$50,000 would be automatically exempted, as would most market rate loans that are not re-lent. I also strongly encourage the regulators to use their