

the senior judge of the court. She is a former President of the Northern Ohio Municipal Judges Association and has served for the past seven years as its Secretary/Treasurer.

Judge Connally, formerly served as chairperson on the Youth Violence Committee of the Task Force on Violent Crime and the Mayor's Advisory committee on Gang Violence.

She is a former member of the Board of Trustees of her alma mater Bowling Green University and in 1994–1995 she served as president of their Board of Trustees and served as the chairperson of the presidential search committee. She also served as past president of the Northern Ohio Municipal Judges Association.

Mr. Speaker, the next person I want to recognize is Judge Mabel Jasper. She received her BS degree from Kent State University in 1956 and her JD from Cleveland Marshall Law School in 1977.

Prior to election to the Cleveland Municipal Court, she served as general trial referee for the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas—Domestic Relations Division. She was also an Assistant Attorney General for the state of Ohio, and was employed as a trial attorney for the Bureau of Workers Compensation for three years.

Judge Jasper is a member of many civic and professional organizations which include: Ohio State Bar Association; Delta Sigma Theta Sorority; and First woman member of the Rotary East club, a mostly all male organization.

The next person I want to honor is Judge Angela Stokes. Her name may sound familiar to many in this chamber because she is the daughter of my predecessor, Representative Louis Stokes.

Angela received her BS degree from the University of Maryland, College Park and her JD from Howard University School of Law in Washington, DC, and is admitted to the Supreme Court of Ohio, the United States District Courts and Northern and Southern Districts of Ohio and the United States Court of Appeals Sixth District.

Prior to being elected to the bench, Angela served as an Assistant Attorney General for the State of Ohio where she was assigned to the Federal Litigation Section in Columbus and later in Cleveland. She also worked for the British Petroleum of America corporate law department. In 1995 she was elected to the Cleveland Municipal Court.

Judge Stokes remains active in the Greater Cleveland Community. She has dedicated her time and energy to a variety of professional and civic organizations: Active Member of the Junior League; Member of a non-profit task force SAMM (Stopping AIDS is my Mission); she is member of the 11th Congressional District Caucus; board member of the Cleveland Marshall College of Law Louis Stokes Scholarship fund; and member of the Board of Trustees of Cuyahoga County Library Board.

Judge Keenon is a graduate of the Cleveland Marshall Law School and received her BS degree from Tennessee State University. Prior to being elected to the bench, Judge Keenon was a teacher and social worker in the Greater Cleveland Area.

Upon earning her JD, Una became staff attorney for the legal aid society and was appointed Attorney in Charge of the Juvenile Division of the Cuyahoga county Public Defender Office. She also served as managing

attorney for the United Auto Workers legal services plan. Judge Keenon was appointed by then Governor Richard Celeste to fill a judicial vacancy. She subsequently was elected to another full term.

While on the bench, Judge Keenon established many programs within the East Cleveland Municipal Court: Curfew laws for children of the East Cleveland community and GED program for young offenders by sending them back to school.

She is a member of many civic and professional organizations: President of the Black Women Lawyers; 1st Vice President of the League of Women Voters; Co-Founder & 1st President of Black Women Political Action Committee; Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority; and National Council of Negro Women.

Judge Lynn Toler received her BA degree from Harvard University and her JD from the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Lynn was elected to the Cleveland Heights Municipal court in 1994 and prior to that Lynn Toler had a distinguished career as an attorney. I have highlighted some of the civic and professional memberships as an indication of her commitment to her community: Cleveland Chapter of Links; Board Member—Board of Trustees Juvenile Diabetes Foundation; Cuyahoga County Criminal Justice Services which oversaw funding for services related to the criminal justice system; and Board of Trustees for the Goodwill Starting Program.

Another one of my sisters I want to mention during this special order is Judge Shirley Strickland Stafford who received her BA degree from Central State University and law degree from Marshall College of Law.

Prior to her election, Judge Stafford was in the criminal division of the Legal Aid Society of Cleveland, Public Defender's office. In 1994 she was elected to Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas.

I want to mention some of the Civic and Professional Associations that Judge Stafford is affiliated with as an indication of her commitment to our community: Member of the National Bar Association; American Judges Association; Ohio County and Municipal Judges Association; National Association of Women Judges; and First African American woman to be elected President of the American Judges Association.

Judge Janet Burney received her BS from Skidmore College and her JD from Cleveland State University, Cleveland Marshall College of Law.

Prior to joining the bench this year, Judge Burney has a long and distinguished legal career that has spanned over twenty years.

Civic and Professional Associations: Member of the state bar of Ohio; United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio; United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit; United States Supreme Court; Board of Trustees; St. Luke's Foundation; Interchurch Council of Greater Cleveland; Dean of Christian Education at Open Door Missionary Baptist Church; and Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank my colleague, Representative BARBARA LEE for organizing this Special Order.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF ROBERT CONDON AND THE ROLLING READERS

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise today to acknowledge the fine work of Rolling Readers USA and of its founder, Robert Condon, who died in January at the young age of 40.

In 1991, Mr. Condon, realizing the profound benefits of reading aloud to his sons, began reading to other children at a local homeless shelter and at a Head Start preschool. He was soon reading to children in Boys and Girls Clubs, after-school programs, and public housing sites. By recruiting 10 volunteers, Mr. Condon was able to rapidly expand this reading program to over 400 economically-disadvantaged children each week.

From this simple beginning, Rolling Readers USA was born! Eight short years later, 40,000 volunteers now read to and tutor 300,000 children each week and give \$3,000,000 worth of new books to children each year—often the first books these children have owned. Each volunteer in the Rolling Readers program reads to the same group of children each week, establishing a continuity, not only in tutoring, but in inspiring minds, touching imaginations, developing language skills, and assuring a positive impact on children's lives.

The Rolling Readers vision is very clear. We have a major crisis in our country—for 30 years literacy rates in the United States have been falling, with the biggest decline occurring in those children already in the bottom half in reading test scores. The work of Rolling Readers volunteers is critical to our nation!

Rolling Readers has grown from one man's ideals and commitment to service to become California's largest and one of the Nation's premier volunteer-based children's literacy organizations. Upon the death of its founder, Rolling Readers is sponsoring a national read-in day on March 27, 1999 to commemorate his life and achievements.

I would like to add my voice to the many who are thanking Robert Condon for his vision, his leadership, and his outstanding contribution to the children of our nation.

DEATH TAX SUNSET ACT

HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to introduce the Death Tax Sunset Act which would put an end to the Federal government's most outrageous form of taxation. Very simply, my bill would put an end to estate and gift taxes after the year 2002. Hard working Americans deserve no less.

The thought that our government can take over half of a person's life savings when they die should sicken every American. How can we justify taking 55 percent of Americans' life savings when they die? The answer, quite simply, is that we cannot.

First instituted in the late 18th century, the estate tax was enacted to help our young nation build a Navy to protect our shores. Until 1916 when it became a permanent part of the tax code, it was repealed and brought back several times during times of emergency. It has been largely unchanged since the 1930's. The death tax is now a combination of three taxes: the estate tax, the gift tax, and the generation-skipping transfer tax. Its tax rate is the steepest in the tax code—beginning at 37 percent and rising to an incredible 55 percent.

The National Federation of Independent Businesses has called the estate tax “the single greatest government burden imposed upon small family businesses.” The National Commission on Economic Growth noted in its report that it makes little sense and is unfair to impose extra taxes on those who choose to pass their assets on to their children and grandchildren rather than spend the money before they die. This cuts to the heart of the American dream of success from hard work and fiscal responsibility. Entrepreneurs should not be punished for their success—they should be rewarded.

Why should death taxes be repealed? Besides the fact that these taxes punish savings, thrift, and entrepreneurship, they have a devastating effect on family farmers and small businesses. According to a recent report by the Center for the Study of Taxation, 7 of our 10 businesses don't survive through a second generation and almost 9 in 10 fail to make it through a third. In fact, 9 out of 10 family business owners who took over after the principal's death in a recent survey said death taxes contributed to their business' demise.

If Congress succeeds in repealing these unfair, burdensome, and punitive taxes, the economic benefits will be enormous. In fact, the Heritage Foundation in 1997 forecast that during the ten year period after death tax repeal: an average of 145,000 new jobs would be created; our economy would yield an extra \$1.1 billion per year; personal income would rise by an additional \$8 billion per year; and the economic growth caused by repeal would more than offset any revenue lost to the treasury from the repeal. This is just one of a number of studies that detail the extraordinary benefits of repealing estate and gift taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in sunsetting the most egregious form of taxation. We should set a goal of the end of the year 2002 to completely repeal death taxes. We must make it a priority so that we move away from punishing hard work, thrift, savings, and entrepreneurship and start rewarding these most American of values.

EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO DECLARATION OF PALESTINIAN STATE

SPEECH OF

HON. PAT DANNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1999

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that I clarify my position regarding the resolution that recently passed in the House of Representatives expressing congressional opposition to a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state (H. Con. Res. 24).

My vote for this resolution was not a comment on the merits of a Palestinian state. Rather, my vote is a reflection of my belief that a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state at this time would hamper efforts to reach a just and lasting peace between the parties. A unilateral Palestinian declaration of an independent state outside of the framework agreed upon in Madrid, Oslo and Wye would not bode well with the current, precarious state of the peace process. This is the position advanced by our Administration. Indeed, the resolution simply restates official U.S. policy. Ultimately, this is why I voted for it.

However, I would note that I chose not to cosponsor the resolution because of my concerns with its one-sided approach. I am concerned that unilateral actions by any of the parties would have a great potential to undermine the efforts we have set forth for peace—whether committed by Palestinians or Israelis. The resolution's failure to mention any Israeli unilateral actions was, in my opinion, a grave error.

The Administration has worked hard to keep this process going—to keep the hope for peace alive for both Israelis and Palestinians. Congress should work diligently to support this effort and maintain balance.

A BILL TO AMEND THE RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION TAX CREDIT TO PROVIDE A CREDIT AS AN INCENTIVE TO FOSTER COLLABORATIVE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PROJECTS THROUGH BROADLY SUPPORTED NON-PROFIT, TAX-EXEMPT SECTION 501(c)(3) RESEARCH CONSORTIA

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, together with twenty-one of our colleagues, in introducing our bill, the “Public Benefit Collaborative Research Tax Credit.” This bill would amend the research and experimentation tax credit in order to foster collaborative scientific research projects through broadly supported non-profit section 501(c)(3) research consortia. These collaborative not-for-profit scientific research consortia are devoted to research projects that benefit not just one company, but the economy and the country as a whole. Our amendment to the research credit would provide incentives for multi-company and multi-industry research partnerships, with the result that this important tax credit would be structured to foster the kind of collaborative research on which America's economic growth in the 21st century will depend.

Our proposal would require that the research tax credit be extended beyond its June 30, 1999 expiration date, and we strongly urge extension of the credit. The research intensive sectors of our economy find it very difficult to do planning for research due to the constant stop-and-start arising from the perennial expiration and re-enactment of the research credit. The research credit is one of our most important tax incentives for economic growth, because scientific and technological innovation

are, in the final analysis, the sources of that growth.

This is why our public benefit collaborative research credit proposal is so important. More and more scientific and technological research of the greatest economic value now takes place not in the confines of individual companies, but collaboratively—and this is true for traditional manufacturing and utility sectors as well as computers and telecommunications. Yet the research credit as it currently stands actually contains disincentives for collaborative research. Companies are required to reduce their contributions to non-profit research consortia by an arbitrary 25% before those amounts can be used in the computation of the credit. Our proposal would eliminate the disincentives in current law for collaborative research, and make the research credit “fit” modern research-partnership approaches.

Under our bill, companies would be entitled to a flat (non-incremental) 20% credit for support payments made to non-profit, tax-exempt section 501(c)(3) scientific research organizations. Section 501(c)(3) scientific research organizations are required under existing law—which would not change—to make their research results available to the public on a nondiscriminatory basis. In this way, our proposal assures that all the scientific research for which our new credit is allowed is public-benefit research. In addition, for support payments to be eligible for our credit, the tax-exempt scientific research organization receiving the support payments would be required to have at least 15 unrelated supporting members, no three of which provide more than half of its funding and no one of which provides more than 25% of its funding. This assures that only truly multi-company collaborative research consortia are supported by our proposal.

Examples of broadly supported section 501(c)(3) research consortia whose continued success is tied to our proposal are the Gas Research Institute, funded by member companies in the natural gas industry, the Electric Power Research Institute, funded by member companies in the electric utility industry, the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences, funded by a coalition of high-technology manufacturing companies, the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, funded by water utilities, and non-profit consortia funded by other utility sectors. Collaborative public-benefit scientific research conducted by these and other section 501(c)(3) research consortia (and our bill should encourage new consortia) represents some of the most efficient and economically significant research being performed in the United States today, e.g. in the areas of cutting-edge manufacturing techniques, energy efficiency, public health, and economically rational pollution control, among many other areas. Collaborative research consortia supported by our proposal are devoted to sophisticated scientific research that in many cases no single company could afford, or would be willing, to conduct on its own, because of the uncertainty of immediate success or because of the risk of copycat competitors.

For all these reasons collaborative scientific research represents our brightest economic future. Our bill amends the research tax credit provisions to foster this goal. We urge our colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this very important legislation, the “Public Benefit Collaborative Research Tax Credit Act of 1999.”