

creeds, colors and backgrounds. Today, in 1999, we should dedicate ourselves to remembering the universality of his message.

Dr. King contributed more to the causes of national freedom and equality than any other man or woman of our century. His achievements as an author and as a minister were surpassed only by his leadership, which transformed a torn people into a beacon of strength and solidarity, and united a divided nation under a common creed of brotherhood and mutual prosperity.

It was Dr. King's policy of nonviolent protest which served to open the eyes of our nation to the horrors of discrimination and police brutality. This policy revealed the Jim Crow laws of the South as hypocritical and unfair, and forced civil right issues into the national dialectic. It is due to the increased scope and salience of the national civil rights discussion that the movement achieved so much during its decade of our greatest accomplishment, from 1957 to 1968.

It was in 1955 that Dr. King made his first mark on the nation, when he organized the black community of Montgomery, AL, during a 382-day boycott of the city's bus lines. The boycott saw Dr. King and many other civil rights activists incarcerated prison as "agitators," but their efforts were rewarded in 1956, when the U.S. Supreme Court declared that the segregational practices of the Alabama bus system was unconstitutional, and demanded that blacks be allowed to ride with equal and indistinguishable rights. The result proved the theory of nonviolent protest in practice, and roused our nation to the possibilities to be found through peace and perseverance.

In 1963, Dr. King and his followers faced their most ferocious test, when they set a massive civil protest in motion in Birmingham, AL. The protest was met with brute force by the local police, and many innocent men and women were injured through the violent response. However, the strength of the police department worked against the forces of discrimination in the nation, as many Americans came to sympathize with the plight of the blacks through the sight of their irrational and inhumane treatment.

By August of 1963 the civil rights movement had achieved epic proportions, and it was in a triumphant and universal air that Dr. King gave his memorable "I Have a Dream" speech on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. In the next year, Dr. King was distinguished as Time magazine's Man of the Year for 1963, and he would later be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for 1964.

Throughout his remaining years, Dr. King continued to lead our nation toward increased peace and unity. He spoke out directly against the Vietnam War, and led our nation's War on Poverty, which he saw as directly involved with the Vietnam struggle. To Dr. King, the international situation was inextricably linked to the domestic, and thus it was only through increased peace and prosperity at home that tranquility would be ensured abroad.

When Dr. King was gunned down in 1968 he had already established himself as a national hero and pioneer. As the years passed his message continued to gather strength and direction, and it is only in the light of his multi-generational influence that the true effects of his ideas can be measured.

Dr. King was a man who lacked neither vision nor the means and courage to express it.

His image of a strong and united nation overcoming the obstacles of poverty and inequality continues to provide us with an ideal picture of the "United" states which will fill the hearts of Americans with feelings of brotherhood and a common purpose of years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to bear in mind the courageous, dedicated deeds of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and to join together on Monday, January 18, in solemn recollection of his significant contributions for enhancing human rights throughout our nation and throughout the world.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO REAUTHORIZE THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a simple authorization extension bill for the Federal Aviation Administration's programs. With the passage of this bill, \$10.3 billion for FAA would be authorized for 1999.

The Omnibus Appropriations bill passed at the end of last Congress extended FAA's Airport Improvement Program for 6 months. The bill I am introducing today would extend AIP until the end of the fiscal year and reauthorize two other FAA programs for 1999—Facilities and Equipment, and Operations.

The AIP program authorization expires on March 31, 1999. Since AIP is funded with Contract Authority, the expiration of Contract Authority means no further funding of the program. Without this extension, the nation's airports will stop receiving new airport grants. These grants fund projects such as runway extensions, taxiway constructions, and other airport capacity enhancing projects.

Aviation delays already cost the industry billions of dollars. According to the Air Transport Association, aviation delays in 1997 cost the air carriers \$2.4 billion. If this bill is not passed by March 31, 1999, the airport capacity enhancing projects supported by the AIP program could be delayed, possibly increasing the cost of delays in the future.

The bill also reauthorizes the formula that determines the Aviation Trust Fund contribution to the FAA's Operations account. In addition, the bill makes minor adjustments to the Airport Improvement Program formulas.

The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has always worked in a bipartisan fashion. I look forward to working with my colleagues; Congressman JIM OBERSTAR, Congressman JOHN DUNCAN, JR., and Congressman BILL LIPINSKI, on this bill and other important aviation issues we will face during the 106th Congress.

LIMIT CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again introduce a proposed amendment to the

U.S. Constitution to limit the terms of Members of the House of Representatives. I do so on the first day of the 106th Congress to underscore my belief that this legislation is one of the most important reforms the new Congress can pursue.

My legislation would limit Members of the House to three four-year terms. I have long maintained that the current system of unlimited two-year terms frustrates our ability to advance legislation that is in the Nation's best interest. We have seen first-hand that reelection pressures can paralyze Members. All too often, Members succumb to special interests and cast their votes in favor of parochial causes, instead of what is best for the country. Under the system of nation-wide term limits that I am proposing, Members would have a new perspective on governing. They would have a sense of independence in knowing that they will be in Washington for a limited time and would no longer be beholden to special interest and contributors.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that term limits must be enacted nationally to be truly effective. Some of my colleagues, who I admire and respect, have chosen to abide by self-imposed term limits. While their actions are clearly well-intentioned, I believe they are placing their states and districts at a disadvantage. Under a system of piecemeal term limits, unaffected states will build an inordinate amount of seniority and power.

Mr. Speaker, the courts have ruled that nothing short of a constitutional amendment can limit congressional terms. Last Congress, we failed to agree on term limit language to send to the 50 states for ratification. We should not repeat this mistake in the 106th Congress. I strongly urge all of my reform-minded colleagues to cosponsor my proposed amendment.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MILITARY RETIREE HEALTH CARE TASK FORCE ACT

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to introduce the Military Retiree Health Care Task Force Act of 1999. This legislation will establish a Task Force that will look into all of the health care promises and representations made to members of the Uniformed Services by Department of Defense personnel and Department literature. The Task Force will submit a comprehensive report to Congress which will contain a detailed statement of its findings and conclusions. This report will include legislative remedies to correct the great injustices that have occurred to those men and women who served their country in good faith.

Let us not forget why we are blessed with freedom and democracy in this country. The sacrifices made by those who served in the military are something that must never be overlooked. Promises were made to those who served in the Uniformed Services. They were told that their health care would be taken care of for life if they served a minimum of twenty years of active federal service.

Well, those military retirees served their time and expected the government to hold up its

end of the bargain. They are now realizing that these were nothing more than empty promises.

Those who served in the military did not let their country down in its time of need and we should not let military retirees down in theirs. It's time military retirees get what was promised to them and that's why I am introducing this legislation.

THE FILIPINO VETERANS SSI
EXTENSION ACT, H.R. 26

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 26, the Filipino Veterans SSI Extension Act.

For the last several Congresses, I have introduced the Filipino Veterans Equity Act, a bill which would provide full veterans benefits to those veterans of the Commonwealth Army of the Philippines.

Although hearings were held on this bill last year, the prospect of legislative action on a comprehensive benefit package for Filipino veterans appears unlikely. Therefore, I am offering this measure in part to provide some relief for those Filipino veterans residing in the United States who currently receive supplemental security income benefits.

Under current law, individuals who receive SSI benefits must relinquish those benefits if they choose to leave the country. This bill would permit those who were members of the Filipino Commonwealth Army and recognized guerrilla units during World War II to continue to receive SSI benefits if they elect to return to the Philippines.

These benefits would be reduced by 50 percent if the individual veteran returned to the Philippines, to reflect the lower cost of living and per capita income of that nation.

It is estimated that several thousand veterans would be affected, many of whom are financially unable to petition their families to immigrate to the United States. Should this bill be adopted, these veterans would be able to return to their families in the Philippines while bringing a decent income with them.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this worthwhile measure.

H.R. 26

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PROVISION OF REDUCED SSI BENEFIT TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS WHO PROVIDED SERVICE TO THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE PHILIPPINES DURING WORLD WAR II AFTER THEY MOVE BACK TO THE PHILIPPINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding sections 1611(b), 1611(f)(1), and 1614(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act—

(1) the eligibility of a qualified individual for benefits under the supplemental security income program under title XVI of such Act shall not terminate by reason of a change in the place of residence of the individual to the Philippines; and

(2) the benefits payable to the individual under such program shall be reduced by 50 percent for so long as the place of residence of the individual is in the Philippines.

(b) **QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.**—In subsection (a), the term “qualified individual” means an individual who—

(1) as of January 1, 1990, was eligible for benefits under the supplemental security income program under title XVI of the Social Security Act; and

(2) before August 15, 1945, served in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President dated July 26, 1941, including among such military forces organized guerrilla forces under commanders appointed, designated, or subsequently recognized by the Commander in Chief, Southwest Pacific Area, or other competent military authority in the Army of the United States.

HONORING MY FRIEND, BASEBALL LEGEND NOLAN RYAN, ON HIS ELECTION TO THE HALL OF FAME

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay honor to my long-time friend, Nolan Ryan, on the announcement of his election to the Baseball Hall of Fame. I've known Nolan for many years, and I knew him as a kind, generous man who seeks to do what is right and just. It seems there are so few heroes for kids today, especially in athletics, but I can sincerely commend Nolan Ryan as a true hero of our times, a role-model for our youth, and a man worthy of honor and respect.

Nolan was born in Refugio, Texas, a historic town in my congressional district, but he was destined for the national stage. His successful career spanned 27 years, taking him from rural Texas to the dug-outs of the New York Mets, the California Angels, the Houston Astros and the Texas Rangers. He pitched a record seven no-hitter games, but his real fame comes from having pitched 5,714 strikeouts.

Nolan told newspaper reporters yesterday that he never viewed himself as a “hall of famer.” For once, I have to disagree with my friend. He is Hall of Fame material not only for his prowess on the field, but for his strong character and unwavering dedication to his family, his friends, his beliefs, and his God.

I trust all my colleagues join me in congratulating Nolan Ryan.

GOOD ADVICE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION CEREMONIES

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly commends to the attention of his colleagues an editorial found in the January 5, 1999, edition of the Omaha World Herald entitled, “Discreet State of Union Would Do.” The editorial appropriately points out that during recent years during a president's State of the Union address “supporters bounce up and

down giving standing ovations in response to choreographed rhetorical flourishes. His opponents, also playing to the cameras, signify displeasure with stony silence. Or they disproportionately applaud such presidential lines as, “We must do better,” when “better” refers to a policy that the opponents support.”

Indeed, it should be obvious to Members of Congress and to much of the American public that the atmosphere now attending the delivery of a State of the Union address has become high political theater which does not serve the reputation of the Congress well; nor does it reassure the American public that the Congress or the President are seriously attempting to work together to address the problems and opportunities facing our nation. It has degenerated into the kind of exaggerated conduct that one would expect to find in an old-fashioned melodrama. It is time for a change, and the editorial makes some relevant points and suggestions about directions for such changes. This Member urges his colleagues and especially leaders of the Congress to work with the President and his successor to make appropriate modifications in the manner in which the State of the Union is presented to the Congress.

DISCREET STATE OF UNION WOULD DO

Some U.S. senators, including Democrats Robert Torricelli of New Jersey and Joseph Lieberman of Connecticut, say it would be inappropriate for President Clinton to appear before a joint session of Congress to report on the State of the Union while his impeachment trial is pending. It would not be a national tragedy if Clinton listened to them.

Nothing in the Constitution says a president must deliver a prime-time, televised speech from the House of Representatives every year. It says only that the president “shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.” George Washington and John Adams addressed joint sessions of Congress in person. Thomas Jefferson discontinued the practice. He said a personal appearance was too monarchical a ceremony for the leader of a democratic republic.

Written State of the Union addresses—often not much more than a collection of bureaucratic reports from the departments of the executive branch—were delivered to Congress until 1913, when Woodrow Wilson resurrected the tradition of a presidential speech. Wilson said he wanted to show “that the president of the United States is a person, not a mere department of the government, hailing Congress from some isolated island of jealous power, sending messages, not speaking naturally with his own voice—that he is a human being trying to cooperate with other human beings in a common service.”

It's hard to quibble with that proposition. But the development of television since Wilson's time has put the State of the Union address in a different light. The president is now one of the most visible persons in the world. And the event Wilson described as a chance for the president to speak naturally with his own voice about common service to the people has devolved into a glitzy production heavy on style and light on substance.

In the modern television age, the formula is the same regardless of which party holds the White House. As senators and representatives look on in the House chamber, the president's entrance is preceded by processions of Cabinet members and Supreme Court justices. Members of the president's