

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife Freda and their five children, six grandchildren, and his brother.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank my colleague Mr. SWEENEY for offering this special tribute, and ask if the House would please Join me in pausing to recognize the distinguished life of Gerald Solomon.

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 2001

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark an important yet often overlooked month in our nation's landscape National Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Each year, nearly 2 million women are victims of domestic violence. In fact, in the time that it takes me to complete this speech, eight women will have suffered some form of mental, physical or sexual abuse.

The problem of domestic violence is one that I have fought for many years.

In my district—the 31st district of California—domestic violence is a widespread phenomenon. When I first took office as state legislator in 1992, there were more shelters in my district for abused animals than there were for abused women.

But through the vigilant work and determination of our law enforcement agencies and the community, we've worked to reverse that trend. Today, we have a number of excellent shelters and non-profit organizations designed to help battered families rebuild their lives.

As pleased as I am that the shelters exist, though, I am still disappointed. Yes, every person who is the victim of domestic violence deserves as much help as possible to escape their current situation and find a better, more loving environment. But no one deserves to be placed in such a horrendous situation to begin with.

We as a nation have made remarkable strides in domestic violence legislation. We prosecute criminals. We assist victims with finding transitional housing. We help train battered housewives to reenter the workforce. These are all admirable actions. But we can and must do more.

We must work harder to ferret out the root cause of domestic violence. We know that children of batterers are more likely to become batterers themselves. We must work to ensure that these children have the necessary counseling to combat any such violent urges.

We know that immigrant women who are battered are much less likely to leave their abusers because they fear being deported. We must eliminate immigration barriers that prevent these women from getting help.

And we know that nearly one million women each year are victims of stalking. We must strengthen anti-stalking laws to protect women before violence enters the picture.

I ask my colleagues to join me in this commitment to eradicating domestic violence in our great nation, not only with our words but also with our deeds.

THE SERVICEMEMBERS AND MILITARY FAMILIES FINANCIAL PROTECTION ACT OF 2001 (H.R. 3173)

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 2001

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, these are enormously challenging times for our country. Yet, we are doing what we can to meet these challenges. We are reaching across party lines to show national unity. We are reaching across social and ethnic lines, native-born citizens and immigrants alike, to show that we will not turn away from our nation's highest values, or from each other.

We are exercising caution and common sense. We are going about our daily lives. In my case, and that of my fellow members of Congress, going about business as usual has been a little more difficult in recent days. But—as this productive week demonstrates—it has not made our work impossible.

And, as parents, we are reminding our children how much we love them. Those are a few of the important steps that each of us is taking. And we can be proud of them. However, no group of Americans has made—or will make, as long as this effort lasts—as valuable a contribution, or as great a sacrifice, or will have as much to be proud of, as the people who are the men and women of our armed forces—full-time uniformed personnel, as well as reservists and members of the National Guard called up for active duty.

They are seeking peace for us and for our allies around the globe. Their own security has been put on hold so that we can go about our lives freely and free of fear. Last week, I introduced legislation to ease at least a handful of their many burdens.

My bill is admittedly a modest effort when compared to the full scope of challenges which they face. After all, I cannot give them the kind of blanket protection that I wish for them. I cannot ensure that no harm comes to them on the field of battle, or while in transit or training for their mission. However, it is worth remembering that among the many hazards and challenges faced by men and women in uniform, not all of them are found on the battlefield, or foreign soil, or on the high seas.

Some confront them here at home. Even while they are far from home. And, to make matters worse, they are challenges that face not only the men and women who sign up for duty—but face their family members too.

These challenges are financial. In various ways, members of the armed forces—and in particular, members of the National Guard and the Reserves who leave jobs, homes, and families at a moment's notice—face tremendous economic burdens as a result of their willingness to serve. It is at least within my powers to do something about that.

Last week, I introduced legislation, "The Servicemembers and Military Families Financial Protection Act of 2001", aimed at giving men and women called up for duty—and their families—new financial protection and peace of mind.

First, my bill will help ensure that members of the military who are called away from home still have a home to which they can return. When members are deployed and separated

from their jobs, their household income levels often drop dramatically. Yet, there are still bills to pay—in particular, the monthly rent or mortgage payment.

My bill would prohibit the removal of an activated military member's family from their place of residence due to a failure to meet monthly housing payments. This protection would be in place during the term of active duty and continue for up to an additional three months after active duty is over.

If a landlord initiates eviction proceedings during that period, a judge would be directed to first rule on whether the family's income has been "materially affected" by the military service. An eviction can only occur only if a judge finds that the family's income has not been so impacted. This relief would apply to a service member's family whose monthly housing payment is \$1,950 per month or less.

Under current law—the Sailors' and Soldiers' Civil Relief Act—such relief is limited to families whose monthly housing payments are \$1,200 or less. I seek to increase of that threshold by about 37.5 percent. I think that my proposal is reasonable. If you have given up your bed, and the comfort of home and the security of having your own roof over your head . . . and have traded that for an army cot in a pup tent or a barracks—you are certainly entitled, when your service is completed, to return to your home. And, just as important, you are entitled to know that even if you cannot be at home, at least your family is there.

The second major element of my proposal ensures that a family will be well provided for in the event—the very rare event, I hope—that something unfortunate occurs. Again, our country's reliance on members of the guard and reserves helps illustrate the need for a change in current law. Our military cannot operate without the contributions of civilian soldiers—medical personnel, academics familiar with foreign countries and languages, engineers and people from a vast array of fields—who agree to give up good jobs and good wages here at home to serve where and when they are needed.

The economic needs of full-time uniformed personnel are just as great, and only increase with more years of service. As it stands right now, however, significant barriers prohibit those men and women from knowing with confidence that their families will be adequately safeguarded if something should happen to them.

Today, armed services personnel are eligible for life insurance paid through an affordable monthly premium, and administered through the Service members' Group Life Insurance program, or SGLI. However, current law caps payouts at \$250,000. Far too low.

Meantime, it is standard practice for private life insurance policies to include clauses that deny payouts for deaths resulting from incidents occurring as part of war-related service. My bill would enable personnel covered by SGLI to opt for considerably higher payouts for their beneficiaries—if they so desire and if they are willing to pay for it.

Under my bill, military personnel could opt for coverage in increments of \$250,000 above the current ceiling, up to a total of \$1 million. This represents a potential increase of \$750,000 above the current limits for members of the Guard and Reserves; an increase of \$900,000 for uniformed personnel.

All increased benefits would be the result of higher premiums deducted from military paychecks. Coverage usually costs approximately 8 cents per month per every thousand dollars of coverage. Again, this would be optional and it would be achieved at no additional cost to the government.

In fact, assuming that the pool of policy holders remains steady and perhaps increases due to this added incentive, it could lead to greater revenues for government coffers. We know that military service is dangerous. But, the already significant risk should not be compounded by additional financial risks to one's dependents.

My hope would be that not a single family ever has the need to take advantage of this increased level in benefits. But, even if that is the case—it still will have done some good for all of us.

A member of the military can carry out duties better if there are fewer worries about what could happen to his or her family.

And finally—as long as we are updating current law to reflect the true needs of members of the military—I think it is crucial that the law better reflects the true composition of the military.

As we all know, that includes women.

The same holds true for our country's economy, and the earnings of the typical family. A family's loss of income does not simply occur when a father or husband leaves his regular job for service—but when a mother or wife does so. Unfortunately, current law inexplicably uses the phrase "wife" to describe dependents eligible for protection while a member is on duty. My bill replaces such references with gender-neutral language.

Such a change has practical value. Let's make certain that no court or agency denies a family relief on the basis that a mother or wife serves her country. Yet, if some people think that changing the language in this manner is mostly "symbolic"—so be it. This is a time when symbolism matters.

And, among our foes is a Taliban that degrades women to a degree that is beneath civility and decency. Let's take every opportunity to remind them—and ourselves—that our country's success and our country's strength is achieved because in our nation women can carry out any role that they choose for themselves.

I am confident that my colleagues will join me in agreeing that risking life and limb for one's nation should never be compounded by a family's potential loss of shelter or economic security. Please join me and cosponsor my bill, H.R. 3173.

HONORING JARVIS CHRISTIAN
COLLEGE

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 2001

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jarvis Christian College, the Tom Joyner Foundation's historically black "College of the Month" for October.

All too often, a student enters college only to encounter financial challenges that force him or her to drop out of school. As a nationally syndicated radio personality, Tom Joyner

uses his platform to raise money to help students continue their education at black colleges. Every month, the foundation selects an Historically Black College or University to receive funds raised during that month. During the month of October, Joyner will encourage individuals, groups, organizations, and Jarvis alumni to make financial contributions to Jarvis.

Over the past year, the Tom Joyner Foundation has raised more than \$500,000 for deserving students. The money is given directly to the school and its students. Additionally, the Ronald McDonald House Charities has pledged to provide 50 cents for every dollar, up to \$333,000 donated, for this year.

I am very proud of Jarvis for being chosen by the Tom Joyner Foundation to receive these important funds for its students. Located in Hawkins, Texas, Jarvis Christian College has lived up to its mission to provide a quality liberal arts education that prepares students "intellectually, socially, and personally to function effectively in a global and technological society."

Founded in 1912, Jarvis Christian College held its first formal classes in January 1913, with 12 elementary-level students. Only two years later, the school began officially teaching high school courses. Further, until 1937, it was the only accredited high school exclusively for African Americans in the area.

In 1927, Jarvis began offering junior college courses, and the school was accredited as a college the next year. Since that time, Jarvis has been an East Texas institution, an excellent choice for students who wish to develop their skills and talents to their highest levels of ability.

For 90 years, Jarvis Christian College has given hope and opportunity to the African American community of East Texas, guaranteeing students a quality education within a solidly Christian environment. This year, Jarvis was ranked among the top "Comprehensive Colleges" in the nation by U.S. News and World Report.

I would like to thank the Tom Joyner Foundation for its mission to support Jarvis Christian College's motto: "The college with the personal touch, where dreams come true!"

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS
MONTH

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 2001

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the Women's Caucus and add my strong support to the struggle against domestic violence.

October, Domestic Violence Awareness Month, is an opportunity for us to remember those who have been victims of abuse, to support those who are survivors, and to assist those who labor on a daily basis to put an end to this horrible violence.

While the devastating physical and emotional consequences of domestic violence have been well documented, less attention has been paid to the economic reasons women stay victim to their abusers. Far too many victims remain in abusive relationships because of their inability to financially support themselves and their children.

Lack of affordable childcare, inaccessibility to job training and healthcare programs, and low wages are a few of the obstacles women face when they wish to leave an abusive home. Those who are able to find employment often find it difficult, if not impossible, to keep a job because of the consequences of domestic abuse such as: lower productivity, reduced attendance, and the higher risk of insurance and healthcare costs to employers. In addition, employed victims of abuse live with the added fear of losing their job if they take time off from work to seek help for themselves and their families.

Unfortunately, current law does not specifically allow women to take leave from work to effectively deal with the abuse in their lives. Nor does the law often allow women who leave work as a result of domestic violence to collect unemployment compensation.

These realities faced by abused women often hinder their ability to seek or maintain employment. As a result, far too many women are left with the terrifying choice of staying with their abusers or becoming homeless, often with their children. In fact, the Downtown Women's Center of Los Angeles recently conducted a needs assessment among 400 homeless women in Los Angeles. Of those interviewed, 58.5 percent had experienced domestic violence in their lifetime, and 39.5 percent had experienced domestic violence as recently as the previous year.

To address the needs of victims of abuse, I have introduced the Victims' Economic Security and Safety Act in the House of Representatives. My legislation is specifically designed to help victims of domestic violence retain their employment and financial independence, by ensuring that they are allowed to take time off from work to make necessary court appearances, seek legal assistance, contact law enforcement officials or make alternative housing arrangements, without the fear of being fired or demoted. Further, to ensure victims can retain the financial independence necessary to leave their abusers and avoid having to rely on welfare or become homeless, my bill requires states to provide unemployment benefits to women who are forced to leave work as a result of domestic violence. This legislation currently has the bipartisan support of 106 of my colleagues in Congress.

Obviously, we cannot legislate the problem of domestic violence away. An important step we can take, however, is to create a system that gives women a fighting chance to remove themselves and their children from abusive environments. As a nation, we must develop and implement laws that provide the support necessary to ensure the safety and security of our most vulnerable citizens. No woman should ever have to choose between physical safety or financial security for herself or her family.

TRIBUTE TO LYNN SWANN ON HIS
ENSHRINEMENT IN THE NA-
TIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE
HALL OF FAME

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 31, 2001

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to San Mateo County native and