

It is right that we remember those that fought so hard for that first contract 65 years ago, and draw strength from their perseverance, so that 65 years from now our children will look back and see the great progress made by current generations.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "SAFE SLEEPWEAR AND BURN PREVENTION ACT OF 2002"

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 2002

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Representative ED TOWNS, in introducing the "Safe Sleepwear and Burn Prevention Act of 2002." This legislation is important to thousands of children and their parents who face the dangers of sleepwear-related fires every day.

This legislation accomplishes three things. First, it repeals an ill-advised exception to our children's fire safety regulations created by the Consumer Product Safety Commission in 1996. This exception completely exempted sleepwear for infants age 0–9 months from the fire safety requirements. Second, the legislation repeals a similar regulatory exemption created for so-called "tight-fitting" sleepwear. Finally, our bill closes an egregious loophole in current law, which allows manufacturers of garments used by children to sleep in to avoid all fire safety requirements simply by labeling the garment as "daywear" rather than "sleepwear."

We owe a debt of gratitude to the Shriners Hospitals for Children for bringing this situation to our attention. Following the CPSC's 1996 decision, doctors at the Shriners Hospitals, which treat over 20 percent of all serious pediatric burn injuries in the United States, began to notice an alarming increase in the number of children suffering from sleepwear-related burn injuries. In the two years following the Commission's decision, the Shriners documented an alarming 157 percent increase in the number of children with fire-related injuries.

Last Congress, our subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection held a hearing on this issue and received testimony from the Shriners and the American Burn Association, which represents all the Nation's burn centers and burn health care professionals. The evidence is compelling, and Congress must act quickly to ensure a burn-safe environment for children.

This legislation will reverse the Commission's ill-considered relaxation of the fire safety regulations and require that all garments used with regularity as sleepwear by children age 0–7 years must meet fire safety requirements. Mislabeling a garment as daywear or claiming that it is not intended to be used as sleepwear will no longer be an excuse for not meeting fire safety requirements, especially for the youngest and most vulnerable of our children.

We are also fortunate that we now have the technology available to create such a fire-safe environment for just pennies per garment. These new technologies are inexpensive, safe, do not wash out and do not alter the texture of the garment. We simply have no ex-

cuse for not ensuring that all garments used as sleepwear take advantage of this new technology.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will truly create a safer environment for children. We can prevent thousands of horrific burn injuries and lessen the severity of those that do occur by adopting this legislation. The agency charged with protecting our children has failed in its duty to do so, and now Congress must act.

TRIBUTE TO GUADALUPE S. RAMIREZ

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 2002

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of Guadalupe S. Ramirez for whom Los Angeles Mission College recently dedicated a new Collaborative Studies Building. Guadalupe was an outstanding community activist who died in January of 2000 at the age of 84.

Born in El Paso, Texas, Guadalupe had to end her formal education in the seventh grade to care for her ill mother. Soon after her mother passed away, Guadalupe relocated to California in the 1930's. She later married Manuel C. Ramirez. The couple partnered in many community efforts and they worked together to establish the San Fernando Valley chapter of the League of United Latin American Citizens. Even with their deep involvement in the community, the Ramirez's dedicated themselves to family, raising and caring for more than 35 children, including their many foster children. Guadalupe's many accomplishments involved helping found both the first Head Start childcare program in the Valley, and the Chicano Studies Department at Cal State University, Northridge. She also helped develop the North Valley Occupational Center.

In the 1970s Guadalupe led the campaign to place a proposed community college in the northeast San Fernando Valley. Her tireless effort proved successful, and in 1975 Mission College was founded in San Fernando. Dubbed as "the mother of Mission College" for her efforts on behalf of the community and the college, Guadalupe is remembered and loved by the greater Northeast San Fernando Valley community. The dedication of the Collaborative Studies Building in Guadalupe's name serves to acknowledge her role in bringing an institution of higher learning to the northeast San Fernando Valley while at the same time advancing the goals and values she held so dear.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to ask my colleagues to Join me in saluting Guadalupe S. Ramirez, whose life is an inspiration to all.

TRAFICANT TRIAL: A RAILROAD OF JUSTICE

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 2002

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the government presented a ten-count indictment against

me on May 4, 2001. And convicted me on those ten counts, Thursday, April 11, 2002.

Count Two—David Sugar.

David Sugar was indicted for backdating invoices for his company, some of which concerned me and Mr. Sugar ended up getting caught up in making false statements about these invoices.

To avoid perjury, Mr. Sugar stated he was pressured into doing quid pro quo favors at the Traficant farm.

Be advised that David Sugar testified that he received \$1,400 in one payment and accepted a Steinway piano, appraised for between \$6,000 and \$7,000 and claimed the same on his tax records.

In my trial, the judge did not permit the testimony, or consensual taped phone call with Harry Manganaro, friend of David Sugar, in whom Sugar confided after being visited by the FBI for a second time. Clearly under the circumstances, Mr. Sugar's discussion with Mr. Manganaro should have fallen under the hearsay rule and been permitted as evidence.

On Sunday, January 27, 2002 I had the following conversation with Harry Manganaro regarding Mr. Sugar's situation:

JT: This is what, the twenty-seventh? Sunday, January twenty seventh? Okay now, Harry do you want to spell you last name?

HM: M-A-N-G-A-N-A-R-O.

JT: Manganaro. Yea. We've known each other for a lot of years, but you work for Dave Sugar right? You used to?

HM: I used to.

JT: And on or about the time that Dave ah, has gone through this ordeal with me, you were his employee?

HM: Yea, when I was there I was just a consultant on demolitions.

JT: Yea, you wanna move a little closer? And you realize we are taping this conversation?

HM: Yes.

JT: Okay. Ah, in fact, you mentioned, there, you came to me yesterday to my house at about what, 10:00? This is the first you divulged that information to me.

HM: Right.

JT: Okay. And you realize I represent myself, I'm my own attorney.

HM: I do.

JT: Now, I've asked you to meet me here today and you told me that basically Dave Sugar had made statements to you relative to this case. I want you to just in short, brief terms tell me what Dave Sugar said.

HM: Well first of all, he had people coming in, they came in two times.

JT: Who were the people?

HM: That was the FBI people. I don't know exact names.

JT: That's fine.

HM: The first time they came in they were questioning what he did for ah, you and (sounds like transport machinery) and ah, they didn't charge you for it. And Dave is bad on keeping some records and things like that. There was stuff on my desk where I didn't even bill people yet, but I got the bills. And he probably had your bill on there too. And they were aware of that, basically they left that time. Then they came back when Dave wasn't there and they went through the whole office, and ah (unintelligible).

JT: Well, what they did to him was they charged him with some offense involving me, quite frankly I'm not even up to date on his offense, but then at some point he said to you that he had to make statements.

HM: Right, basically they told him that if he doesn't cooperate with them, he was going to get his wife involved and ah, his son

involved with the business and everything like that so, he didn't want anybody else to get involved with business or he pleaded guilty, he doesn't want to get his wife involved and have problems. They gave him the opportunity.

JT: Who is they again?

HM: They is the FBI.

JT: Now, did ah..

HM: I know one thing, he has been nervous ever since then cause they've got the threat of going to jail over his head and ah.

JT: If he don't do what?

HM: If he doesn't cooperate.

JT: Did he tell you that, well what did he tell you, did he tell you he broke the law with me, what was the statements to you?

HM: Basically he don't feel that he broke the law because ah, your dad and his dad were friends for years and years. And he thought he was helping a friend but he did say that whatever he did for you, he was paid because he had gotten some money, I'm not sure of an exact amount, I don't know fourteen, eighteen hundred dollars, something like that, plus a piano that's worth more than what these people are saying.

JT: Well, he mentioned to you that it was an eighteen fifty-six Steinway that was registered in the book?

HM: Right, I moved it out of your house.

JT: Yea, and it was registered in the book only two made in eighteen fifty-six, but there was other antiques too. Did you help move those things from the barn and from the house?

HM: Yes I did, you had them in the barn, we went to the barn, we got stuff up in the attic.

JT: There were several other antique pieces that he had taken, but basically all he did there, was he laid, you guys spread the concrete, he did not have anything to do with paying for the concrete.

HM: No, he didn't buy the concrete. The concrete was bought by a guy in Struthers, I believe it was.

JT: T.C. Ready Mix delivered it. And ah, I paid T.C. Ready Mix and he had nothing to do with paying that. But the point I'm making is, did he say look, I had to lie or they were going to put me in jail, bring my son involved.

HM: Yep.

JT: Tell me exactly what he said.

HM: That's what he said. What your saying is that he was deathly afraid that they were going to bring his son in, his wife in, and ah, if he didn't cooperate with them, he was going to go to jail.

JT: And by cooperating, what does that mean?

HM: Well by cooperating, right now he is not in jail.

JT: Yea, by telling them...

HM: Whatever they want to hear, he had to tell them. And at this point, he is still worried about going to jail, because if he doesn't cooperate in the courthouse he has got that threat lingering over his head about going to jail.

JT: When did he tell you this, do you recall?

HM: Oh, it had to be after the second meeting with the FBI. I can't give you a specific date, but it was right after that. It was actually before he went to jail on ah, another offense, I think they had something with his old DUI.

JT: Against the father? Dave senior?

HM: Dave senior, yea he had one.

JT: Yea he had one too.

HM: And they pushed that issue.

JT: They were pushing that. But they indicted him on, was supposedly he backdated a bill to me and he supposedly said he didn't backdate the bill, and then they found that he did backdate a bill or whatever the hell it

was and they were going to get him for perjury, that was technically the count so, is that what you recall?

HM: Right, but the bill, as I said before, Dave was bad, he'll do work for other, and he even explained to the FBI people that he has done work for New Middletown and different things like that, and he'll forget to send a bill, or he'll have it out but he won't put a date on it and it might be a month later that he'll decide to put a date on it to send it for when he did the work. And it's backdated, but on the same token, ah, a lot of times its just forgetfulness.

JT: But ah, evidently Dave was concerned cause he knew they were after me so, he said that he didn't backdate the bill right?

HM: Right. Correct.

JT: And that was the technicality that got him indicted.

HM: Right that was just...

JT: Bull sh—?

HM: Him protecting an old friend, that's what it, amounts to. Myself, for the petty little thing that he did, I don't think that....

JT: But he said to you that he felt bad that he had to do this, because it wasn't truthful, and he and I did nothing illegal, is that in fact what he said?

HM: That's it. Because the point is that you know, he can't figure out why he can't help people and still get some money for it, which he did, and ah, get in trouble for doing something he didn't do.

JT: There were no intentions to do something for me because I was doing something or helping him.

HM: Right.

JT: That's exactly what he said?

HM: That's about the extent of it. And ever since then he has been really worried.

JT: I know he feels bad. Everybody is saying you can see he don't want to do what they are forcing him to do. But he is forced to this, is that what he told you?

HM: That's it.

JT: And were he not being forced with these technicalities, he would tell the truth in Cleveland, wouldn't he?

HM: Yea he would.

JT: And he's still real worried that he may tell the truth and if he does, they are going to send him to jail, don't they?

HM: That's the problem right now that Dave has. If he tells the truth, he goes to jail, if he lies about it he goes to jail. He's caught in a nutshell and he don't know which way to go.

JT: He has to go the way they want him though, don't he?

HM: You got that right.

JT: But he told you that explicitly?

HM: Yes he did.

JT: And you are willing to testify to that?

HM: Yes I will.

JT: Thank you Harry, I think today is Sunday, January, what's the date, the twenty-seventh?

HM: The twenty-seventh I think.

JT: Is there anything else you want to say Harry?

HM: Ah, not really, unless you want to hear about that ah...

JT: About the city of Youngstown and their deals they had going, no. That's something that, I got an investigation going on and I may go over that with you at some point, but right now, I'm more concerned about his case here and what they have done with witnesses.

HM: One more about Dave, you know that he doesn't need any trouble.

JT: He certainly doesn't need any trouble, is that what you said?

HM: No he's a very good guy, hard worker at times, and he's still a good guy.

JT I know that.

HM: I Don't believe that by him supposedly talking to you about out of town people at one time for a job, could justify all the problems that he has coming.

JT: Yea, and he in fact was right the rightful bidder. And there was some hanky panky in the city wasn't there?

HM: There definitely was.

JT: And he told it to me didn't he?

HM: Yes he did.

JT: And I looked into it.

HM: Yes you did, and there was nothing promised, anywhere along the line.

JT: And as soon as I looked into it, they changed the whole ball game down there didn't they?

HM: Right. They got some out of town firm that went bankrupt.

JT: The out of town firm did go bankrupt didn't they?

HM: Yea they did, I went to the auction.

JT: Well thank you Harry, I appreciate you coming to me by your own volition.

HM: Yes I did.

JT: Thank you and this is Sunday, January twenty seventh, approximately Eight fifty-five a.m., is that the time you got? Eight fifty-five a.m., alright.

There are also contract issues relative to Sugar and the city of Youngstown, in which the government maintained that I leveraged the City to give Sugar the contract.

I did try to help Sugar get that contract. There was no quid pro quo. David Sugar and his company pay more than \$100,000 in taxes into Mahoning County, where the city of Youngstown is located. And, because the need for employment in my district, I always support good quality bids from local companies, which hire my constituents and pays taxes into this community. The contract was eventually awarded to a company from Buffalo, New York for a difference of \$14,000.

The poor quality of the company that was granted the bid for the City is evidenced by it's bankruptcy auction, in which Harry Manganaro attended at the request of David Sugar. Additionally, the company's performance created a fire at the work site causing damage after smoldering for a lengthy period of time.

Did I help David Sugar? Answer—Yes. I helped thousands of my constituents in similar situations and David Sugar was paid for any services he may have provided at the Trafficant farm.

The sugar count has been manipulated so much it's more like NutraSweet®

Next week . . . Pinocchio, Attorney at Law.

A TRIBUTE TO CALIFORNIA STATE
ASSEMBLY SPEAKER PRO TEM
FRED KEELEY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 2002

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, California State Assembly Speaker pro Tem Fred Keeley. In his years of service to the communities of the Central Coast and throughout California, he has earned a reputation for professionalism, and the ability to fairly balance competing interests and find common ground between them. His legacy of tireless work has been an inspiration to me, his colleagues in the California State Assembly, and many others.

Fred Keeley holds an unwavering conviction that Californians need, and deserve, a clean