

political base with roots in the community, and from those roots could grow a truly committed and organized electorate.

The City Council needs revamping too. Dixon suggests the council elect its own chairman, rather than having voters decide who can best run the council. Why not also have the salaries—now over \$70,000 a year—and make the council a truly part-time job as it was conceived to be? Then double the number of members, to make it more like a legislature? We would get debate, diversity and conditions of power.

And why should we have a year-round legislature? Maybe it should meet in legislative session for only two or three months, as in Virginia and Maryland, rather than its nearly nonstop chattering of legislation. Who can keep track except staff members and lobbyists? The council could meet in monthly sessions the rest of the year to take care of routine municipal affairs. A defined legislative session would allow citizens to focus on and participate in the making of city laws.

Political reform is well and good, but in Dixon's eyes, nothing comes before good management, something the city is obviously lacking.

It's painfully clear that management of key city agencies has been marred by political considerations, low pay and lack of expertise. Mayor Kelly's best hire in her first year was Jack Bond, a manager with a proven track record in Durham, N.C., and other cities. Although Bond officially resigned, in fact the mayor forced him out for reasons that remain unclear.

The worst case of horrendous management is in the public housing department, which has had more than a dozen directors in as many years. Thanks in part to inept management, the city's public housing complexes are breeding grounds for drug dependency, gunplay and poverty. Just as important, the spillover effect undermines what otherwise would be more stable working poor, middle and upper-income black neighborhoods.

Dixon suggests that the day-to-day operations of the city be placed in the hands of a professional city manager. That person could be nominated by the mayor and confirmed by the council. "The manager could then be more immune to the day-to-day politics of the city," says Dixon.

Identifying laws in the way the District has developed under 30 years of the Home Rule Act is not difficult. The tough part is charting the course toward a healthy social, political and financial future. How do we make the second 30 years of the city's history a success story?

The first step is to acknowledge our current dependence on Congress, and in return demand that Congress fulfill its part of the relationship. In this phase, the District gets its financial house in order. In some measure, this has already begun, with the recent request—by Dixon and Rep. Pete Stark (D-Calif.)—that two federal agencies conduct a thorough examination of the city's books.

But the District could play a leading rather than trailing role by embarking a financial oversight commission to review the nuts and bolts of many city agencies. The commission would be made up of local and federal officials whose mandate would be more than advisory. Such a presumptive strike could forestall the installation of a mandatory board like the one that was given power to oversee New York City's government in the 1970s.

To the most serious statehood advocates, this could seem a serious retreat from home rule. But look around. The federal government is already involved in a host of local government functions: Federal agents police the streets; federal officials are now part of

an executive commission assigned to fix city public housing; courts dictate foster care and prison health; federal auditors are examining every item of local spending.

An oversight commission might need as many as five years to do its work. But in the process, city residents would take control of more government functions, such as local criminal prosecution, while Congress relinquished power to review the city's budget. Such a slow but steady march toward full independence is the path Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton believes has the best chance of success.

Dixon and Norton aren't alone in their vision of restructuring and reform. The consensus to reevaluate home rule is spreading from the Greater Washington Board of Trade to the Democratic State Committee to the streets, where frustration with the status quo runs higher every day. All people of good will want safe streets, better housing, decent schools, steady jobs and a local government that works. Only a fresh look at home rule will get them what they want.

TRIBUTE TO MARTIN BARBER

HON. BOB FRANKS
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Mr. Martin Barber of Livingston, NJ. A longtime friend, Marty has most recently earned distinction as the chair of the Stamp Out Hate Coalition, an organization dedicated to promoting tolerance and understanding in my home State of New Jersey.

Marty has a lengthy and dedicated history of public service, balancing responsibilities to his family and profession with the demanding obligations of helping to lead his community. As vice president of the Metropolitan Chapter of the American Jewish Committee, as a member of the executive committee of the Jewish Federation of MetroWest, and as past president of Temple Beth Shalom in Livingston, Marty has consistently battled the bigotry and hate soeringly on the rise in our society. I commend Marty's resolute and steadfast opposition to these forces of discord, and his advancement of policies and practices that benefit all peoples.

Mr. Speaker, Marty Barber's courage and perseverance are a tremendous example of public service for us all. I am, therefore, pleased to announce that Marty will be honored at the American Jewish Committee Annual Dinner Meeting on June 1, 1994, and I commend him and his many outstanding accomplishments.

AIRLINER CABIN AIR QUALITY ACT

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Airliner Cabin Air Quality Act of 1994, to prohibit smoking on international flights to and from the United States. Congress banned smoking on all domestic flights of 6 hours or less in 1990. However, smoking

remained permitted on U.S. carriers on international flights, and most foreign carriers serving the United States permit smoking as well.

On May 18, 1994, the Subcommittee on Aviation, which I chair, held a full day of hearings on airliner cabin air quality. While there are many concerns about the overall quality of the air, the single most effective—and cost-free—action that we can take is to ban smoking on international flights.

Most persuasive to the subcommittee at this hearing, as at our previous one, was the testimony of flight attendants, who are forced to spend their working lives aboard aircraft. Our flight attendant witnesses described ailments which they and their colleagues incur in the small, enclosed, smoke-filled cabin environment. They described health problems ranging from eye, nose and throat irritation, headache, nausea, dizziness, blurred vision, shortness of breath, and heart palpitations to permanent disability and even death from the occupational hazards of their jobs in airplanes. Non-smoking flight attendants are suffering and dying from diseases common to smokers—simply from working in the smoking section.

There is also a safety issue involved. Flight attendant witnesses showed us photographs of cigarette butts all over the floor of the airplanes—a potential fire hazard. They testified to passengers falling asleep in their seats, dropping lit cigarettes on the floor—a clear fire risk.

Equally outrageous is the plight of children stuck in the smoking section with their parents. And businessmen who must be at their peak when they arrive at their destination, but stagger off, jet-lagged and debilitated by smoke-caused allergies and sensitivities. And pleasure travelers whose vacations are ruined by smoke-induced illnesses. And the millions of non-smoking passengers who cannot really get away from the smoke, no matter where they sit in the airplane.

Mr. Speaker, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) has proposed that nations and smoking on aircraft in 1996. This is a proposal only, and unless all countries agree, passengers and flight attendants will continue to suffer, and airlines forced to go non-smoking will maintain that they are at a competitive disadvantage.

Airlines serving the United States, whether carrying the U.S. flag or some other, would under my bill be smoke-free. There would thus be no competitive disadvantage between U.S. and foreign airlines, and I believe that the airlines themselves as well as the vast majority of their employees and passengers will welcome enactment of this bill.

REMEMBER THEM WITH FLOWERS

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a call from a constituent who told me a story and gave me an idea that is especially appropriate to Memorial Day and the 50th anniversary of D-Day.

Doris Winkler, who syndicates the television show, "The Senior Report," lost her brother, Capt. John M. Hennessy, Jr., during World War II.

500818754