

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH PERMANENT STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE OFFICE ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today, along with 20 of my colleagues, I will be reintroducing legislation to establish permanent statutory authority for the Public Health Service Office on Women's Health. Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE has introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

With this bill, we hope to create an enduring structure within which the current well-documented ongoing needs and gaps in research, policy, programs, and education and training in women's health will continue to be addressed. It will ensure that important initiatives—in breast cancer detection and eradication, in the promotion of healthy behaviors and disease prevention, in improved public information about women's health, in better informed health care professionals, among others—will reach fruition.

The Public Health Service's Office on Women's Health, established by the Bush administration and now within the Office of the Secretary, is the focal point for women's health activities in the Department of Health and Human Services. By administering cross-cutting initiatives across the PHS, the OWH is able to fill gaps in knowledge, and to initiate and synthesize program activities in ways that no other single PHS agency or office could accomplish alone.

In addition, the bill also makes permanent offices on women's health at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, the Health Resources and Services Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration; these agencies currently have offices or coordinators which were established administratively and could be abolished at any time. Women's health offices at the National Institutes of Health and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration have been made permanent in previous legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this legislation.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. KILDEE and I have introduced a technical amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1965. The amendment makes a technical correction to

the student right to know provisions of the Higher Education Act.

The student right to know provisions of the Higher Education Act require institutions of higher education to report graduation rates for their student body. These statistics are compiled for the student body at large and for student athletes as well. A change made in the fiscal year 1996 omnibus appropriations bill resulted in these rates being calculated at different points in time during the academic year. As a result of this oversight, institutions will be required to keep two sets of records for calculating and reporting graduation rates.

The amendment corrects the problem by conforming the section of the Higher Education Act dealing with the reporting date for student athletes to the section of the Higher Education Act that requires preparation of graduation rates for all students. This amendment will first, allow institutions to more accurately reflect the manner in which institutions collect the data on graduation rates, and second, eliminate the burdensome task of preparing two distinct sets of graduation rates.

I urge all Members to support this technical amendment that simplifies record keeping requirements for institutions of higher education.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL SPORTSMANSHIP DAY, MARCH 4, 1997

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National Sportsman's Day, March 4, 1997. This day, in its celebration of sportsmanship, brings together student athletes from across the United States and 74 countries world-wide in an effort to promote the importance of fair play, integrity, character, and ethics. Teamwork, respect and cooperation, values that are integral for success in society, business, and sports alike, are the themes of the activities for the young people who take part in this day.

Established by the Institute for International Sport located at the University of Rhode Island, National Sportsman's Day is just one element of the institute's efforts to establish a greater awareness in the area of physical fitness. Other year-round components of the institute's efforts are the Student-Athlete Outreach Program, where student-athletes from high schools and colleges visit local elementary and middle schools to serve as positive role models and promote good sportsmanship, and the World Scholar-Athlete Games.

I am proud to offer my support to programs like this that provide students of all ages the opportunity to develop the skills that will help promote success and achievement throughout their lifetime. I would like to acknowledge the parents, teachers, coaches, participants, and especially those individuals who have committed

their time and efforts to broaden participation in the arena of friendly competition and sportsmanship.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE CHILDREN'S PROTECTION FROM VIOLENT PROGRAMMING ACT

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join millions of American parents, teachers, doctors, and children's advocates in endorsing a content-based rating system for television viewing among children. For too long Congress and the American people have left programming content decisions to motion picture and broadcasting industry executives. Parents have expressed frustration with the constant barrage of violence, sex, and adult language on television. I am pleased to join Representatives MARKEY, BURTON, SPRATT, MORAN, and others to introduce a bill that gives parents the ability to determine what type of programming content is appropriate for their children to watch.

Parents are tired of having Hollywood tell them what is best for their children. Congress gave the broadcasting industry a golden opportunity to meet this challenge in the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Instead of addressing these longstanding concerns, the industry proposed an age-based rating system that is still inadequate because it does not inform parents of objectionable programming content. Furthermore, the age-based proposal will continue to prevent parents from making informed choices about their children's viewing behavior. The rapid growth of network and cable programming has been a mixed blessing for parents. They are left with the daunting task of learning the content of numerous shows and channels. The age-based rating system will not help make this task any easier.

I have heard from parents and child advocates all across Oregon who say that they want to know what to expect from a particular television show. They also want to know if the show contains explicit sex, adult language, and excessive violence. Most importantly, they want to make their own decisions about what their own children watch, not leaving the decisions up to television executives. A parent does not want to be told that their child is old enough to watch a "TV-PG" rated show. The majority of parents are smart enough to know that this category is quite broad, covering a wide range of shows.

According to a nationwide survey conducted by the National Parent Teachers Association [PTA], over 80 percent of parents stated that they want separate ratings for sex, violence, and language content to help parents decide what shows their children can and cannot watch. In fact, a large number of organizations have criticized the age-based rating system including the National PTA, the American Medical Association [AMA], the American Academy

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of Pediatrics, the Children's Defense Fund [CDF], Family Research Council, and many others. I am confident that this bill will aid parents with these decisions and encourage the broadcasting industry to adopt a content-specific rating system.

In an attempt to require broadcasters and manufacturers to help parents block shows they considered too objectionable, Congress passed the V-chip law to the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Until this law takes effect in 1998, this bill is the necessary next step in addressing the concerns of parents in the information age.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CONGRESSMEN REGULA AND MURTHA

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call your attention to a special award that was recently given to our distinguished colleagues and longstanding leaders of the Congressional Steel Caucus, RALPH REGULA and JACK MURTHA. Last month, RALPH and JACK were recognized by the American Iron & Steel Institute and the U.S. Department of Energy [DOE] during DOE's Industrial Efficiency Symposium in Arlington, VA.

On February 25, RALPH and JACK received individual awards testifying to their unflagging contributions to the future of the American steel industry. The awards were in recognition of the central role they have played, both as leaders of the caucus and as individual legislators, in creating the metals initiative program within the energy efficiency function of DOE. The metals initiative, a government-industry collaborative program designed to improve the competitiveness of steel and other metal industries, has received \$120 million in appropriations over the past decade to develop direct steelmaking, advanced process controls, and an optical sensor for measuring temperatures.

In their respective positions as chairman and vice chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus, RALPH REGULA and JACK MURTHA have worked tirelessly over the years to promote and expand the economic viability of the American steel industry and the jobs of its workers. The Steel Caucus is a bipartisan organization, which has served as a forum since the 1970's for Members of Congress to exchange information and ideas with steel industry representatives, steelworkers and their representatives, and the administration. And their hard work has paid off handsomely: Today, the American steel industry and its workers are the most productive and efficient in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and my other House colleagues will join me in congratulating RALPH and JACK for receiving this award in recognition of their crucial support for the American steel industry and its workers.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this year's budget debate promises another round of arguments over cutting programs and services to American citizens in order to balance the Federal budget. In that debate, it is time to take a serious look at the wasteful practices that drain the Treasury while subsidizing the developers of natural resources from the public lands.

Today I am introducing a bill, the Public Resources Deficit Reduction Act, that will terminate the very expensive subsidies that taxpayers have long provided to many of the nation's natural resource developers and require, instead, that taxpayers receive the fair market value of the public's resources.

While we often disagree about the precise way to allocate limited Federal resources, I believe we should all be able to agree that we should not waste billions of dollars in taxpayers' money and resources. Yet our natural resources policies, often formulated decades ago when it was necessary to induce people to settle the West, still give away billions of dollars each year in subsidies to mining conglomerates, timber barons and argibusinesses. The taxpayers' largesse benefits some of the wealthiest ranchers and farm operators in the United States, while subsidizing environmental damage that the taxpayers eventually pay to clean up as well.

This bill has a very simple goal: Companies and individuals who use natural resources from public lands—minerals, timber, water, hydropower and forage for grazing—would pay fair market value for those resources. In order to provide a transition period, it exempts all existing contracts and phases fair market pricing in over 5 years. But after 5 more years of taxpayer subsidies, this bill asks natural resource developers to pay the taxpayers what their assets are worth.

The bill also contains a number of specific provisions to ensure that particular programs are altered to eliminate unfair subsidies. It would amend the 1872 mining law to require that the taxpayers receive a fair royalty for gold and silver mined on public lands. It would alter programs in the national parks to ensure that the public receives a fair share of the profits made by the concessionaires. It would set standards for eliminating below-cost timber sales and charging fair market value for grazing and the use of utility rights-of-way across public land. It would move the income from timber and grazing programs on-budget, so that the receipts are accounted for in annual budgeting.

Another area addressed by this bill is the inconsistency of Federal irrigation and farm support policies, which often contradict one another or provide enormous combined subsidies. To address these inconsistencies, the bill would eliminate Federal irrigation subsidies to farmers already receiving payments under the Agricultural Market Transition Act. It also would require that the irrigation subsidies be counted into the cap on farm subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, we have asked all of our citizens to accept some cuts in Federal programs

in order to balance the budget. We told welfare recipients their aid would end after 5 years. This bill would tell our citizens that we can be responsible stewards of the assets they have entrusted to us, and that we will not longer demand that they tolerate wasteful subsidy programs.

In the last Congress, this legislation was introduced with dozens of co-sponsors, including Members of both political parties. It was not even accorded a hearing by the Committee on Resources. The last Congress utterly failed to reform any of the major resource subsidy programs that currently apply to billions of dollars in public resources.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford such indifference again in the 105th Congress. We cannot afford environmental indifference to the consequences of subsidized resource development and usage. And we cannot afford the fiscal burden of maintaining, on the eve of the 21st century, subsidy programs born at the end of the 19th century.

LINDSAY WASHICK WINS PARADE MAGAZINE AWARD

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor Lindsay Washick, daughter of Bob Washick of Conyngham, PA, for winning first place in a contest sponsored by Parade Magazine and the Times-Leader newspaper of Wilkes-Barre, PA.

Lindsay is a 14-year-old ninth grader at MMI preparatory school in Freeland, PA.

Lindsay's article, entitled "Our President's Greatest Challenge," was chosen from six finalists. As a reward as part of the Young Columbus Program, Lindsay will act as a young ambassador on a trip to Ireland in April.

Lindsay is an example of the fine quality of students who are dedicated to learning and expanding their knowledge of the world they live in. The youth of today are tomorrow's future and I congratulate Lindsay on winning first prize.

I am inserting her article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Text from Lindsay Washick:

With November fifth long and gone, the votes have been counted and tallied, and the leader of our country has been decided. Mr. William J. Clinton will be our president for the next four years.

With a new term starting, many people are anxious to see what he'll be concentrating the most on. Will it be drugs, health care, the environment, our involvement in foreign countries, or balancing the budget? All of these issues are very important but every time the very important issues do come up, there is always one that's overlooked—The Young People of America.

I think that the greatest challenge to our new President is to be getting in touch with our young people, and getting them involved.

I just recently turned 14, and am therefore an adolescent. I'm, involved in, and have a wide variety of liking, but when it comes to government, and politics, I'm always the last one to know and/or care. The rest of the nation is in such a tizzy about everything else, that they're overlooking us too. The President goes where the people go, and that's always away from us. But, every now and