

"risk assessment" regulatory reform policy. In 1979, Ed was instrumental in initiating a pioneering study by the National Academy of Sciences, Risk Assessment in the Federal Government: Managing the Process. This year, Ed participated in the Academy's reorganization and a second seminal study, Science, Technology and the Law.

Currently, Ed is responsible for Procter & Gamble's federal policy on advertising, energy, the environment, labor, research and development and telecommunications. His principal focus has been on Internet privacy policy. He serves as Chairman of the BBB Online Steering Committee, overseeing the development of self-regulatory privacy approach for American industry.

Ed and his wife, Wanda, live in Great Falls, Virginia, and have two sons. Both Ed and Wanda are committed to their community. Ed chairs the University of Wisconsin Foundation in the Washington, DC area. Wanda is a leader in the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation's annual "Race for the Cure."

Mr. Speaker, we salute Ed Behrens as he completes 38 years of service to the Procter & Gamble Company.

WOMEN AND CHILDREN'S RESOURCES ACT

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1999

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce a bill that is about solutions. About solutions for women in need. It's called the Women and Children's Resources Act and it is truly seeking to improve women's health and offer a woman compassionate choices when she finds herself facing an unplanned pregnancy.

This is legislation that can frankly bring pro-life and pro-choice together to offer real solutions to women—on common ground. If today's women need choices we must offer them real choices. We must offer them compassion. To truly respect women and to respect the value and uniqueness of all human life—both mother and child—we need to meet their needs in a holistic way. This is the essence of caring for women.

We all rejoice when we hear that the abortion rate is dropping in America. We rejoice because we know that it is due in part to the compassionate services and alternatives that are being offered to today's women.

Indeed, as Frederica Mathewes-Green has said so well, many women would choose not to have an abortion if only they knew that other options were available to them.

Alternatives like adoption services, maternity home stays, crisis pregnancy centers, caring extended church families and religious communities, even para-church organizations.

I'm pleased to have representatives from some of these organizations here today. It is each of you who provide the time-intensive, long-term, compassionate assistance to women—women who may be scared, poor, lonely, even confused. Thank you.

The Women and Children's Resources Act takes a successful model—the Pennsylvania model—and expands it for all 50 states. In Pennsylvania, because of a fee-for-service

funding stream that goes directly to crisis pregnancy centers, maternity homes, and adoption services, small organizations that meet these needs are helping hundreds more women than they would have been able to otherwise.

At the federal level, the 85 million dollar grant that would be set up through the Women and Children's Resources Act will provide a helping hand to such organizations all over the United States—organizations meeting essential needs of women, through: Testing for pregnancy; follow-up services; prenatal and postpartum health care; health and nutritional needs of pregnant and postpartum women; and essential information on childbirth, parenting, and pregnancy during adolescence.

For thousands of women, unfortunately, unplanned pregnancy is a reality. We are here today because we care about women in these situations.

Even as funding for Title X continues to grow, small organizations like crisis pregnancy centers, maternity homes, and adoption agencies rely almost solely on contributions from concerned citizens just to keep their shoe-string budgets afloat.

Mother Teresa showed us that the most important thing we can do is to meet the needs of those in our midst, those on our street corner, those in our cities and towns, those who come to us for help.

The Women and Children's Resources Act empowers those who are making a tangible difference in the lives of women facing an unplanned pregnancy. This is a critical part of offering choices. And this is the very essence of compassion. And this is something on which pro-choice and pro-life people can agree: that women facing crisis pregnancies need compassionate assistance.

MODEL TEACHER: CHARLOTTE RAY

HON. ERNIE FLETCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1999

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I have heard hours of testimony on the failure of our nation's public education system. Far too often, we fail to recognize the success stories, and the thousands of men and women that dedicate their lives to the education of our children. Next to parents, I believe the most important factor in whether or not a child succeeds academically is the quality of the teacher in the classroom. With that in mind, today I rise in recognition of a model teacher from Lexington, Kentucky—the kind of teacher that every child in Kentucky, and across the nation, deserves to have standing in front of the chalkboard.

Fayette County Public Schools recently honored Charlotte Ray as high school teacher of the year. During her twenty-seven years as a ninth grade chemistry and physics teacher, she has touched the lives of hundreds of children by showing them that there is much more to science than what can be found in a textbook. With an energy level that rivals her students, Mrs. Ray uses the entire school as her laboratory and through hands-on experimentation teaches students that learning can be both interesting and fun.

Mrs. Ray is also a teacher that enjoys her job. In her acceptance speech, she said, "My family encouraged me at the end of last year to think about retiring. Perhaps they were optimistic for better meals, or for ironed shirts. I'm not a very good cook and I sure don't want to iron. I'm still having a great time in the classroom." Her enthusiasm is contagious, so contagious that she was nominated not by her principal, or a group of her peers, but by the parent of a former student. She has also benefited from the school system in which she serves. A product of Kentucky public education, she graduated from Bryan Station High School in Lexington, and went on to receive a Bachelor's Degree from Eastern Kentucky University, followed by a Master's Degree from the University of Kentucky.

As the students and faculty of Lafayette High School celebrate Charlotte Ray's award, I would like to commend her on this achievement, and encourage all of us to look to her as an example of one of education's brightest stars.

BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN P. GEIS: 30 YEARS OF HONOR, DUTY AND SERVICE

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1999

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Brigadier General John P. Geis, who is retiring after 30 years of honorable service in the United States Army. On October 6, 1999, General Geis will be stepping down after one year as commander of the Army Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center (ARDEC) at Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey.

General Geis was born in Jonesboro, Arkansas on January 31, 1947, and later attended Arkansas State University. He completed the Reserve Officers Training Corps program there, and graduated as a Second Lieutenant in 1969 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration. He went on to earn a Master of Arts degree in Logistics Management from Central Michigan University, and received additional training through a number of advanced military courses, including the Army War College.

General Geis developed his expertise in weapons systems as a result of his extensive involvement with the Army's research and development programs. Prior to his service as commander of TACOM-ARDEC, General Geis served as Commanding General of U.S. Army Simulation, Training and Instrumentation Command (Florida); Executive Office to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition); Project Manager, Advanced Field Artillery System/Future Armored Resupply Vehicle; Project Manager, Future Armored Resupply Vehicle; Director for Program Integration, ASA (RDA); Chief, Logistics Plans and Operations, Combined Field Army, Korea; Commander, 27th Main Support Battalion, 1st Cavalry Division; Logistics Staff Officer, ODCSLOG, HQDA; and Chief, Weapons Systems Assessments, HQ Army Material Command.

While serving as Picatinny Arsenal's commanding officer, General Geis has exercised

calm and caring leadership to help move the base ahead in a time of downsizing, realignment and change. During General Geis' tenure at Picatinny, TACOM-ARDEC has received numerous awards for its work on the Army's weapons of the future, including the Crusader Self-Propelled Howitzer, the Lightweight 155 Towed Howitzer, the Objective Individual Combat Weapon (OICW), and the Precision Guided Mortar Munition (PGMM).

Under General Geis' command, the awards bestowed upon Picatinny include the Army Communities of Excellence, Chief of Staff of Army Award; the New Jersey Quality Achievement Award; the U.S. Army R&D Organization of the Year; and the U.S. Army R&D Excellence Award. These awards acknowledge what I have long known, that the men and women working at Picatinny Arsenal are the recognized experts in munitions technology.

Mr. Speaker, I again commend General Geis for his 30 years of service to his country. I wish him and his wife Lee all the best in the years to come as they embark on their new life in Virginia.

UNFETTERED LEGISLATIVE DEBATE MUST TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER A WITCH HUNT FOR GAYS IN THE MILITARY—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT INITIATED BY CONGRESSMAN BARNEY FRANK AND TOM CAMPBELL

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1999

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strongest support for the efforts of our distinguished colleagues and my friends, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman BARNEY FRANK, and the gentleman from California, Congressman TOM CAMPBELL, for their principled commitment to the sanctity of unfettered legislative debate. These two colleagues—one a Democrat and the other a Republican—acted quickly and responsibly by sending a letter to the President in the matter of Arizona State Representative Stephen May, who is facing possible discharge from the Army Reserves because he discussed his sexual orientation within a relevant context during an official debate in the Arizona House of Representatives.

Like my colleagues, I find it absolutely intolerable that a duly elected States legislator should be punished by the military for appropriate comments which he made during the course of an official debate in the Arizona State Legislature. Taking action against a State representative for what he said in debate as elected legislator is a violation of the spirit of the "speech and debate clause" of the United States Constitution. The overwhelming majority of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, have strongly defended the democratic privilege of American legislators to speak freely, without having to fear that they will be prosecuted for comments they choose to make during official, public debate.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman FRANK and Congressman CAMPBELL have written an eloquent defense of the principle of legislative debate to the President of the United States. I thank them both for their leadership on this issue,

and I ask that the full text of their excellent letter be placed in the RECORD. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join in signing this excellent letter to the President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President, The White House
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge you to honor the tradition of full and unfettered legislative debate in America by instructing the Defense Department to drop charges against State Representative Stephen May of Arizona.

As you know, Representative May now faces potential discharge from the military because in his capacity as a member of the Arizona Legislature, during formal debate on legislative matters, he alluded to his sexual orientation in a context in which such an allusion was fully relevant.

The signers of this letter have varying views on the merits of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy regarding the military. But we do not write this letter as a commentary on that policy. Rather, we are writing because we as elected representatives believe strongly in that principle embodied in the "speech and debate clause" of the American Constitution which seeks to extend full protection to members of legislative bodies from any sanction for comments they legitimately make in the course of legislative debate.

We recognize, of course, that the speech and debate clause does not technically apply to members of State Legislatures. If it did, presumably this letter would be unnecessary. But we do believe in the policy embodied in that clause—namely that only when elected legislators are confident of their ability to speak out freely without any fear of external sanction from outside the legislative body can the process of representative government flourish.

As a student of Constitutional history, you know that this clause made its way into the United States Constitution in reaction to the harassment of members of the British Parliament that occurred in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. There was then a tradition of members of the House of Commons in particular suffering penalties for speaking freely in the course of legislative debate. Thus, the speech and debate clause as it is known says "and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place."

The purpose of this is so that members of legislative bodies in fulfillment of their duty fully to represent their constituents need not fear that members of the Executive, or Judicial branches will penalize them for comments of which they disapprove. What is being proposed regarding Representative May is for the federal Executive Branch to punish an elected member of the Arizona State Legislature because of comments he chose to make that were fully relevant to a public policy debate in the legislature to which he was duly elected. We find it difficult to believe that you, as a believer in the importance of full legislative debate, would permit the Executive Branch over which you preside to punish an elected legislator for remarks made in the course of legislative debate.

As we noted earlier, we realize that the Constitutional clause protecting Members of Congress does not apply to State Legislators. But obviously the justification for that clause—preserving full freedom of debate—applies very strongly. Indeed, we believe there is an added policy reason why you should not allow your Executive Branch to penalize Representative May for comments

made in the course of legislative debate. That is the respect that the federal government ought to show for the democratic process within the states. The speech and debate clause says that no Members of Congress shall be made to answer "in any other place". Surely that applies with strong logical force to a situation in which the federal Executive Branch would reach down and take punitive action against an elected member of the Arizona Legislature. Certainly the Arizona Legislature ought to be considered by the federal Executive Branch competent to run its own affairs, and we believe that you will be setting a terrible precedent if you allow the military to go forward with its proposed action against Representative May.

While some have suggested that no Members of Congress, for example, should serve in the Reserves, that has not been our policy. The military clearly has strong views about many issues. And the general rule is that members of military are not to take issue with official policy. Are federal and state legislators who serve in the Reserves now to begin to censor their comments in relevant legislative debates lest they face sanctions imposed by the federal Executive Branch?

As you know, Members of Congress have long treated the "speech and debate clause" as a matter of high Congressional privilege, embodying a principle essential to the functioning of our democracy. Our history is replete with examples of the overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress, including the bi-partisan Congressional leadership of both Houses, coming to the defense of legislators who are faced with potential sanction for remarks which they made in debate, even in cases where the overwhelming majority of legislators strongly disagreed with the remarks in question. If Representative May is to be subjected to the severe sanction of expulsion from the military, where he has served with such distinction and without any negative marks on his record, the principle that legislators must be free from having to answer in any other place for comments they choose to make in public debate will have been more seriously eroded than in any other single instance that we can recall in recent times.

We prepared to debate the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy among ourselves in our contexts. But here, we ask you to show the respect for unfettered legislative debate that has long been a hallmark of American democratic practice and drop any effort to punish a duly elected member of a state legislature for comments made during the course of debate.

HONORING JOHN SEPULVEDA FOR HIS DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1999

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to rise today to join with the New Haven Hispanic community as they gather this evening to pay tribute to my dear friend, John U. Sepulveda. I regret that I am unable to join this evening's celebration though I am proud to convey my sincere congratulations to John as he is honored by Casa Otonal and the Hispanic community.

Before setting his sights on our nation's capitol, John was an active member of the New Haven community. A graduate of Yale