

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF STS. PHILIP & JAMES CHURCH

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Sts. Philip & James Church. A true leader in Cleveland's church community, Sts. Philip & James has progressed with the times and continues still to redefine itself in keeping with its mission of community outreach.

The decree for a new parish, to be located in Cleveland's West Boulevard neighborhood, was made effective on May 1, 1950; the cornerstone was laid on September 24 of the same year. Sts. Philip & James school opened in February of 1951, with 270 students transferring from eight area public and parochial schools. As both the school and parish continued to grow, disaster struck in 1953 when a tornado ravaged the neighborhood. For three days, Sts. Philip & James became a Red Cross Shelter for victims, and the 107th Army Calvary Regiment established its field headquarters there. After helping the area to recover, the parish became even more active, with such groups as the women's guild, the Alter and Rosary Society, a Parent Teacher Union, a Holy Name Society, as well as numerous choirs.

Upon entrance to its second decade, Sts. Philip & James continued to grow in both numbers and facilities for the surrounding Catholic community. Though a fire in the rectory in 1963 tested the congregation's strength, it bounced back with fundraising drives establishing permanent housing for both the priests as well as the Franciscan Sisters who have been an integral part of the parish community since the school opened. Serving as both staff and teachers, the Franciscan Sisters have tirelessly dedicated their time to the betterment of the community. Like many Cleveland diocese churches, though, numbers inevitably decreased in the 70s and 80s, culminating in the eventual closing of the school in 1998. This left a smaller church community, though one which has never lost the spirit which kept Sts. Philip & James thriving through both the best and most trying of times.

Today, Sts. Philip & James is undergoing a self proclaimed "adjustment period," though one that they are handling with deft and grace. The convent, abandoned when the school closed, has been converted into a maternity home for young girls who need a safe haven, and in 1999, renovations were underway on the school to create the new Horizon Science Academy for seventh, eighth and ninth grade students. Truly, Sts. Philip & James church deserves our acknowledgment and congratulations for fifty impressive years of service to the Cleveland community, and what appears to be many more years to come.

I ask my colleagues to join me in rising to honor this truly remarkable institution as it celebrates fifty years of outstanding service to the Cleveland area.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE HERBERT H. BATEMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

SPEECH OF

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 2000

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to a steadfast colleague and a truly dedicated public servant. This week, this House lost a treasured friend with the passing of Representative Herb Bateman of Virginia.

One characteristic distinguished Herb throughout his 50-year career: commitment to public service. Whether as a teacher, Air Force Officer, attorney, or legislator, Herb aspired to and reached a high standard of service to his students, his country, his clients, and his constituents. I know this first-hand, since we served together for over 18 years.

In his time in the Virginia Senate, Herb distinguished himself as a leader in diverse issue areas including agriculture, energy, education, and the budget. In this body, Herb, a member of the Armed Services Committee, earned a reputation as a fighter for a strong and prepared military. He understood the dynamic role of the United States in the post-cold war world. Toward this end, Herb was a strong advocate for military readiness, and a staunch supporter of his constituents in the shipbuilding industry and the local military community.

Perhaps the greatest reasons for Herb's success as a legislator are his bipartisanship and his patriotism. He was always looking out for America's best interests, always willing to hear the other side, always capable of expressing his views in logical, rather than partisan, ways. Herb showed us the importance of duty, integrity, and responsibility in public life.

We will miss him.

MARRIAGE TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 2000

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for

marriage penalty tax reform. Americans should not have to pay additional taxes simply because they have made the decision to get married. However, I will continue to oppose the marriage penalty tax relief as proposed in the bill under consideration today because it offers the majority of the relief to wealthy individuals subject to this tax without regard to the economy, future revenues or tax fairness. I will vote to sustain President Clinton's veto of this misguided effort.

Many middle class Americans believe they do not receive value for their taxes. An important component of any tax reform debate should focus on renewing taxpayer's confidence that they are not only being taxed fairly, but that their tax dollars are being spend wisely. It concerns me that we are considering a marriage penalty tax relief proposal today without a broader discussion of reform of our tax policy. We don't make decisions in a vacuum and the decisions we make today will have an impact on future revenues and spending on priority initiatives.

I want to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come up with meaningful, fiscally responsible marriage penalty tax relief. We can afford to correct this oddity in the tax code and offer middle class families much needed relief. Unfortunately, the bill before us today does not do that. A couple making \$31,000 annually would get a tax cut of only \$182 under this bill, while the wealthiest five percent of couples would be getting a tax cut of approximately \$1000 each year. Further, many of these higher-income families who would receive the majority of the relief under this bill are not impacted by the existing marriage penalty. Consequently, the bill as currently drafted gives the most affluent a marriage bonus. This isn't fair, it isn't responsible tax policy and it isn't affordable.

The bill vetoed by the President costs \$292 billion over 10 years. This tax cut is \$110 billion more than the version which passed the House of Representatives earlier this year. A tax cut of this size passed without regard to other tax reform needed, such as the estate tax, and without regard to other dynamics in the economy is irresponsible. Adoption of this tax cut will greatly jeopardize our nation's ability to pay down the national debt, comprehensively reform the tax code and ensure the stability of Social Security and Medicare.

I am hopeful that by working together we can come up with an economic strategy which provides fiscal security by using any surplus pay down our publicly held debt and make Social Security and Medicare solvent, while also providing a tax relief package that helps working families. The bill before us today doesn't do this and I cannot support it. I hope our actions today will bring the House leadership to the table to design a measure that the President can sign into law.

• 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.

IN HONOR OF PARMADALE'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Parmadale's 75th anniversary. Over the years, this organization has continued to provide a vital caring service for deprived and needy children in the city of Parma. It has been an outstanding force in support of the family unit and provides an essential vision of social cohesion within our community for which we should all pay our respect.

Founded in September 1925, Parmadale was created with the objective of strengthening families by teaching parents how to more effectively care for their children. Throughout its years of community service, Parmadale's ethos has always been founded upon the strengths of family, neighborhood and community. As a care treatment provider it has maintained this fundamental value through services such as "Whole Family Treatment." It has also succeeded in adapting to the changing needs of children in our society.

Today it provides essential services for children suffering from drug dependence, mental difficulties, and serious emotional problems. The center prides itself on its flexible clinical response to the needs of children. The faculty provides specialized residential services, a range of foster care, as well as in-home services and day care. In 1989, the St. Augustine Center for Special Needs Children was established. This was the first Intensive Treatment Center for adolescents in the State of Ohio. In 1994, its success was conformed by the addition of a second Intensive Treatment Center.

My fellow colleagues please join me in paying respect to the outstanding work of the Parmadale Center. Its years of experience and flexible approach to care services ensure that it will continue to provide an invaluable service for the youth and general community of Parma, Ohio.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 5179, THE REGISTERED NURSES AND PATIENTS PROTECTION ACT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today, with our colleague, the Gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), I am introducing legislation that would restrict the ability of hospitals and other medical facilities to require registered nurses to work mandatory overtime hours as a normal course of business. Increasingly, employers, particularly in the health care field, are requiring employees to work overtime. Our legislation is H.R. 5179, the Registered Nurses and Patients Protection Act.

The Fair Labor Standards Act grants nurses the right to receive overtime compensation even though they are licensed professionals, but it does not limit the amount of overtime that nurses can work nor does it permit them

to refuse mandatory overtime. In this era of full employment, it is simply easier and cheaper for hospital administrators to require existing employees to work overtime than it is for them to recruit and train new employees.

Mr. Speaker, no employer should be allowed to force an employee to work overtime or face termination unless there is an emergency situation that requires immediate emergency action. In the health care field, however, we are not just talking about an employee's right to refuse overtime work. We are also talking about patient safety. When nurses are forced to put in long overtime hours on a regular basis against their better judgment, it puts patients at risk.

The Registered Nurses and Patients Protection Act would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to prohibit mandatory overtime beyond 8 hours in a work day or 80 hours in any 14-day work period except in the case of a natural disaster or in the event of a declaration of an emergency by federal, state or local government officials. The legislation does not preclude a nurse from voluntarily working overtime.

Mr. Speaker, mandatory overtime for nurses is bad health care policy. A nurse shouldn't be on the job after the 15th or 16th consecutive hour especially after she has told her supervisor "I can't do this, I've been on the job too many hours today."

Nursing is physically and mentally demanding. When a nurse is tired, it is much more difficult to deliver quality, professional care to patients. Health care experts and common sense tell us that long hours take a toll on mental alertness and mandatory overtime under such conditions can result in serious medical mistakes—medication errors, transcription errors, and errors in judgment. By the end of a regular shift a nurse is exhausted. Increasingly, however, nurses are being forced to work 16, 18 or even 20 consecutive hours in hospitals across our nation.

Mr. Speaker, a nurse knows better than anyone—better than her supervisor and better than a hospital administrator—when she has reached the point of fatigue when continuing to work can result in serious medical problems. We must give nurses more power to decide if long hours on the job is making it difficult to perform their duties. This legislation is not a case of government micro-managing—this legislation gives nurses the power to say "NO" to the forced overtime practices of hospitals nationwide. We cannot continue to allow hospitals to force nurses to work so many hours that the health and safety of patients are put at risk. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the adoption of the Registered Nurses and Patients Protection Act.

FSC REPEAL AND EXTRA-TERRITORIAL INCOME EXCLUSION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 2000

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is problematic for a number of reasons. First, it does not address concerns laid out clearly in a letter to Deputy

Secretary Eizenstat I signed in April along with 31 of my colleagues. I am attaching a copy of that letter.

In the wake of the WTO's adverse decision on Foreign Sales Corporations, we urged the Administration—as it fashioned its response to the WTO decision—to resist efforts to increase benefits for military arms sales. After all, if the U.S. is serious about leading the world into a peaceful future, we should be promoting arms control—not increasing subsidies for defense contractors so that they can promote the conventional arms race. But this bill does just what we urged the Administration not to do—it would increase defense contractor subsidies.

In addition, this bill continues export subsidies for tobacco, thus making it American policy to promote the sales of cigarettes all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, these are serious issues deserving of serious debate. At a minimum, the bill should have been brought up under a rule for purposes of a thorough debate and consideration of amendments. This was especially necessary given the cost of the bill. At \$1.5 billion over five years (in addition to the revenue that would be lost under FSC), this bill should have been more thoroughly discussed before being put to a vote.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support H.R. 4986 as it has been brought before the House.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, April 19, 2000.

Hon. STUART E. EIZENSTAT,
Deputy Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY EIZENSTAT: In your position as the lead Administration official charged with implementing an acceptable response to the adverse World Trade Organization (WTO) decision on Foreign Sales Corporations (FSC), we urge you to resist all efforts to increase benefits for military arms sales. Indeed, the existing benefits should actually be narrowed.

The current limitation on this benefit, as contained in 26 USC §923(a)(5), provides that the normal FSC benefit is reduced by 50% for sales of certain military property, defined by Treasury as, "an arm, ammunition, or implement of war." Specific covered military property is listed on the U.S. Munitions List (22 CFR 121), as provided for by the Arms Export Control Act (22 USC §2778).

Firmly believing that our nation should be providing more leadership for effective arms control policies, we seek your help to avoid additional subsidies with federal taxpayer monies to promote the conventional arms races that plague our planet. We should be promoting arms control, not arms sales.

The complicated legislative history of the FSC provision does show that it was intended to help U.S. companies to compete overseas. However, according to the Congressional Research Service, in 1997, the United States enjoyed a 44% share of the world market for arms while Great Britain, its nearest competitor, had 17%. In 1998, the United States led in new arms deals with \$7.1 billion, followed by Germany at \$5.5 billion. Even the Defense Department has touted the world market dominance by U.S. companies, writing in 1994:

"The forecasts support a continuing strong defense trade performance for U.S. defense products through the end of the decade and beyond. In a large number of cases, the U.S. is clearly the preferred provider, and there is little meaningful competition with suppliers from other countries. An increase in the level of support the U.S. government currently supplies is unlikely to shift the U.S.