

during the Republican Convention in August. Evelyn and I enjoyed the time we spent with them, and as grandparents ourselves, we could tell that they were looking forward to his impending retirement in order to spend more time with their two children, Laura Margaret and Herbert Jr., Herbert Jr.'s wife Mary, and their three grandchildren Emmy, Hank, and Sam.

The American people were the beneficiaries of Congressman Bateman's lifetime of public service, a commitment that spanned five decades. He was a great statesman, and I will miss him personally, this nation will miss his leadership. However, his legacy lives on in everything from the U.S. space program to our military, as well as many other achievements too numerous to name. The fruits of his labor will continue to benefit generations of Americans to come, and they will honor his memory.

CALIFORNIA'S SESQUICENTENNIAL

SPEECH OF

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 2000

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the State of California on the occasion of California's Sesquicentennial—the 150th Anniversary of California's Statehood. California is home to a diverse and resourceful people with a rich and colorful history. I represent the 35th District of California, a district which includes residents of African-American, Latino, Asian, Native American and European descent. My district is as rich in diversity and resourcefulness as the great State of California itself.

The 35th District of California includes several communities in South Central Los Angeles as well as the cities of Inglewood, Gardena and Hawthorne. South Central Los Angeles is a community of resourceful people and small businesses. Gardena is a racially diverse and economically vibrant city. Hawthorne is a center of technology and a home to the aerospace industry. Inglewood is at the center of a growing Los Angeles region close to Los Angeles International Airport. Its predominantly black and Latino students are known for educational achievement and academic excellence. It is also home to the Los Angeles Forum sports arena. All the cities in the 35th district are home to hard-working, creative, energetic and resourceful people and numerous successful small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, the people of 35th District of California are dedicated to economic and educational development, and they are proud of their history and their heritage. I look forward to continuing to represent them as they look forward to the next 150 years of history as residents of the great State of California.

TRIBUTE TO MR. ROBERT L.
DOYLE

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to remember and honor one of the pioneers of

the City of Roseville, in my district in California, Mr. Robert L. Doyle. After a lifetime of dedication and service, my good friend Bob Doyle passed away on August 21 at 8:47 p.m. He was 81 years old.

From the time he was born in his family's home in 1919 until his death, Bob was a fixture in Roseville. After graduating from Roseville High School in 1937, he went to work on the family farm where he expected to remain for the rest of his life. However, in 1953, he reached a turning point in his career. His father, who along with a group of other local farmers had formed the Roseville Telephone Company 26 years earlier, asked him to take over the struggling business.

What started out as a temporary stint to set Roseville Telephone on the right course turned into a lifetime of building both the company and the community. In 1953, Roseville Telephone was a company serving 3,777 customers, employing 47 workers, with revenues of \$210,000. It is now a highly successful, expanding business with annual revenue above \$140 million and more than 700 employees. In 1995, the Roseville Communications Company was formed, becoming the parent company of Roseville Telephone and other subsidiaries. Bob Doyle acted as president of the Roseville Telephone Company until retiring from that post in 1993. He did, however, remain as Roseville Communications' chairman of the board of directors until retiring just one day before his death.

Besides his own hard work and determination, Bob Doyle's management success was due in part to his talent for hiring good people and allowing them to do their job. He made his employees and shareholders feel like they had a personal stake in Roseville Telephone. He also made people feel that way about the Roseville community at large. In addition to his leadership at the company, Bob Doyle was involved in numerous civic and professional organizations. Among the local clubs he belonged to were the Roseville Masonic Lodge No. 222, Scottish Rite Bodies of Sacramento, Shriners, Loyal Order of the Moose Lodge, and the Elks Lodge. He also served as president of the Roseville Chamber of Commerce.

Outside of Roseville, Bob Doyle was also recognized for his leadership in the telecommunications industry. He was involved with the Independent Telephone Pioneers Association and served as president of the California Telephone Association of Sacramento.

It is also important for me to recognize that Bob's career of service included time in the U.S. Army Medical Division during World War II.

On a personal note, I had the opportunity to work with him closely to address two of the Sacramento region's most vital needs—improved flood control and an increased water supply. Over the years, as we worked to advocate the construction of the Auburn Dam, I developed an even greater admiration and respect for Bob. Robert Doyle was not only a community leader, but he was also a great friend.

He is survived by his wife, Carmen, three children and five grandchildren. While we join his family and friends in mourning his passing, we also celebrate his life and cherish our associations with him. He clearly left his mark on all of us. Roseville, which was once a sleepy railroad town, is now a vibrant, well-planned community with award-winning parks, law en-

forcement, and city management. Its railroad past blends with its newer high-tech industry and thriving retail centers. Its residential areas include dynamic new developments as well as historic neighborhoods. In short, Roseville has experienced many great changes and Robert Doyle seemed to be at the heart of them all. He will be sorely missed.

May you rest in peace, Bob.

INTRODUCING THE SMALL BUSINESS LIABILITY RELIEF ACT

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with a bipartisan group of original cosponsors, the Small Business Liability Relief Act to provide long overdue liability protection to individuals, families and small business owners who are innocent parties that have been wrongly and unfairly trapped in the litigation nightmare of the Superfund program for two decades. Superfund badly needs to be reformed to provide liability relief for innocent parties.

Today, I am saying enough is enough. It is time to provide relief to Barbara Williams, the former owner of Sunny Ray Restaurant in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania and to Greg Shierling, the owner of two McDonald's Restaurants in Quincy, Illinois, as well as thousands of others just like them whose only "crime" as small business owners was sending ordinary garbage to the local dump.

This bill only provides relief to innocent small businesses who never should have been brought into Superfund in the first place. First, it provides liability protection to small businesses who disposed of very small amounts of (110 gallons or 200 pounds) of waste. Second, it provides relief for small businesses who dispose of ordinary garbage. Third, it provides shelter from costly litigation for small businesses who dispose of de minimis amounts of waste and who otherwise face serious financial hardship.

It is my strong belief that we can pass this bill with overwhelming bipartisan support so that countless others can be spared the litigation nightmare that has already hit so many of America's small businesses.

CONCERNING THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

SPEECH OF

HON. MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 2000

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, I voted against H.R. 4892, the bill to repeal the Boy Scouts of America Charter. I have a personal stake in this debate. As a boy, I benefited from everything the Scouts had to offer. While I worked my way towards earning the rank of Eagle, I learned the lessons of leadership, trustworthiness, loyalty, and more. Additionally, the memories I have, of sharing my interest in the outdoors with other boys my age will be with me for the rest of my life.

I opposed this bill for two reasons. Number one, I do not believe it is right to single out an individual group in legislative remedies. If change in any area of law occurs it should apply to all affected, not as, in this case, with only the Boy Scouts. It does not make sense to repeal the Scouts' charter and leave in place charters for groups such as the Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists, National Ski Patrol System, Aviation Hall of Fame, or any of the roughly 90 other groups who hold charters.

If Ms. WOOLSEY's bill repealed all federal charters, it might represent a legitimate debate, unfortunately, this bill has a more narrow scope. According to a report published by the Library of Congress, the chartering by Congress, of organizations is essentially a 20th century practice and does not assign the group any governmental attributes. The report continues by stating, that the attraction of charter status for national organizations is that it tends to provide an "official" imprimatur to their activities. With these facts in mind, in 1989, the House Judiciary Committee decided to impose a moratorium on granting new charters.

However, the bill does not address this point, instead it focuses solely on the Boy Scouts. The intent of the bill is to pressure the Boy Scouts to change their practices, which brings me to my second point.

The First Amendment provides all American's the right of association. Whether a group preaches race-based hatred or the teachings of Christianity, their right to gather together has continually been protected by our nation's courts. In fact the courts have already ruled on the practices of the Boy Scouts. State courts in California, Connecticut, Oregon, Kansas, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit have ruled in the Boy Scouts favor.

On June 28, 2000, the Supreme Court affirmed the Constitutionally protected right of the Boy Scouts to set its own standards for membership and leadership. In his ruling Chief Justice Rehnquist stated, though alternative lifestyles are becoming more socially acceptable, "this is scarcely an argument for denying First Amendment protection to those who refuse to accept these views," he continued. "The First Amendment protects expression, be it of the popular variety or not." This decision, once again, reaffirms the Boy Scout's First Amendment rights.

This bill attempts to circumvent the courts ruling by forcing the Boy Scouts to change their practices or else lose their charter. Upon reflection, I have come to agree with Chief Justice Rehnquist and the Supreme Court's, ruling, it should not be the federal government's role to alter the Boy Scout's values. More significantly, the, Boy Scout case is ultimately about something much bigger than scouting, it was a decision of whether or not our Constitutional right of association should remain intact. Passing this bill would have had just the opposite effect and for this reason, I voted against the bill.

ESTUARY RESTORATION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 2000

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1775, the Estuary Restoration Act. This important piece of legislation provides a strong framework and strategy for protecting, maintaining and strengthening the nation's estuaries.

Estuaries are essential and fragile ecosystems that deserve a comprehensive plan to ensure their long-term viability. They are home to thousands of species of aquatic plant and animal life. They are also some of the most productive commercial fisheries in the world. And, millions of Americans flock to estuarine areas for vacations and recreation.

The legislation we are considering today gives us another tool to use for estuary preservation and restoration. This bill streamlines financing for estuary projects and integrates existing federal and non-federal programs. The bill also gives priority to those estuaries currently part of a management plan or pollution mitigation plan. This is so important that my colleague, ROSA DELAURIO, and I introduced H.R. 1096, to provide special funding to States for implementation of national estuary conservation and management plans. I hope that with the passage of this legislation we can continue to provide the funding necessary to truly safeguard these essential natural resources.

Unfortunately, I can also tell you, from recent experience, about the tenuous nature of estuaries. Many of my constituents live near and fish from Long Island Sound. The Sound, until recently, was the third largest lobster fishery in the United States, behind Maine and Massachusetts. But the last two seasons have been a disaster for the Long Island Sound fishery. All of the lobsters in Long Island Sound have died. Lobster harvesters are finding their traps empty and their lives thrown into turmoil. The cause of this die-off is being studied and investigated, and it reinforces the need for greater protection of the nation's estuary habitats.

I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it.

BILL TO COMPENSATE POISONED NUCLEAR WORKERS

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing another bill dealing with the pressing matter of providing compensation and care for current and former nuclear-weapon workers made sick as a result of their on-job exposure to radiation, beryllium, and other dangers. Let me explain why I am doing so at this time.

Earlier this year, I joined in supporting the Whitfield amendment to the Defense Authorization bill for fiscal year 2001. That amendment, which was adopted by the House, clear-

ly stated that Congress needs to act this year to make good on the promise of a fairer deal for these people who helped America win the Cold War.

This is a very important matter for our country. It's particularly important for many Coloradans because our state is home to the Rocky Flats site, which for decades was a key part of the nuclear weapons complex. Now the site's old military mission has ended, and we are working hard to have Rocky Flats cleaned up and closed. But while we work to take care of the site, we need to work just as hard to take care of the people who worked there.

The people who worked at Rocky Flats and the other nuclear weapons sites were part of our country's defense just as much as those who wore the uniform of an armed service. They may not have been exposed to hostile fire, but they were exposed to radiation and beryllium and other very hazardous substances—and because of that some have developed serious illnesses while others will develop such illnesses in the future. Unfortunately, they haven't been eligible for veterans' benefits and have been excluded from other federal programs because they technically worked for DOE's contractors—and for far too long the government was not on their side. That has changed, I'm glad to say—the Department of Energy has reversed its decades-old policy of opposing workers claims.

I strongly supported that amendment because, as Len Ackland, writing in the Denver Post, has correctly said, "The shape of such legislation will determine whether or not this nation, through its political leadership, will finally accept responsibility for the physical harm to thousands of the 600,000 workers recruited to fight the cold war by producing nuclear weapons."

So I was encouraged when the House adopted that amendment and went on record as saying that now is the time for the Congress to accept that responsibility. Adoption of the amendment signaled that the House recognized this to be a matter of high priority and that it was important for Congress to pass legislation this year to create an efficient, uniform, and adequate system of compensation for these civilian veterans of the cold war.

But that amendment was only a very modest first step. Since its adoption, both the House and Senate have completed initial action on the defense authorization bill—and the bill as passed by the Senate includes a separate title, Title 35, that would set up a compensation system for these workers who played such a vital role in winning the Cold War. That title, and the other differences between the House and Senate versions of the defense authorization bill, are now being considered by a conference committee.

I am sure that this Senate-passed legislation could be further refined. But we are rapidly nearing the end of this Congress, and time is of the essence. That is why, along with more than 100 of our colleagues, I have strongly urged the House's conferees to agree to this part of the Senate bill. I remain convinced that having the Senate-passed legislation included in the conference report on the defense authorization bill would be the very best way to take the essential first step toward the vital goal of doing justice to these workers.

However, some questions have been raised about the details of that Senate-passed legislation—and, next week, there will be a Subcommittee hearing in the Judiciary Committee