

their families truly gain an appreciation for technology and the Internet, in the home, unfettered by the constraints of an institutional setting.

The legislation which we introduced this morning provides the incentives to bridge this gap and ignite the massive effort needed to make the information age a classless society. The legislation will induce private companies to donate computers, Internet access, software and technology training to schools, libraries, computer centers, and homes of poor families. In addition, the tax incentives will make it less costly for poor families to purchase computers.

Let me tell you what the legislation will do: first, the legislation will provide a refundable credit equal to 50 percent of the cost for computer purchases by families receiving the Earned Income Tax Credit, up to \$500. While the costs of computers and Internet access are dropping, the cost of a computer still remains a barrier for many low-income families and many working families. Returning half of the cost of the computer to these families, or, in some cases, all, if computers are less expensive, will help to lessen the financial toll. Just a little assistance can go a long way towards helping working families help themselves and provide a brighter future for their children.

Second, the legislation increases the charitable deduction for computer donations to the higher of the depreciated costs of the computer and the market price of the computer.

□ 1830

Many corporations have already stepped up to the plate and have offered their assistance in trying to bridge this digital divide. However, if we are truly to give every American access to technology, more has to be done and here government should play a role. As a result of this provision, computer manufacturers will have a greater incentive to donate unsold computers because they can deduct the full value of the computer.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, nonmanufacturers will also have a greater incentive to donate computer equipment even where the depreciated cost of the computer exceeds the market price of the computer. Under current law, it is more economical for many nonmanufacturers to throw away used computers than to donate them to charity because they can take a higher tax deduction for disposing of the computer than for donating it. That is clearly bad tax policy. Mr. Speaker, and thankfully this provision will change that result.

Third, the legislation will extend the special charitable deduction for computer donations through 2004 and expand it to include donations, not only to libraries and training centers, but also to nonprofits that provide computer technology to poor families.

The experience of Computers for Youth in New York City which to date

has delivered 103 fully-loaded Pentium computers to the homes of 7th and 8th graders in a South Bronx middle school highlights the need to extend these tax incentives to nonprofit organizations that are placing computers in the homes of poor families.

Computers for Youth has scratched the surface in this one place in New York. We need to encourage similar efforts by nonprofits across the country.

In conclusion, the President has placed priority on this issue and included \$2 billion of tax incentives in his budget. I applaud him for this effort. This legislation goes even further to bridge the digital divide by focusing itself not only on provisions outside the home, but to bring computers to every home of every poor family in America. I appreciate this chance to bring this legislation to the American people.

□

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KIND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BIGGERT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□

HONORING DONNIS H. THOMPSON ON 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to recognize the achievements of one of Hawaii's extraordinary women as we celebrate the 20th Anniversary of the National Women's History Project.

Dr. Donnis H. Thompson virtually founded women's collegiate athletics in Hawaii. She was one of the individuals who inspired my authorship of federal Title IX legislation by highlighting the inequities in funding of women's collegiate sports. During her 30 years at the University of Hawaii, Dr. Thompson pioneered numerous health and athletic programs. She served as Hawaii's first woman Superintendent of Education, was the first Women's Director of Athletics at the University of Hawaii, and authored the innovative "Vision of Excellence," a 10-year blueprint for public education. Dr. Thompson has been a state and national leader in promoting girls and women's participation in sports and in promoting civil rights.

Donnis Thompson is the recipient of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., National Outstanding Service Award, a member of the University of Hawaii Hall of Fame, and an Honor Fellow of the National Association of Girls and Women

in Sports. April 15, 1981 was proclaimed as "Donnis Thompson Day" in the State of Hawaii.

Donnis is a dear friend and one of the women whose opinion and advice I value most highly. Today I celebrate her life of achievement and the positive impact she has had on improving opportunity for women in Hawaii.

□

FAIRLY COMPENSATING OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to start my comments off tonight by reading a poem that I think reminds us of just how important the men and women in uniform are to this Nation.

And the poem is written by a Father Denis Edward O'Brien, the United States Marine Corps, and it says:

It is the soldier, not the reporter, who has given us freedom of the press.

It is the soldier, not the poet, who has given us freedom of speech.

It is the soldier, not the campus organizer, who has given us the freedom to demonstrate.

It is the soldier, who salutes the flag.

It is the soldier who serves beneath the flag. It is the soldier whose coffin is draped by the flag.

It is the soldier who allows the protester to burn the flag.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I read that poem is to remind the Members of Congress as well as the American people that we have many men and women in uniform who are willing to die for this country and to die for our freedoms. The reason I come to the floor once a week is to remind my colleagues in the Congress, both Republican and Democrat, that we have between 5,000 and 11,000 men and women in uniform on food stamps.

The reason I use that figure between 5,000 and 11,000, it depends on which agency we are talking about, but the way I look at this, if we have one, just one family in the military on food stamps, that is one too many. We have 60 percent of our men and women in uniform who are married who serve this Nation.

Our men and women are being deployed more than ever before. In fact, between 1982 and 1990, Army and Marine Corps operations, the number was 17 deployments. Between 1990 and today, our Army and Marine Corps have been deployed 149 times. We know that we have men and women in Bosnia. We have men and women in Kosovo. We have men and women in uniform all over this world.

My point in coming to the floor once a week is that I introduced, several months back, H.R. 1055 that has been signed by over 90 Members of Congress, both Democrat and Republican, that says that the men and women in uniform, if this bill should pass, would receive a \$500 tax credit, if they qualify for food stamps.

I am first to say that this would not get each and every one off, whether it be 5,000 or 11,000 on food stamps, but what it would say to those men and women in uniform, we care about you. And, yes, we need to do more. At this point, this is the best that we can do.

Mr. Speaker, I am first to say that, yes, it would be nice if we could raise the salaries of those in the military so no one would ever be on food stamps, but that is not possible. Who is to say that 2 or 3 years from now we might not have any extra money to give any increases to those in our military?

I bring this picture, this happens to be a Marine, it could be a member of the Air Force or the Army or the Navy, I bring this Marine to the floor of the House, because this Marine represents all married men and women in uniform.

You can see standing on his feet it happens to be his daughter Megan. In his arms, he is holding his daughter Bridgett. And I look at this photograph, and I see this little girl's look. Of course, she is looking at the camera. But I am thinking, this little girl does not know this, but possibly her daddy might not come back from deployment. Hopefully, he will.

But each and every time our men and women in uniform go overseas, no matter where it might be, there is always that possibility that they might not come back. So I want to say to my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, I want to thank those first who have signed the bill. Again, we are somewhere around 90 Members who have signed the bill.

I want to say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I think it is unacceptable. I think it is deplorable that any man or woman in uniform who is willing to die for this country should be in the need of WIC, the WIC program or food stamps.

I will be sending out a dear colleague letter this coming week, and I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will sign with me on this bill, H.R. 1055. It is only a modest step forward, but it is a step forward for those in uniform on food stamps.

□

STEM CELL RESEARCH HELPS US FURTHER UNDERSTAND CERTAIN MEDICAL CONDITIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY of New York) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week, there was a hearing before the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the Committee on Commerce concerning fetal tissue. Though the hearing was purported to be about alleged abuses involving fetal tissue for medical research, I believe it was an attempt by antichoice Members to try to stop lifesaving research involving fetal tissue and stem cells.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 414 in a bipartisan manner

with the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and many others to allow Federal funding of human pluripotent stem cell research to help us further understand Parkinson's Disease and other medical conditions.

I am asking for no specific amount of money nor to direct disease-specific research. I am only asking that Federal money be allowed to be used to utilize the next best chance science has to not only treat, but to cure debilitating and life-threatening illnesses that afflict millions of Americans.

Many people have been confusing human pluripotent stem cell research with human embryo research. Stem cells are not embryos. There is now a ban on the use of Federal funds for human embryo research in the United States. Stem cells cannot develop into a complete human being and therefore, under the law, they are not embryos. Stem cells are a type of cell that can be turned into almost any type of cell or tissue in the body. With further research, these cells can be used as replacement cells and tissues to treat many diseases, including Parkinson's Disease, Alzheimer's, Diabetes, AIDS, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and many others.

Stem cell research holds hope of one day being able to treat brain injury, spinal cord injury and stroke for which there is currently no treatment available. They may solve the problem of the body's reaction to foreign tissue, resulting in dramatic improvements in the treatment of a number of life-threatening conditions, such as burns and kidney failure, for which transplantation is currently used.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution, House Resolution 414, discusses Parkinson's Disease in particular for many reasons. My family has been personally affected by this devastating illness, and I am proud to serve as cochair of the congressional working group on Parkinson's Disease. However, it is science that makes the best argument to lead with this disease.

With all that is already known about Parkinson's Disease, it is believed that with Federal funds and stem cell research, it is very possible that Parkinson's Disease could not only be treatable, but curable within as little as 5 years.

Dr. Gerald Fischbach, the Director of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, said last year in the Senate, and I quote, "I concur that we are close to solving, and I mean the word 'solving,' Parkinson's Disease. I hesitate to put an actual year or number on it. I think with all the intensive effort, with a little bit of skill and luck, 5 to 10 years is not unrealistic. We will do everything possible to reduce that below 5 years. I would not rule that out."

Mr. Speaker, here is why that is possible. Parkinson's Disease is a progressive degenerative brain disease which kills a specialized and vital type of brain cell, a cell which produces the substance dopamine, that is essential

for normal development and balance. The loss of these dopamine-producing cells causes symptoms, including slowness and paucity of movement, tremors, stiffness and difficulty walking and balancing, which makes the sufferer unable to carry out the normal activities of daily living.

In 30 percent of the cases, those symptoms include dementia. As the disease progresses, it inflicts horrific physical, emotional, and financial burdens on the patient and family, requiring the care-giver to assist in the activities of daily living and may eventually lead to placement in a nursing home until death. With further research into stem cells, scientists will be able to reprogram the stem cells into the dopamine-producing cells which are lost in Parkinson's Disease.

Parkinson's Disease affects at least 1 million Americans. Fifty thousand are diagnosed each year, and for every one diagnosed, two who have Parkinson's Disease are not diagnosed. It is alarming to think that 2 million Americans with Parkinson's Disease are undiagnosed. Parkinson's Disease costs the Federal Government approximately \$10 billion in health care costs and, on an average, the cost per patient is 5,000 per year.

As a society, we spend \$15 billion a year on Parkinson's disease and that is only in direct costs for treatments that only bring temporary relief.

Building on the technology developed from research on Parkinson's disease makes treatments and even cures possible for many conditions. These include Alzheimer's, diabetes, AIDS, Lou Gehrig's, brain injury, spinal cord injury, stroke, and problems with the body's reaction to foreign tissue.

It may even provide for safer and more effective ways to test drugs without experimenting on humans and animals.

We cannot allow the opportunities afforded us by stem cell research to go untapped!

The National Institutes of Health has proposed guidelines to human stem cell research to address the legal and ethical issues surrounding this particular type of research.

It is being approached in a responsible way to utilize the technology while being sensitive to the ethical questions raised.

The National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC) even felt they could have gone further and is very supportive of allowing this type of research to continue with Federal funding.

The NBAC points out that Federally funding this research will allow Federal oversight to ensure this type of research continues ethically.

And finally, the American people support stem cell research as shown by a nationwide survey conducted by Opinion Research Corporation International last year that found that 74% of those polled favored funding of stem cell research by NIH.

Federal funds are crucial to allow scientists to proceed with stem cell research and to exploit fully this novel, innovative, and groundbreaking technology.

□

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the