

The last two young women that I would like to celebrate today, Mr. Speaker, are Serina and Venus Williams, the winners of Wimbledon, Venus as the singles winner and Serina and Venus as the doubles winner.

What better role models could we have for young women throughout this country than to see these two fantastic young women who have been successful in the tennis arena?

I am very proud to be able to stand today, Mr. Speaker, to celebrate four strong African-American women.

□

#### IN HONOR OF OFFICER JOHN KELLY, STATEN ISLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, John Kelly was a young man, 31 years old, who grew up in the Oakwood section of Staten Island, attended high school there, was a parishioner at Lady Star of the Sea in Huguenot, had a wonderful wife, also a police officer with the New York City Police Department.

John, after graduating, fulfilled his desire like so many of his family members, his brothers Thomas, James and Daniel, as well as other family members, to go become a New York City police officer.

He did that for 8½ years. He had two beautiful children, a 2-year-old and a 9-month-old. He had his whole life ahead of him, until yesterday. This decorated New York City police officer was killed while he was doing his job protecting the people of New York City and specifically the people of Staten Island.

He is the third police officer to die in the last 3 years in Staten Island alone, adding to the list of hundreds of others who have given their life for their country and for the community.

So now a 2-year-old and a 9-month-old grow up without a father. Patricia, with our prayers, along with her family, will live on.

John's mother, Margaret, as well as his brothers Michael, Robert and Patrick, hopefully will find some comfort and solace from the other people of our community knowing that Officer John Kelly, a decorated officer with four commendations during his career, who went above and beyond the call of duty for the people he loved so much, the community he loved so much, as well as for the job he took so much pride in performing day in and day out. His partners and everyone who worked with him on Staten Island have nothing but praise for him.

I just thought it was appropriate that from time to time while others, like cats on mice, jump to disparage what good police officers do throughout our Nation, that we understand and pause for just a moment to remember that people like John Kelly, just 31 years old, gave his life for the very reason that he took the oath to be a New York City police officer.

So if anything comes out of this, I just would hope that the people of this Nation remember the Kelly family in their prayers. We wish, on behalf of the people of Staten Island, that they find some comfort in knowing that John Kelly died a hero.

□

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pallone) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

□

#### NUCLEAR FUEL RELIABILITY ACT OF 2000

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to inform the House that I am introducing a major piece of legislation which would make it possible for this Government to once again assume the ownership of the nuclear fuel production industry in this country. The act is entitled the Nuclear Fuel Reliability Act of 2000.

Why is this legislation necessary? I think it is important for this House to understand that approximately 2 years ago actions were taken that for the first time privatized the industry which is responsible for enriching uranium in this country.

What that means, in practical terms, is that the industry that is responsible for producing approximately 20 percent of all of the electricity that is generated in this country has been placed in private hands.

Now, that may not be so bad if the company that became the owner of this industry had acted responsibly and had kept faith with this Government once privatization had occurred.

One of the obligations placed upon the private company was to operate the two enrichment plants which exist in this country today, one in Paducah, Kentucky, and one in Piketon, Ohio, to operate those plants through the year 2004. Recently, the company has made the decision to close the Piketon, Ohio, plant in June of next year.

Who has benefited from privatization, Mr. Speaker? I think the only ones who have benefited from privatization are those select few individuals who oversaw the privatization process and have enriched themselves. And I am speaking specifically of the CEO of that private corporation, Mr. Nick Timbers.

As I have said before, as a Government employee, his salary was approximately \$350,000, which is a respectable income. He was given permission to oversee privatization, to make recommendations, to advocate; and he did those things and he did so in a way that enriched himself.

As the CEO of the now private corporation, his salary is somewhere in

the vicinity of \$2.48 million; and he has a golden parachute of \$3.6 million.

What has been the result? Who has benefited other than Mr. Timbers and a select few of Wall Streeters? Well, I will tell my colleagues who has not benefited. Have the investors benefited? Absolutely not.

At the point of privatization, the stock of the company was worth approximately \$14.50 a share. It is now hovering around \$4 a share. So the investors have not benefited.

Has the Government benefited? Absolutely not. We find ourselves, as a government, facing a situation where we may become dependent on foreign sources for up to 23 percent of all of the electricity that is generated in this country.

Have the communities where these plants are located benefited? Absolutely not. My community is being absolutely annihilated as workers who have spent 25 and 30 years of their lives working in the service of this country are being summarily discharged and dismissed.

I am terribly troubled by the actions of this corporation. I am terribly troubled as a result of the process that led to privatization. I think it was a process that was corrupted, it was a process that enabled individuals to benefit themselves, to enrich themselves personally at great expense to the well-being of this Nation and to our local communities and to the investors.

□ 1845

That is why I have asked for an investigation of these matters. That is why I look forward this fall to the Commerce Committee's hearings into these matters, because I think they will bring many things to light that the American people need and deserve to know.

And so as I introduce my bill this evening, it is my hope that multiple Members of this House will see fit to join me in supporting this legislation. It is the right thing to do for our country.

□

#### VICTIM OF "DRIVE-BY" POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was talking to a gentleman from Common Cause. I had called him in regard to a statement that they sent out asking all Congressmen to sign the statement. One of the points on the statement that they were asking us to sign on to was a commitment to vote for any ban on soft money, banning all soft money going to political organizations coming from corporations, coming from unions, coming from wealthy individuals.

We got to talking about this. I had called them and asked them to give me their thoughts on this because, of

course, this kind of thing happens often, the kind of thing that they are trying to deal with; and they explained that for a long time there had been a relatively effective ban on the kind of money coming into politics that has a corrupting influence. They use the words "corrupting influence." It started with the Teddy Roosevelt era. But that interestingly in 1992, the Clinton campaign found a way around it and found a way that they could use soft money in the creation of ads attacking their opponents but doing so sort of in a way that separated them from the ad itself. They could set up these dummy little organizations and run ads that were not part of the campaign, and they could use soft money to fund it. So all of a sudden they found this loophole. Now everybody is doing it, essentially. Once they found out how to do it, both parties use it and certainly many, many organizations use it.

Members know the kind of ad that I am talking about. Many people have seen these ads run, where the group comes on, they usually have some name you have never heard of and they will say something like, gee whiz, isn't it horrible that certain Congressmen would do X, Y or Z. Why don't you call them and ask them why they did such a terrible thing.

Now, Common Cause says that this kind of thing has a corrupting influence on the system, and that is why they would like to try to stop it. They want to try to stop these thinly veiled partisan attacks called issue ads if they could. At least they want to stop the funding that goes into them. They say, as I said, that there is a corrupting influence on the system as a result of it.

I would like to give Members a real-life experience that will point out how corrupt organizations can, in fact, help corrupt the system by making Americans even more cynical. I refer back to a situation that occurred on the floor of this House during the debate on the VA-HUD appropriations act.

There was an amendment to that act offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY). The amendment struck certain language in the original bill, actually committee language. The committee language was not mandatory. The committee language simply was urging EPA to do or not do two things, two or three things. It had no force beyond just saying we urge the EPA. It did not take any money away from the EPA if they did it. It was a sense of the committee that they should not do whatever they were planning on doing.

In this case they were saying, please don't force water companies throughout the United States to go through the expense of trying to find a standard, a purer standard for water, especially with the elimination of arsenic from the water, until you set the standard. Tell us what the standard will be. Then of course these companies can try to meet it. But if you do not

set the standard right away, you will have companies spending all the money getting to a certain point, and that point might not be the one that you eventually determine to be correct. So set the standard. And, by the way, you are suggesting that the standard be 5 parts per billion, EPA, and that makes absolutely no sense; there is no scientific evidence to support that that is the kind of standard we should have, so please look at that.

It also said, by the way, we should not dredge the Hudson River, as you are planning on doing, because when you dredge, the committee said, you stir up the sediments and in fact you put a lot of carcinogenic material into the water supply. So we strongly urge you not to do that.

That was the committee language. The amendment that came to this floor struck that. It would have essentially said, go ahead to the EPA, set the standard at 5, or at least wait as long as you want to do it and go ahead and dredge. So a vote against that amendment was a vote essentially, especially when you talk about sediments, it was certainly a vote for clean water.

I think, by the way, 216 Members of this House voted against the amendment and prevailed. They were in the majority. I was one that voted against the amendment. Shortly thereafter, the Sierra Club began to run ads in my district against me, essentially saying that I was for dirty water. This is the kind of corrupting influence, saying something like that which is, by the way, libelous. It is not just wrong, it is libelous. But they did it, and this is the kind of thing that Common Cause is talking about, and this is the kind of thing that should be stopped.

□

#### QUESTIONS REGARDING REPUBLICAN TAX BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues facing Congress this year is how we should address the use of the surplus, the projected surplus this year and in the years ahead. The purpose of tonight's special order is to address three questions regarding the Republican tax bills proposed as a response to the projected or possible surplus.

The first question we want to address is, are the Republican tax bills fiscally responsible? The second question we want to address is, are the Republican tax cuts proposed in the House this year fair to average working families? The third question we want to address is, what major national priorities if any do the proposed and House-passed Republican tax cuts crowd out, other high national priorities?

Mr. Speaker, let me say that over the last several months, I have heard a lot

of speeches about values. It is good that we discuss values. Values are an important part of who we are as an American Nation and as American individuals and families. But I would suggest that as Members of the House, how we vote on the question of spending the people's money says more about our values as Members of Congress than all the political speeches in the world.

Let us go back to the first question we want to address this evening. Are the Republican tax bills fiscally responsible? I would suggest the answer to that question is no. First, let us look at the cost of those tax cuts that have passed the House. Because of the strategy of divvying up the pieces of the pie, a lot of Americans and Members of Congress have not really put together those pieces to figure out what the true total cost is of just the tax cuts proposed and passed in the House this very year alone. The answer to that question is those total \$573 billion over 10 years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we include the additional interest cost as a result of those tax cuts, the House has already passed a series of tax cuts that almost total the total amount of the massive tax cut passed in the House last year that the American people rejected overwhelmingly as being irresponsible at a time when Americans felt we should pay down the national debt.

Let me make several key points about the question of fiscal responsibility. Some say that we ought to pass these massive tax cuts because this is the people's money and they have earned it, they are paying it, they should get it back. I would agree with that point. There is some credence to that point except for one clear, undebatable fact, the fact that we have a \$5.6 trillion national debt. That is not just some sort of vague number that most of us cannot relate to because, in fact, the average family in America pays about \$1,000 per man, woman and child in interest payments on that national debt. That interest payment, paid for by our taxes, does not educate one college student, it does not help train one Army soldier, it just is paying off the interest on past national debt.

So I would suggest it is fiscally irresponsible most clearly to pass these massive tax cuts based on projected future possible surpluses because we ought to be paying down the \$5.6 trillion national debt that is soaking away money from taxpayers and other high national priorities.

The second point about fiscal responsibility I want to make is this: all of these projections, including the most recent Congressional Budget Office projections, are just that. They are projections. I often hear from my colleagues, and I think it is good advice, we ought to run the government like a business. We do not often do that. I would suggest that if a business in any district in this country were to say, we