

In 1981 voters choose him to be sheriff and they re-elected him four more times. During that period, the facilities for law enforcement in Greene County underwent major transformation and the approach to fighting crime got a new more pro-active philosophy. John embraced public participation in crime prevention and quickly had in place a county wide series of "neighborhood watch" districts. The new sheriff also stepped up regular patrols to curb burglaries, thefts and vandalism. He made citizens partners with sheriff's office in the fight against criminal activity.

Perhaps the most startling change guided by Sheriff Pierpont was in the Greene County jail. The old jail, built more than 40 years ago, housed a hundred inmates in 1981. Pierpont pushed for more facilities and new technology. The last of three major modernizations and additions were underway at the time of his retirement. The new jail will house five hundred inmates in the most secure environment available.

John's leadership has also won him praise among his peers. He was elected President of both the Missouri Sheriff's Association and the National Sheriff's Association.

John has been an active leader at home, in our state and for the nation. You would find him in the field working on major crimes, directing manhunts and making sure that investigators had the tools to be thorough and professional. It's been evident during his time in office, that John Pierpont has enjoyed being the Sheriff of Greene County. It is equally evident that John's leadership has provided the citizens of this county a higher level of safety, law enforcement competence and protection for the lives and property of the people he has served during his 20 years as sheriff.

I know that my colleagues from Missouri join me in thanking John Pierpont for his years of making our state a safer place to live and wishing him well as he leaves the Greene County Sheriff's office and opens a new chapter in his life.

IN MEMORY OF JUDGE EARL B.
GILLIAM

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to say a few words in the memory of one of the outstanding jurists of our nation who passed away on January 28, 2001, after a long illness. The Honorable Earl B. Gilliam served on the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, which includes the 50th Congressional District that I represent.

Judge Gilliam was born on August 17, 1931, in Clovis, New Mexico, and spent his early years in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. As a boy, he moved to San Diego, California with his family where he attended local primary and secondary schools before graduating from San Diego High School and later San Diego State University, with a business degree, in 1953.

Judge Gilliam's many years of distinguished service to the legal community began in 1957 when, having just graduated from Hastings College of Law, he was admitted to the California Bar and appointed Deputy District Attorney for the County of San Diego. In 1961, he

started his own general practice, and two years later Judge Gilliam was appointed to the Municipal Court, becoming the first African-American to sit on the San Diego bench. In 1971, Judge Gilliam became the Presiding Judge of the Municipal Court, and in 1975 he was elevated to the Superior Court by California Governor Jerry Brown. Five years later, President Jimmy Carter appointed him to serve on the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

In his long and distinguished career, Judge Gilliam presided over numerous noteworthy trials of regional and national importance. Whether these cases dealt with drug trafficking, fraud, tax evasion, bribery or civil matters, Judge Gilliam's fair and professional approach to the law laid the foundation for his solid reputation both within and outside the legal community.

In 1969, Western State School of Law in San Diego (presently known as Thomas Jefferson School of Law) recruited Judge Gilliam as an adjunct professor. With a background in business administration, economics, civil and criminal law, and trial practice, Judge Gilliam proved to be an inspirational and devoted instructor for the Contracts, Torts, Criminal Law, Trusts, Community Property and Trial Practice courses.

In civic activities, Judge Gilliam actively promoted the value of education for youth, for women, and for his fellow lawyers. He generously gave time and effort to his community in countless ways. He served on the boards of numerous civic, professional and charitable organizations, including the YMCA, the Urban League, the Salvation Army, Western State University and the University of California at San Diego.

The community in turn, has repeatedly acknowledged his contributions. He was named Young Man of the Year by the San Diego Junior Chamber of Commerce in 1965 and Golden Man of the Year in 1981. In 1982 he was honored twice—he was the recipient of the prestigious Trial Judge of the Year award by the San Diego Trial Lawyer's Association and San Diego's African American Lawyer's Organization honored him by changing its name to the Earl B. Gilliam Bar Association. Judge Gilliam was named Legal Professional of the Year in 1994 by the City Club and Chamber of Commerce and in 1995 he earned the Sharp Hospital Foundation's Eagle Spirit Award and the NAACP's Civil Rights Pioneer Award.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost not only one of our nation's great legal minds but a true friend who contributed so much to so many. He will be truly missed.

IN SUPPORT OF MIFEPRISTONE

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a pro-choice member of Congress who supports the recent FDA approved use of mifepristone, and I strongly oppose any efforts that would undermine the availability of mifepristone, also known as RU-486, to women who are seeking a safe method to terminate a pregnancy.

I recognize that there is misinformation out there on the use and access of this drug. But, the truth is mifepristone pills must be prescribed by a doctor, and the treatment is done under strict supervision of a medical professional. The first dose is taken at the doctor's office, and the second dose is taken 48 hours later. There are some doctors that allow women to take the second dose at home, but others require a clinic visit. It is also important to note that a woman can only take mifepristone up to 49 or 63 days from the date of her last menstrual period. This restriction is well within the laws of aborting a fetus in the first trimester.

Mifepristone has been laboriously studied and tested by FDA for 8 years. Nearly 10,000 American women have used this drug safely and effectively in clinical trials. Furthermore, Europeans have been using this drug for over 12 years.

Women in this country should have a choice to make decisions about their own fate. Abortion is legal, and women should be entitled to all medically proven safe options available, including mifepristone. Furthermore, I believe that women should be able to choose a less invasive procedure such as mifepristone rather than a surgical abortion.

Attempts to restrict a woman's access to this drug are not done to protect her safety, but rather to influence her choice. By allowing mifepristone to be prescribed by her own doctor, a woman can preserve her anonymity and be comfortable with her choice.

I have advocated for the approval of RU-486 for several years, in my past and current position. I truly believe that all women should have the right to make their own choices, and I hope that they will not be denied any safe and proven methods to make those decisions.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION STANDARDS ACT OF 2001

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my colleague from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, in introducing the Federal Election Standards Act of 2001.

Now that the dust has settled over the presidential election of 2000, I hope we will treat our recent experience as an opportunity to adopt long overdue reforms in the way we run our Federal elections. I hope we will enlist our best minds in the effort to develop better systems and procedures that will restore public confidence in the accuracy and integrity of the electoral process. And I hope we will provide State and local election officials with the wherewithal to take advantage of these improvements.

The Act seeks to advance these goals by establishing a bipartisan commission to study the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures and develop standards of best practice for the conduct of Federal elections. It further authorizes grants and technical assistance to States which wish to adopt measures consistent with the standards.

Title I of the Act establishes the National Advisory Commission of Federal Election

Standards (the “Commission”). Twelve of the 24 voting members of the Commission are appointed by Congress; the other 12 by leading State and local government associations. The Attorney General and the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission serve ex-officio as non-voting members.

In addition to ensuring a balance among Federal, State and local interests, the Act requires that the members of the Commission include equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats, and that larger and smaller states from all geographic regions be fairly represented.

The Commission will have three responsibilities which it must discharge within one year of its appointment. First, it will examine and report to the President, the Congress, and the State Secretaries of State regarding the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures in the several States.

Second, the Commission will develop a set of standards for the conduct of Federal elections and make recommendations with respect to the periodic review and updating of the standards. Among the issues to be addressed by the standards are (1) procedures for voter registration and maintenance of lists of registered voters; (2) ballot design, voting equipment, the methods employed in counting [and recounting] votes, and the procedures for challenging the results; (3) factors that affect access to and the efficient and orderly operation of polling places, including hours of voting (which may include standards for a uniform national poll closing time for presidential elections); number and accessibility of polling stations; training of poll workers; methods of reducing delay; and steps to ensure that all voters who report to the polls have an opportunity to cast their vote; and (4) procedures for mail-in and absentee voting (including deadlines for receipt of mail-in and absentee ballots).

Third, the Commission will make additional recommendations to Congress in regard to certain procedural aspects of Federal elections that are governed by Federal law (and would therefore require Congressional action to alter), such as whether Federal law should be amended to authorize Federal elections to be conducted (1) on dates other than those prescribed by current Federal law so as to permit weekend elections, voting on multiple days, or expanded early voting options; or (2) by means of the Internet.

Title II of the Act authorizes the FEC to provide matching grants and technical assistance to the States to improve the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures. The Federal share may not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of the program, project, or activity, although the FEC may waive this requirement in whole or in part where appropriate.

Grants may be used for programs, projects, and other activities whose purpose is to bring the conduct of Federal elections into conformity with the standards for Federal elections developed by the National Advisory Commission. Specifically, grants may be used to (1) hire employees or consultants to design and implement systems and procedures that meet the standards; (2) procure equipment, technology, and administrative and managerial support systems that meet the standards; (3) provide training or retraining to election officials, employees and volunteers in the proper use and maintenance of new systems and

procedures that meet the standards; (4) enhance public confidence and participation in the electoral process by increasing awareness of new systems and procedures that meet the standards; and (5) evaluate the effectiveness of new systems and procedures put in place through Federal assistance under the Act.

The Act would not mandate changes in State practices, nor would it federalize election procedures. Rather, it would encourage State election officials to upgrade and modernize their election systems by establishing benchmarks for the conduct of Federal elections and providing the States with the resources needed to meet them. In so doing, the Act gives maximum latitude to the states and localities in assessing their own needs and determining which solutions are most appropriate for their circumstances.

Recent announcements of collaborative ventures among academic researchers and technology companies have fueled expectations of a technological “fix” to our nation’s election problems. Such initiatives as the one launched this past December by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Caltech are a very promising development, and ought to be encouraged.

On the other hand, we must resist the temptation to look for attractively simple—and simplistic—solutions. The latest hi-tech equipment will be expensive, and the best technology in the world will make little difference if voters and election workers don’t know how to use it. Thus, while some jurisdictions may choose to acquire new technologies, others may feel their resources would be better spent on voter education and training of election workers.

I am hopeful that the Congress will take prompt action on this legislation, so that the most advanced nation on earth will have an electoral system that is second to none.

FEDERAL ELECTION STANDARDS ACT OF 2001

The Act establishes a bipartisan commission to study the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures and develop standards of best practice for the conduct of Federal elections. It further authorizes grants and technical assistance to States which wish to adopt measures consistent with the standards.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON FEDERAL ELECTION STANDARDS

Title I of the Act establishes the National Advisory Commission on Federal Election Standards (the “Commission”). Twelve of the 24 voting members of the Commission are appointed by Congress; the other 12 by State and local government associations. The Attorney General and the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission (the “FEC”), or their representatives, serve ex-officio as non-voting members of the Commission.

In addition to ensuring a balance among Federal, State and local interests, the Act requires that the members of the Commission include equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats, and that larger and smaller states from all geographic regions be fairly represented.

The Commission will have three responsibilities which it must discharge within one year of its appointment. First, it will examine and report to the President, the Congress, and the State Secretaries of State regarding the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures in the several States.

Second, the Commission will develop a set of standards for the conduct of Federal elec-

tions and make recommendations with respect to the periodic review and updating of the standards. Among the issues to be addressed by the standards are (1) procedures for voter registration and maintenance of lists of registered voters; (2) ballot design, voting equipment, the methods employed in counting [and recounting] votes, and the procedures for challenging the results; (3) factors that affect access to and the efficient and orderly operation of polling places, including hours of voting (which may include standards for a uniform national poll closing time for presidential elections); number and accessibility of polling stations; training of poll workers; methods of reducing delay; and steps to ensure that all voters who report to the polls have an opportunity to cast their vote; and (4) procedures for mail-in and absentee voting (including deadlines for receipt of mail-in and absentee ballots).

Third, the Commission will make additional recommendations to Congress in regard to certain procedural aspects of Federal elections that are governed by Federal law (and would therefore require Congressional action to alter), such as whether Federal law should be amended to authorize Federal elections to be conducted (1) on dates other than those prescribed by current Federal law so as to permit weekend elections, voting on multiple days, or expanded early voting options; or (2) by means of the Internet.

FEDERAL ELECTION STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

Title II of the Act authorizes the FEC to provide matching grants and technical assistance to the States to improve the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures. The Federal share may not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of the program, project, or activity, although the FEC may waive this requirement in whole or in part where appropriate.

Grants may be used for programs, projects and other activities whose purpose is to bring the conduct of Federal elections into conformity with the standards for Federal elections developed by the National Advisory Commission. Specifically, grants may be used to (1) hire employees or consultants to design and implement systems and procedures that meet the standards; (2) procure equipment, technology, and administrative and managerial support systems that meet the standards; (3) provide training or retraining to election officials, employees and volunteers in the proper use and maintenance of new systems and procedures that meet the standards; (4) enhance public confidence and participation in the electoral process by increasing awareness of new systems and procedures that meet the standards; and (5) evaluate the effectiveness of new systems and procedures put in place through Federal assistance under the Act.

CONGRATULATING GENE BESS,
COACH OF THREE RIVERS COMMUNITY COLLEGE MEN’S BASKETBALL, ON HIS 880TH WIN AND FOR BEING THE WINNINGEST COACH IN JUNIOR COLLEGE BASKETBALL

HON. JO ANN EMERSON
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, Vince Lombardi once said, “Leadership rests not only upon ability, not only upon capacity; having the capacity to lead is not enough. The