

Stanton Englehart has long been recognized as one of the most prominent painters of the Southwest. He carries the honor of Professor Emeritus of Fine Art at Fort Lewis College, and his popularity and enthusiasm has brought him international recognition. He says, "I hope my paintings express some of the beauty and mystery of the earth and the sky above it. . . . The paintings are most about energy and its power as a creative force in all things."

Stanton selflessly shares that energy with just about anyone who asks him. Charlie Langdon of The Durango Herald, says that when asked by an audience member at a lecture if he would be willing to exhibit in more Colorado arts centers, he answered, "Just call me, and tell me how much wall space you have. I'll pack a show for you and truck it to your door." Incredibly, Stanton turns out "about a hundred paintings a year. Many of them are enormous." All told, he has created more than 1200 paintings, some 21 feet wide. To ensure that those without the funds to enjoy his art can do so, he donates many paintings to public institutions.

Stanton has made a huge impact in Colorado art, and has brought international attention to the glorious landscapes of Colorado. He works with the art community to act as a model for the young and the old, for the artistic and the admirer. Mr. Speaker, I ask to thank Stanton Englehart on behalf of Congress for his ongoing contributions to this important creative aspect of Colorado. He deserves our congratulations.

TRIBUTE TO MELANIE STOKES

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 2001

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Melanie Stokes and all women who have suffered in silence from postpartum depression and psychosis with the introduction of the Melanie Stokes Postpartum Depression Research and Care Act.

Chicago native, Melanie Stokes was a successful pharmaceutical sales manager and loving wife of Dr. Sam Stokes. However, for Melanie, no title was more important than that of mother. Melanie believed motherhood was her life mission and fiercely wanted a daughter of her own. This dream came true on February 23, 2001 with the birth of her daughter, Sommer Skyy. Unfortunately, with the birth of her daughter, Melanie entered into a battle for her life with a devastating mood disorder known as postpartum psychosis. Despite a valiant fight against postpartum psychosis, which included being hospitalized a total of three times, Melanie jumped to her death from a 12-story window ledge on June 11, 2001.

Melanie was not alone in her pain and depression. Each year over 400,000 women suffer from postpartum mood changes. Nearly 80 percent of new mothers experience a common form of depression after delivery, known as "baby blues." The temporary symptoms of "baby blues" include mood swings, feelings of being overwhelmed, tearfulness, and irritability, poor sleep and a sense of vulnerability. However, a more prolonged and pronounced mood disorder known as postpartum depres-

sion affects 10 to 20 percent of women during or after giving birth. Even more extreme and rare, postpartum psychosis, whose symptoms include hallucinations, hearing voices, paranoia, severe insomnia, extreme anxiety and depression, strikes 1 in 1,000 new mothers.

Postpartum depression and psychosis afflict new mothers indiscriminately. Many of its victims are unaware of their condition. This phenomena is due to the inability of many women to self-diagnose their condition and society's general lack of knowledge about postpartum depression and psychosis and the stigma surrounding depression and mental illness. Untreated, postpartum depression can lead to self-destructive behavior and even suicide, as was the case with Melanie. As was seen recently in the case of Andrea Yates of Houston, Texas who drowned her five children, postpartum depression and psychosis can also have a dire impact on one's family and society in general.

In remembrance of Melanie Stokes and all the women who have suffered from postpartum depression and psychosis, as well as their families and friend who have stood by their side, I am introducing the Melanie Stokes Postpartum Depression Research and Care Act which will:

Expand and intensify research at the National Institute of Health and National Institute of Mental Health with respect to postpartum depression and psychosis, including increased discovery of treatments, diagnostic tools and educational materials for providers;

Provide grants for the delivery of essential services to individuals with postpartum depression and psychosis and their families, including enhanced outpatient and home-based health care, inpatient care and support services.

It is my hope that through this legislation we can ensure that the birth of a child is a wonderful time for the new mother and family, and not a time of mourning over the loss of yet another mother or child.

INSULAR AREAS OVERSIGHT AVOIDANCE ACT

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 2001

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to reintroduce the Insular Areas Oversight Avoidance Act, legislation I previously introduced during the 106th Congress.

This legislation, which is cosponsored by Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTIAN-CHRISTENSEN from the Virgin Islands and Resident Commissioner ANÍBAL ACEVEDO-AVILA of Puerto Rico, seeks to hold the federal government more accountable in the manner that federal policy is developed towards the insular areas, which include Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. The bill would require that the Office of Management and Budget explain any omission of any insular area from treatment as part of the United States in any policy statement issued by the Office of Management and Budget on federal initiatives or legislation.

The impetus for the bill is to improve federal-territorial relations and to encourage

greater use of government resources in a more cost-efficient manner. Given our geographical distance from Washington, D.C., and our political status as territories, it is very difficult for insular area officials to sometimes be heard at the federal level. We face repeated challenges in ensuring that the insular areas are not forgotten in federal initiatives and policies on a daily basis, whether it be international treaties, Presidential Executive Orders, proposed legislation by the Executive Branch or Congressional Members, or federal regulations.

It is my belief that the U.S. insular areas should be considered at the outset of the development of federal policies, including Presidential initiatives. I believe that such consideration would be a more effective way of ensuring that all Americans—in the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and the insular areas—are treated fairly.

The failure of the federal government to contemplate the impact of the insular areas in federal initiatives often results in the need for insular area governments to expend an exorbitant amount of resources and energy to either rectify the "oversight" through legislation or through extensive and sometimes futile negotiations with federal agency officials.

An example of such a situation is the way in which U.S. Treasury Department officials negotiate international tax treaties. There are around 75 international tax treaties that the U.S. has negotiated with other countries. The treaties govern the bi-lateral relationships the U.S. has with other countries on tax matters, including foreign investment withholding rates.

In its definition of the term "United States", there are several definitions used by U.S. negotiators. The most commonly employed definition explicitly excludes Guam and the other insular areas by name. Another definition explicitly includes the 50 states and the District of Columbia as comprising the "United States."

Currently, the Congress is considering legislation I introduced, H.R. 309, the Guam Foreign Investment Equity Act, which is trying to rectify Guam's exclusion in these international tax treaties. H.R. 309 provides the Government of Guam with the authority to tax foreign investors at the same rates as states under U.S. tax treaties. The bill passed the House on May 1, and is awaiting Senate consideration.

I would not have to be pushing for the Guam Foreign Investment Equity Act if the federal government had contemplated its impact on the insular areas, including Guam, when the current U.S. tax treaties with other countries were negotiated.

To understand why this "oversight" is detrimental to Guam and the federal government, let me give you an overview of how this action has stymied economic development on Guam. Currently, under the U.S. Internal Revenue Code, there is a 30% withholding tax rate for foreign investors in the United States. Since Guam's tax law "mirrors" the rate established under the U.S. Code, the standard rate for foreign investors in Guam is 30% since Guam is not included in the definition of "United States" for international tax treaties. As an example, with Japan, the U.S. withholding rate for foreign investors is 10%. That means while Japanese investors are taxed at a 10% withholding tax rate on their investments in the fifty states, those same investors are taxed at

a 30% withholding rate on Guam. As 75% of Guam's commercial development is funded by foreign investors, such an omission has deprived Guam of attracting foreign investment opportunities.

Other territories under U.S. jurisdiction have already remedied this problem or are able to offer alternative tax benefits to foreign investors through delinkage, their unique covenant agreements with the federal government, or through federal statute. Guam, therefore, is the only state or territory in the United States which is unable to provide this tax benefit or to offer alternative tax benefits for foreign investors.

The Insular Areas Oversight Avoidance Act would be helpful to insular area governments and the federal government by requiring that situations like the U.S. negotiations on international tax treaties are for the good of all U.S. jurisdictions in the country, not just the fifty states. I understand that the U.S. government is currently renegotiating with Japan on the tax treaty between our two countries. While I hope that Guam is not excluded from being part of this treaty, the record of U.S. negotiators on previous tax treaties does not provide me with any level of comfort. This is a perfect example of why the bill I have introduced today is needed.

KLAMATH BASIN GOVERNMENT-CAUSED DISASTER COMPENSATION ACT

HON. WALLY HERGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 2001

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, principles of fairness and justice demand that the Government not force some people to bear burdens, which should rightfully be borne by the public as a whole. However, that is precisely what is happening in the Klamath Basin in northern California and southern Oregon because of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), and today I rise, joined by my Oregon colleague, Congressman GREG WALDEN, to introduce legislation to address that.

The ESA has strayed far from its original mission. It was never intended to sacrifice human health and safety and economic well-being. Yet, the fact remains that under the guise of species protection, constitutionally-protected property rights are being trampled, local economies are being destroyed, families are being forced into bankruptcy and, in many cases, human health and safety are being jeopardized. There is little consideration given to the human species under the ESA. Once a species is "listed," its needs must come first—before the rights and livelihoods of American people. As it is currently being implemented, the ESA requires species protections at any and all costs.

Regrettably, rural Western communities are disproportionately bearing the burdens and costs associated with species protection, burdens which should rightfully be borne by the American public as a whole. The zero-water decision that was recently handed down in the Klamath Basin is the "poster child" for precisely these kinds of injustices. Farmers in this rural area were told on April 6, 2001 that there would be no Klamath Project water for agri-

culture this year, because, in the opinion of a few government biologists, it was needed to protect two species of fish that may or may not be endangered.

The decision does not come without significant social and economic impacts. The Klamath Project supports approximately 1,500 hundred small family farmers and ranching operations and scores of related businesses. This agricultural area generates in excess of \$250 million in economic activity annually. The annual value of crops produced is estimated at more than \$110 million. All of this human activity has come to a grinding halt because of an ESA mandated decision that is based only on speculation and guesswork. Preliminary estimates place total economic damage in the neighborhood of \$220 million. Regrettably, all of the costs and economic hardships associated with this decision will be borne solely by the people who live and work in the Klamath Basin, many of them veterans of World War II who were promised a permanent supply of water and land, and their sons and daughters.

It is important to note that this is not simply a Klamath Basin problem. Nor is it a new problem, or one that is specific to the agriculture industry in general, or to federal project irrigators in particular. Small businesses throughout the Sierra Nevada mountains in California face potentially debilitating economic losses because of forest management restrictions associated with extremely dubious concerns about the status of the California Spotted Owl. Water users throughout California have faced extreme hardship as the government has exercised what amounts to federal takings by reducing contractual water deliveries to a mere percentage of their contract amounts because of pumping or other water use restrictions driven by the ESA. A rural area in my northern California Congressional District has incurred millions of dollars in extra costs on critically important infrastructure improvement projects because of ESA-mandated mitigation. In this same area a much-needed high school continues to be delayed at taxpayer expense because of the ESA. There are many examples, but the fact remains that people are suffering economically because of the implementation of the ESA.

These requirements and restrictions are, simply, an unfunded federal mandate. The federal government should not force some to bear the costs, but should bear the burden itself, or, if it cannot pay or is not willing to pay, then it should avoid the action altogether. Or, it must find some middle ground. That is simple accountability.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation—the "Klamath Basin Government-Caused Disaster Compensation Act." It requires the Secretary of the Interior to fully compensate the individuals of the Basin who have been economically harmed as a result of the restrictions that have been placed on the operations of the Klamath Project. Such Payments would come from within the Department of Interior's budget. This legislation sends a resounding message to Washington that if the federal government is going to force this kind of social and economic harm on rural American through its laws, it will be held accountable. And if it rebukes those costs as unacceptable, then it will face the question of whether this kind of species protection—recklessly imposing requirements that may or may not benefit species, but that will certainly

carry significant costs to real people—is a goal all Americans truly want, and if so, whether they're willing and prepared to share the impacts.

Ultimately, the ESA itself must be modernized if we are to ensure that people and communities come first. However, real people have been significantly harmed as the direct result of the federal government's actions in the Klamath Basin, and while the long-term social and other hidden impacts from this decision can never be fully mended, fairness and justice demand that the federal government step in to rectify the economic harm that it has caused.

TRIBUTE TO McNEIL FAMILY FOR 2001 NATIONAL WETLANDS AWARD

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to a couple that has taken extensive efforts to promote land stewardship, wetlands conservation, research and education in the Monte Vista area of Colorado. Mike and Cathy McNeil have truly exemplified the ideals honored with the 2001 National Wetlands Award of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Environmental Law Institute and I would like to add my thank you and appreciation to their labors.

Nestled on the edge of Rock Creek just south of Monte Vista and neighbored by the Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge, the McNeil ranch persists as a fourth-generation operation. Understanding the importance of responsible development and the intersection with environmental preservation, the McNeils launched the Rock Creek Heritage Project—an effort which protected nearly 15,000 acres of farm and ranch land in the Rock Creek Watershed. This collaborative effort, involving 27 landowners, accentuates 5 aspects including land protection, watershed enhancement, training in holistic management, community building and support for value-added marketing of agricultural products. Extending beyond land matters, the McNeils have adopted innovative calving patterns to provide their 800 mother cows warmer birthing periods during June and July rather than throughout the cooler winter months utilized by most ranchers in the area. In all of these endeavors the McNeils have exhibited innovation, excellence and outstanding effort.

Mr. Speaker, Mike and Cathy have been united in matrimony for 20 years and have the blessing of their daughter Kelly who is 14 years of age. The teachings of her parents are allowing Cathy to value and preserve the heritage from which she comes. Through the extraordinary contributions of the McNeils, wetland protection and land stewardship has been heralded and an example has been established for others to follow in order obtain ecological health while not compromising agricultural profitability. The National Wetlands Award will be one of many awards that the McNeils have garnered from their hard work—alongside the distinct recognition of being the Colorado Association of Soil Conservation District's Conservationists of the Year in 1999