

DOUBLING THE BUDGET OF THE
NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE**HON. PATSY T. MINK**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill that would double the budget of the National Eye Institute (NEI) within three years.

Blinding eye and vision disorders pose a tremendous challenge to our health care system. The numbers are staggering. By the year 2030, 66 million Americans will be at risk for blinding-eye disorders. Cataracts affects 29 percent of Americans between the ages of 65–74. Glaucoma, the leading cause of blindness in African Americans, affects three million Americans. Age-related macular degeneration (AMD), a disease which alters central vision, affects an estimated 1.7 million Americans.

Since its establishment in 1968, NEI has conducted and supported research that helps prevent and treat eye diseases. A few of its research achievements include: New medical therapies to treat glaucoma; introducing drugs to treat uveitis, a potentially blinding inflammation of the inside of the eye; and contributing to the development of medical lasers to treat patients with glaucoma, AMD, and other eye disorders.

The National Eye Institute has many exciting research projects on the horizon. They cannot complete those projects without adequate funding. In FY 2000, NEI's funding was \$452,706,000. This year, NEI is funded at \$510,611,000. By FY 2004, we should commit \$791,714,000 to the NEI budget.

We have an obligation to make our commitment to eye and vision research at the NEI as strong as our commitment to the biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health.

I urge my colleagues to support increasing the research efforts at the National Eye Institute by cosponsoring this legislation.

CARR, O'KEEFE, KAHLO: PLACES
OF THEIR OWN**HON. TOM UDALL**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and announce that an exhibition entitled "Carr, O'Keefe, Kahlo: Places of Their Own" has been organized by Dr. Sharyn Udall of my home town, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Each artist in this exhibition represents one of the three great countries of North America: Canada, the United States and Mexico.

This exhibition, therefore, celebrates the cultural bond of the North American continent which transcends national borders. We may well find that this cultural bond will also prove to be a benefit to our mutual economic interests.

In the Congress, we often talk about the need for opening our borders for trade, commerce, importation and exportation. Rarely do we reflect on the need for the international exchange of art. This exhibition gives us an opportunity to do so.

This exhibition also celebrates the contribution of women to the arts. Each of the three artists, Emily Carr of Canada, Georgia O'Keefe of the United States, and Frida Kahlo of Mexico, became one of her country's pre-eminent twentieth century painters. Each is recognized as a legend. Viewed together, their work takes us beyond all borders and the only passport needed is the eyes and the heart.

"Carr, O'Keefe, Kahlo: Places of Their Own" can be seen in Toronto, Canada, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico and, a year from now, at the National Museum of Women in the Arts in Washington DC. It is a tribute to these artists and to the spirit of cultural cooperation in North America.

RECOGNIZING JOHN CUSEY

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bid farewell to my Legislative Director, John Cusey.

I first met John in March of 1996. Immediately, I was struck by his keen sense of political intuitiveness. Although he had only worked on a few local campaigns, I could tell that his future in government would be bright.

As an employee, John has excelled in many areas. As a result, he rose quickly through the ranks of legislative positions, and for the next week, he will continue to serve as my Legislative Director. John has staffed numerous bills in the California State Legislature and here in Congress. His assistance in the area of unsolicited e-mail, commonly known as Spam, has been crucial, and led to the passage of California's first law to protect e-mail users.

John has also served as my Spokesman and Communications Director. His outstanding communication skills were especially important during my bid for U.S. Congress. On every occasion, he greeted challenging questions with honesty and tact.

Over the last five years, I have come to consider John's family as my friends. His wife, Becky, has tolerated the long hours that legislative and campaign work often entail. Moreover, I have seen John grow as a father, welcoming two healthy, beautiful children, Ethan and Ava, into his life.

Next week, John will be leaving my office to become the Director of the House Pro-Life Caucus. While I wish him the best of luck in this new endeavor, it is with much sadness. John's absence will create both a professional and personal void in my office.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this 107th Congress to join me in recognizing and thanking John Cusey for his hard work and dedication to serving the constituents of California's 41st District and wishing him the best of luck as the Director of the House Pro-Life Caucus.

PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY DONOR
IDENTITY DISCLOSURE**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced legislation that would require organizers

of presidential libraries to disclose the identity of donors and the amounts they give.

I introduced this legislation in the 106th Congress as well because I felt the public should be made aware of possible conflicts of interest that sitting presidents can have while raising funds for their libraries.

Mr. Speaker, we do not know who these donors are or what interests they may have on any pending policy decisions that are to be made. I think that our government needs to operate in the open—not behind closed doors.

Recent news reports surrounding the pardon of billionaire fugitive Marc Rich have brought to light additional justification for this legislation. The Washington Post recently reported that Denise Rich, the former wife of financier Marc Rich, lobbied President Clinton to pardon her former husband by donating \$450,000 to Clinton's presidential library fund starting in 1998.

The Post also reported that, "Clinton foundation attorney David Kendall said he would fight a subpoena for the library donor list." Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of one good reason why the organizers of any future presidential libraries would not be willing to release this information to the public. Even Richard Cohen, the very liberal columnist for the Washington Post said, "But surely it would be anything from interesting to illustrative to just plain damning to see what names are on that list and for what amounts."

Our citizens have the right to know the details of these fundraising activities. The bill I have introduced will ensure this happens. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important foreign policy and defense issues the 107th Congress will consider is National Missile Defense. Our nation is indeed vulnerable to ballistic missile attack, and it is imperative that we take steps to protect ourselves from this threat.

As we address this threat, however, it is critical that we adopt a cautious and comprehensive approach. In an article in today's Washington Post, our former National Security Advisor, the Honorable Samuel R. Berger, makes a compelling case for such an approach. As he asserts, we must be careful not to overlook the danger of attack by less conventional means, such as a terrorist strike or a weapon of mass destruction smuggled across our borders. We must also be careful not to undermine our defensive alliances, such as NATO, or needlessly provoke a new arms race with our former Cold War adversaries. As we move forward on these important issues, Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we not allow ourselves as a nation to be lulled into a false sense of security or let our guard down in other areas of our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the entire text of the insightful article by Mr. Berger entitled "Is This Shield Necessary?" be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I urge my colleagues to review this article and to join me in engaging

all aspects of the National Missile Defense debate in the coming months to ensure that whatever course we choose truly strengthen our national security and advance our national interests.

IS THIS SHIELD NECESSARY?

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 2001]

(Samuel R. Berger)

In the first weeks of the Bush administration, national missile defense has risen to the top of the national security agenda. Having wrestled with this issue over the last years of the Clinton administration, I believe it would be a mistake to proceed pell-mell with missile defense deployment as though all legitimate questions about the system had been answered. They have not.

While the United States maintains strength unmatched in the world, the vulnerability of the American people to attack here at home by weapons of mass destruction is greater than ever. Dealing with our vulnerability to chemical, biological and nuclear weapons requires an ambitious, robust, comprehensive strategy.

But 20 years and tens of billions of dollars later, national missile defense is still a question-ridden response to the least likely of the threats posed by these weapons: a long-range ballistic missile launched by an outlaw nation.

President Clinton last year decided to continue research and development of national missile defense, but deferred a decision on deployment. In part, this was based on a judgment that we do not yet know whether it will work reliably. The Bush administration should reject arbitrary deadlines and, as part of Secretary Rumsfeld's laudable defense review, take a fresh look at the overall threat we face.

Without question we need to broaden America's defenses against weapons of mass destruction. But plunging ahead with missile defense deployment before critical questions are answered is looking through the telescope from the wrong end: from the perspective of bureaucratically driven technology rather than that of the greatest vulnerabilities of the American people.

President Reagan's global shield (SDI) has evolved into a more limited system aimed at defeating long-range missiles launched not by a major nuclear rival but by an irrational leader of a hostile nation, particularly North Korea, Iraq or Iran. Its premise is that an aggressive tyrant such as Saddam Hussein is less likely to be deterred than were the leaders of the Soviet Union by the prospect that an attack on us or our friends would provoke devastating retaliation.

It is further suggested that lack of a defense could intimidate U.S. leadership: We might have hesitated to liberate Kuwait if we knew Saddam could have delivered a chemical, biological or nuclear weapon to the United States with a long-range ballistic missile.

But why do we believe Saddam or his malevolent counterparts would be less susceptible to deterrence than Stalin or his successors? Indeed, dictators such as Saddam tend to stay in power so long because of their obsession with self-protection. And is it likely we would not use every means at our disposal to respond to a vital threat to our economic lifeline, even if it meant preemptively taking out any long-range missiles the other side might have?

The fact is that a far greater threat to the American people is the delivery of weapons of mass destruction by means far less sophisticated than an ICBM: a ship, plane or suitcase. The tragedies of the USS Cole and sarin gas in the Tokyo subway show that lethal power does not need to ride on a long-range missile.

We know that we increasingly are the target of a widespread network of anti-American terrorists. We know they are seeking to obtain weapons of mass destruction. If deterrence arguably doesn't work against hostile nations, it is even less so for fanatical terrorists with no clear home address.

The real issue is what is the most cost-effective way to spend an additional 100 billion or more defense dollars to protect this country from the greatest WMD threats. In that broader context, is national missile defense our first priority?

Is it wiser to continue research and development and explore alternative technologies while we invest in substantially intensifying the broad-scale, long-term effort against terrorist enemies? (Such an effort would include increased intelligence resources, heightened border security, even training of local police and public health officials to recognize a deadly biological agent.)

The ultimate question is whether Americans will be more secure with or without a national missile defense. The answer is not self-evident. We can't build the system that is farthest along in development—a land-based one—without cooperation from our allies.

Their misgivings derive in significant part from the prospect of abrogating the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with Russia; that could unravel the global arms control and nonproliferation system.

It has been suggested that we could address Europeans' concerns by including them in our missile defense system or helping them build their own. But such an amalgamation would be more capable against Russia and thus more likely to stiffen its resistance to change in the ABM; it could also increase the chance Russia would respond in ways that would reduce strategic stability—for example by retaining multiple-warhead ICBMs it has agreed to eliminate.

Of course no other country can ever have a veto over decisions we must take to protect our national security. But in making that judgment, we must understand that the basic logic of the ABM has not been repealed—that if either side has a defensive system the other believes can neutralize its offensive capabilities, mutual deterrence is undermined and the world is a less safe place.

Then there is China. It is suggested that we can work this out with China by at least implicitly giving it a "green light" to build up its ICBM arsenal to levels that would not be threatened by our national missile defense.

This strategy fails to take into account the dynamic it could unleash in Asia: Would China's missile buildup stimulate advocates of nuclear weapons in Japan? How would India view this "separate peace" between the United States and China? What effect would that have on Pakistan and the Koreans?

Will we be more secure as Americans with a missile defense system or less secure? It is not a question that answers itself. But it is a question that requires answers.

JERUSALEM EMBASSY RELOCATION ACT OF 1995

HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to relocating the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem. In

1995, Congress passed the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Act of 1995, which states that as recognition of an undivided Israel, the U.S. Embassy should be moved to Jerusalem no later than May 31, 1999. The bill, which President Clinton signed, also contains waiver authority that the president may exercise if he feels the embassy move should be delayed for national security reasons. Each year since the bill was passed, the President has issued a national security waiver, and the Embassy has still not been moved.

The recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital enjoys the broad support of the American public. Further, it would be consistent with the United States' practice of accepting the host nation's decision as to where its capital is, and where the U.S. Embassy is located. Currently, Israel is the only nation in which the U.S. Embassy is not located in a city recognized internationally as the capital.

In short, moving the Embassy to Jerusalem is consistent with U.S. policy, and does not infringe on the remaining issues of conflict over East Jerusalem. I call my colleagues to support this resolution and I am hopeful that the House International Relations Committee will consider it in the coming weeks. Finally Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following essay, written by one of my constituents, which makes the case for an embassy move most eloquently:

RELOCATION OF THE AMERICAN EMBASSY TO JERUSALEM: A PROPOSITION WHOSE TIME HAS COME

(By Cheston David Mizel)

ENGLEWOOD, CO.—On May 22, 2000 President George W. Bush, speaking in front of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, promised that he would begin to move the U.S. Ambassador from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem as soon as he was inaugurated. Now that he has been elected and the inauguration has passed, the time to move the U.S. Embassy has come. Moving the embassy, at this time, is not only morally and politically apropos, but would augment vital American interests by sending a clear and unequivocal message, to the region, reaffirming the vitality of the American-Israeli relationship.

DOMESTIC POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

The recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and relocation of the U.S. Embassy would immediately and significantly bolster the President's standing with key constituencies on both sides of the aisle. Not only would it clearly demonstrate his determination to fulfill his campaign promises, but it would garner enormous favor among Jewish voters who have felt disenfranchised by the recent presidential election. The prompt relocation of the embassy would further the President's goal of uniting

MORAL IMPLICATIONS

An immediate relocation of the American Embassy is a morally appropriate decision. Israel is the only true western style democracy in a region dominated by ruthless dictatorships. Israel and the United States enjoy a relationship that is unparalleled in the region. Israel is clearly the most loyal pro-American state in the Middle East. Moreover, since biblical times, Jerusalem has always been considered the capital of the people of Israel, whether residing in their land