

Mrs. Rheney is a 1949 graduate of Jefferson-Hillman School of Nursing in Birmingham, Alabama. Her first job was as director of nursing at a tuberculosis sanitarium in Decatur, Georgia. After her move to South Carolina, she accepted positions in the surgical unit of Roper Hospital and later as pediatric head nurse at Saint Francis Hospital in Charleston, South Carolina.

Upon moving to Orangeburg, South Carolina in 1954, Mrs. Rheney immediately became active in the community. She held memberships in the Junior Service League, the Medical Alliance, and the Salvation Army Advisory Board. In the 1960's and 1970's she was an active supporter and volunteer for many activities at Wade Hampton Academy, where her children were students. Mrs. Rheney and her husband, Dr. John Rheney, Jr. are the parents of four children: John III, a local dentist; Betsy, a human resources representative in Aiken; Bruce, a local bank vice-president; and David, a Greenville attorney. The Rheney's raised their children in a loving, Christian home, encouraging them to love God, one another, and themselves.

As South Carolina's Mother of the Year, Mrs. Rheney will represent the state in Portland, Oregon in April at the national convention of American Mothers, Inc., a non-profit, interfaith organization founded for the purpose of developing and strengthening the moral and spiritual foundation of America's families. I am privileged to serve parts of Orangeburg county in this august body, a county which has seen three other of its outstanding women attain the state's Mother of the Year honor. Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Mrs. Joyce Rheney, for her outstanding work as an exemplary mother and unselfish community servant.

#### HONORING GEORGE BECKER

#### HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 28, 2001*

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 2001, one of this nation's most distinguished and able labor leaders will officially retire. George Becker, the president of the United Steelworkers of America, will formally mark the conclusion of a career that spans 57 years.

During his tenure as the president of the Steelworkers union, he has reinvigorated the union's political presence as a force in the national debate about trade, globalization, and its effects on working men and women. He has been an outspoken critic of free trade agreements, such as NAFTA, that have resulted in the loss of tens of thousands of American manufacturing jobs and a weakening of America's manufacturing and industrial base. He has been a fierce proponent of workers' rights and human rights, especially in China, Mexico, and other developing nations around the world.

George Becker literally grew up across the street from a steel mill; the Granite City mill in his hometown of Granite City, Illinois. He went to work in the mill in the summer of 1944. Besides Granite City Steel, Becker also worked as a crane operator at General Steel Castings, and as an assembler at Fisher Body. He also served on active duty in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Becker became active in USWA Local 4804 at Dow Chemical's aluminum rolling mill in Madison, Illinois, where he worked as an inspector. Over the years, he was elected by his co-workers as local union treasurer, vice president, and president. As a result of his hard work and leadership, Becker was later appointed as a USWA staff representative.

In 1975, Becker came to the USWA's International headquarters in Pittsburgh as a staff technician in the union's Safety and Health Department. He helped to establish some of the first national health standards adopted later by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) for workers exposed to lead, arsenic, and other toxic substances.

Becker also led the union's collective bargaining in the aluminum industry as chair of the USWA's Aluminum Industry Conference. Later, he also headed the Steelworkers' organizing program and led major corporate campaigns, including a worldwide campaign against Ravenswood Aluminum Corporation and the return to work of 1,600 Steelworkers after a 20-month lockout. The Ravenswood struggle was later chronicled in the 1999 book, titled, "Ravenswood: The Steelworkers' Victory and the Revival of American Labor," by Tom Juravich and Kate Bronfenbrenner.

In 1985, Becker was elected as international vice president for administration. He was re-elected to that position in 1989. He also served as administrative assistant to Lynn Williams after Williams became international secretary in 1977 and international president in 1983.

In November, 1993, Becker was elected international president of the United Steelworkers and was reelected to a second term in November, 1997.

Becker's presidency of the Steelworkers has included many milestones for the union.

In June, 1995, Becker won the support of his Board of Directors to reorganize the Steelworkers from 18 districts in the U.S. into nine districts, increasing efficiency and political strength. In July, 1995, Becker engineered the merger of the 98,000-member United Rubber Workers with the Steelworkers. In 1997, the 40,000-member Aluminum, Brick, and Glass Workers Union also merged with the Steelworkers.

Under George Becker's leadership, the Steelworkers won significant settlements in strikes at Bridgestone/Firestone, Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel, and Newport News Shipbuilding Company. The struggle at Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel restored a defined benefit pension plan for 4,500 members. The struggle at Newport News Shipbuilding also won significant increases in workers' wages and pension benefits.

Becker also expanded the Steelworkers' political strength by creating a Rapid Response program, which informs and activates local union members to lobby Congress on issues crucial to working men and women. In 1998, Steelworkers generated over 170,000 letters to Congress opposing so-called "fast track" trade negotiating authority, which played a major part in defeating the measure. Becker also initiated a Washington internship program for the union, which brings rank and file members to Washington for an intensive 12-week long session of education about the workings of Congress along with practical experience in the art of lobbying on behalf of the union's legislative agenda.

Becker has become a regular fixture in Washington with frequent appearances and testimony before Congressional committees, the U.S. International Trade Commission, the Administration, and other government agencies. As one of the vice-presidents of the AFL-CIO, he was instrumental in reforming the labor federation and was a key supporter of John Sweeney as AFL-CIO president in 1995.

On the world stage, Becker is an executive committee member of the International Metalworkers Federation (IMF) and chairman of the world rubber council of the International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine, and General Workers' Unions (ICEM).

In 1998, Becker was appointed by President Clinton to the President's Export Council and the U.S. Trade and Environmental Policy Advisory Committee; both important forums which he used to speak out on behalf of workers' rights. Becker also served as a member of the Congressional Trade Deficit Review Commission, which conducted extensive hearings in Washington and across the nation on the causes and consequences of the nation's burgeoning trade deficits. Becker's leadership ensured that Steelworkers were prominent in the protests marking the Seattle WTO Ministerial meeting in December, 1999.

Mr. Speaker, George Becker's success as a labor leader has been because of his intelligence, skills, and tenacity. Because of all of those attributes and above all, because he has never forgotten where he came from, his career has improved the lives of millions of American workers and their families. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Steelworkers union president George Becker upon his retirement and for a lifetime of dedicated service to not only the men and women of his beloved Steelworkers union, but all working men and women.

#### SALUTING THE TUSKEGEE AIRMEN

#### HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 28, 2001*

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, February marks Black History Month and its arrival has afforded us the opportunity to spotlight some of the most courageous men in our nation's history. I am referring to the Tuskegee Airmen, African-Americans who were asked to simultaneously fight the institutionalized segregation of their homeland and the battle hardened pilots fielded by the Luftwaffe of dreaded Nazi Germany.

On the very site where some nine thousand Republic Thunderbolt fighters were built during World War II, a permanent tribute has been created by the American Airpower Museum in Farmingdale, Long Island that salutes the valor and sacrifice of the Tuskegee Airmen. A full size replica of their P-51 fighter welcomes the museum visitor and helps explain the story of these amazing airmen.

I was honored and pleased to be able to join members of the Tuskegee Airmen, and the many friends of Republic Airport and my constituents in dedicating this exhibit during Black History Month.

Tuskegee Airmen flew more than 15,500 sorties and completed nearly 1,600 missions

and they are credited with never losing an American bomber to enemy fighters while flying escort. This tribute at the American Airpower Museum at Republic will forever remind us that racism did not deter these brave men from serving their country, defending our freedoms and protecting our future.

In addition, credit must be offered to two companies that came forward to underwrite this effort—Equal and Avirex—whose support made this tribute possible. These firms reflect the type of public-private partnership that is ensuring our nation's heritage is preserved, protected, and celebrated. I congratulate them for their efforts and publicly salute their commitment to this task.

The remarks of Lee Archer, a Tuskegee Airman ace who is credited with five kills, will ring forever at this historic defense plant. He repeated the words of fellow African-American Air Force pilot Chappie James, "you agitate, you demand, you argue but when the country is in trouble you hold her hand."

# JANUARY 31, 2001 SPEECH TO THE UNIVERSITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

**HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 28, 2001*

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to present my maiden speech as Chairman of the House Science Committee to the Universities Research Association on January 31, 2001.

In my remarks, I outlined my goals and initial priorities for the 107th Congress. As I said in the speech: I want to ensure that we have a healthy, sustainable and productive R&D establishment—one that educates students, increases human knowledge, strengthens U.S. competitiveness and contributes to the well-being of the nation and the world. With those goals in mind, I intend to concentrate initially on three priorities—science and math education, energy policy and the environment—three areas in which the resources and expertise of the scientific enterprise must be brought to bear on issues of national significance.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I submit herewith the full text of my remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

## CONGRESSMAN SHERWOOD BOEHLERT (R-NY) SPEECH TO UNIVERSITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION—JANUARY 31, 2001

It's a pleasure to be with you this morning. This is actually my first speech as chairman of the House Science Committee, so I want to use this opportunity to give you a general sense of where I hope to take the Committee. You can think of this "maiden speech" as a kind of experiment—if it works, you'll be the only people to have heard these themes when they were fresh; if it doesn't work, you'll be the only people to have heard them—period.

Actually, though, after serving on the Committee for 18 years and having worked with many of you, the issues before the Science Committee are hardly virgin territory for me.

I even think I know the recipe for becoming a popular chairman. My formula was

prompted by Clark Kerr's famous advice on how to become a popular university president. He said that to be successful at running a university you just had to provide three things—"football for the alumni, parking for the faculty and sex for the students." Committees are supposed to be a bit more tame, so I figure the three things I have to provide to be popular are: press coverage for the Members, parking for the staff, and money for the scientific community.

I do indeed intend to provide those three items, but I want to go beyond that. I want to build the Science Committee into a significant force within the Congress and, with that momentum, I want to ensure that we have a healthy, sustainable, and productive R&D establishment—one that educates students, increases human knowledge, strengthens U.S. competitiveness and contributes to the well-being of the nation and the world.

With those goals in mind, I intend to concentrate initially on three priorities—science and math education, energy policy and the environment—three areas in which the resources and expertise of the scientific enterprise must be brought to bear on issues of national significance.

Education is perhaps the most pressing dilemma of the three. I imagine that by now we can all recite the litany of evidence that our education system is not performing adequately—particularly—but not exclusively—at the K-12 level. There are the TIMSS surveys showing

The evidence is easy to adduce because it's been familiar for so long. In fact, I dare say, the concerns have not changed appreciably since I first joined the Science Committee in 1983. Unfortunately, a familiar list of solutions doesn't spring as readily to our lips.

Now, I hope you won't be surprised to learn that I don't have a ready set of solutions. I have not been holding back on providing answers all these years just so I could offer them up the moment I became chairman. What I do have is a set of questions that I hope will frame the Committee's agenda as we put together an education program, in concert with the Administration and other House committees.

Here are some of my questions. First, how can we attract more top students into science and math teaching?

This is a fundamental question. No curriculum, no piece of technology, no exam is going to cure our education ills if we don't have teachers who are conversant with the subject matter they are teaching, and who can communicate their excitement and their comfort, to the students. I think scholarships are part of the answer, but clearly we need something more systemic.

Second, how can we ensure that technology actually improves education? The government's focus needs to shift from merely providing access to technology to figuring out how to use it in a manner that truly offers education, not distraction or empty entertainment or even mere information.

Third, how can we use exams in a way that promotes critical thinking, retention of knowledge and a love of learning? The current mania for measurement is a necessary antidote to an era marked by a lack of accountability. But the wrong kinds of tests will not only mask evidence of a continuing decline; they could contribute to it.

This isn't a speech on education policy, so I'll leave the matter there, for now—except to say that the question I've raised—and indeed the entire national discussion about education—must be of active concern to your institutions.

And one of my goals will be to find new ways to draw on the resources of our great

research universities to help answer the kinds of questions that I just posed. The partnership between universities and industry has grown markedly closer in recent years; the relationship between universities and our nation's school systems must do the same.

Universities can also play a role in addressing my second priority area—energy policy. Clearly, as President Bush has said, we need a comprehensive energy policy that looks at all aspects of supply and demand, in both the short- and long-term.

But my focus will be on ensuring that we concentrate sufficiently on alternative sources of energy—wind, solar, fuel cells, etc.—and on conservation and efficiency. These are areas that have been underfunded in terms of both research and deployment.

Moreover, we have spent so much time over the past 20 years having philosophical battles over government energy programs that we haven't devoted enough effort to figuring out how to make the programs work better. The energy supply programs of the Department of Energy (DOE) are due for a good, hard look from people who unequivocally support their goals.

In the area of environment, as well, our government research programs need to be reviewed by people who genuinely want to improve them, by folks who want more reliable results, not more convenience ones. We need to ensure that research in ecology and other environmental sciences—fields in which we know astonishingly little—that such research is adequately funded and is conducted by top scientists both inside and outside the government.

But in making environment a focus of the Science Committee's work, I want to do more than explore the workings of government research programs. I want the Committee to be a central forum to learn about the science behind ongoing—and, even more importantly, brewing—controversies in environmental policy.

Two prominent examples spring to mind immediately. First, global climate change, where the scientific consensus is growing all the time that we face serious consequences from human-generated emissions of greenhouse gases; and second, biotechnology, where I believe more serious attention needs to be paid to concerns about possible ecological impacts even as we acknowledged the potential benefits of genetically modified organisms.

Now, I realize, of course, that I have been speaking to you for a while without mentioning any of the science policy issues usually discussed at URA gatherings. Well, I did say that this was an experiment—but it's not supposed to be one that tests your patience.

But I wanted to start with my three immediate priorities because they will be the subject of our first three full Committee hearings—probably in early March—and because I think that the entire research community needs to think more about such issues, about the intersection of research with our national goals and concerns.

But I don't mean to indicate the Committee will turn away from the equally critical concerns about the health of the research enterprise itself.

So let me say unambiguously that I will fight to increase research funding, in general, and funding for the physical sciences, in particular. Unique and vital DOE facilities, like Fermilab, must continue to prosper, even as we participate in international projects like the Large Hadron Collider.

With that commitment in mind, I want the Committee, early on, to take a serious look