

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING 21 MEMBERS OF NATIONAL GUARD KILLED IN CRASH ON MARCH 3, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2001

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Madam Speaker, today we honor the three Florida Army National Guard members from Detachment 1, 1st Battalion 171st Aviation, of Lakeland, Florida, and 18 Virginia Air National Guardsmen from 203rd Red Horse Flight who died on March 3, 2001, when the C-23 aircraft returning them home crashed in south-central Georgia.

It is not enough to thank these men for their service. And it is not enough to honor their commitment. We must also thank and honor the family these men have left behind. It is never easy to console families who have lost a service member. I ask that we keep the families of the Florida Guard soldiers and the Virginia airmen in our thoughts and prayers. We are grateful for their service and are humbled by the dedication a family member gives when a spouse, parent or child is in the military. Again, our thoughts and prayers are with them.

OSHA ERGONOMICS RULE

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 2001

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, the U.S. Senate voted 56–44 to repeal an OSHA ergonomics rule initiated by the Clinton administration that would affect over 102 million workers at over 6 million work sites. While Congress passed the Congressional Review Act in 1996, granting the authority to review and disapprove of many regulatory rules made by a federal agency, Congress has never passed a joint resolution of disapproval.

I have strong reservations about the rule because it puts a significant burden on already struggling small businesses not only in my community in Central New York but across the United States. Currently, Congress is trying to maintain and strengthen the overall economy by encouraging small business entrepreneurship with a variety of economic stimulus programs. We must continue this effort in a positive manner as it is the small business person who creates jobs in each of our districts. The implementation of this rule would devastate employers with extra costs that would try to fix ergonomically related problems.

Despite my opposition to this rule, our work on this issue cannot stop here. According to OSHA, improper ergonomic design of jobs is one of the leading causes cited for work-related illness. Congress must protect the thousands of employees that have had work-re-

lated injuries while at the same time protect small businesses that must deal with the complexity and cost of the standard. Through federal funding, studies by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) have provided a thorough review of studies that showed significant statistical information between workplace injuries and musculoskeletal disorders. However, the scientific understanding of the problem has not been completed.

With this in mind, I urge Secretary Chao to immediately review and revise the standard that meets the needs of all parties. I do believe in a comprehensive approach to ergonomics that addresses the concerns imposed against the current standard. By finding corrective actions that can redesign the workplace, we will ensure the health and stability of our nation's workforce.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RONNIE SHOWS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 2001

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, my family experienced a tragedy last week that forced me to miss a series of important votes from March 6 through March 8 last week. Due to the death of my mother-in-law on March 6 in Mississippi, I was with my family and was unable to cast recorded votes on rollcalls 26 through 45.

On rollcall 26, I would have voted “yea” on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 724, a bill to Authorize Appropriations to Carry Out Part B of Title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, relating to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

On rollcall 27, I would have voted “yea” on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 727, a bill to Amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to Provide that Low-Speed Electric Bicycles are Consumer Products Subject to Such Act.

On rollcall 28, I would have voted “yea” on Approving the Journal.

On rollcall 29, I would have voted “nay” on Agreeing to H. Res. 79, a bill providing for consideration of S.J. Res. 6, Providing for Congressional Disapproval of the Rule Relating to Ergonomics.

On rollcall 30, I would have voted “yea” on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Con. Res. 31, a bill expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the importance of organ, tissue, bone marrow, and blood donation and supporting National Donor Day.

On rollcall 31, I would have voted “yea” on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 624, the Organ Donation Improvement Act.

On rollcall 32, I would have voted “yea” on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Con. Res. 47, a bill Honoring the 21 members of the National Guard who were killed in the crash of a National Guard aircraft on March 3, 2001, in south-central Georgia.

On rollcall 33, I would have voted “yea” on Passage of S.J. Res. 6, a bill Providing for Congressional Disapproval of the Rule Submitted by the Department of Labor Under Chapter 8 of Title 5, United States Code, Relating to Ergonomics.

On rollcall 34, I would have voted “nay” on Approving the Journal.

On rollcall 35, I would have voted “aye” on the Motion to Adjourn.

On rollcall 36, I would have voted “yea” on the Motion to Adjourn.

On rollcall 37, I would have voted “no” on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 83, a bill Providing for consideration of H.R. 3, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act of 2001.

On rollcall 38, I would have voted “no” to Table the Motion to Reconsider H. Res. 83.

On rollcall 39, I would have voted “no” on Agreeing to H. Res. 83.

On rollcall 40, I would have voted “no” to Table the Motion to Reconsider H. Res. 83.

On rollcall 41, I would have voted “aye” on the Motion to Adjourn.

On rollcall 42, I would have voted “yea” on the Rangel Substitute to H.R. 3.

On rollcall 43, I would have voted “aye” to Table the Motion to Reconsider H.R. 3.

On rollcall 44, I would have voted “aye” on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 3 with instructions.

On rollcall 45, I would have voted “yea” on Passage of H.R. 3, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act of 2001.

Mr. Speaker, for me a “yea” vote on rollcall 33, to pass S.J. Res. 6, was a difficult decision. I supported S.J. Res. 6 because, although I firmly believe an ergonomics regulation is necessary, I am troubled by overly broad scope of the regulation that was promulgated late last year, and by the potential costs incurred by businesses required to implement this unfunded mandate against the private sector.

In recent years, my district has experienced the exodus of thousands of jobs, Mr. Speaker, largely because our trade policies have encouraged businesses to take advantage of lower wages and weaker worker protection and environmental laws across our borders. I fear that imposing this particular ergonomics regulation would have encouraged the loss of even more jobs at home.

At the same time, the process used to bring S.J. Res. 6 to the House floor disappointed me. It was rushed with no House hearings and little opportunity for debate. This process gave me little time to solicit the opinions of my constituents in Mississippi. That is why I would have voted against the rule governing consideration of the Joint Resolution.

Nonetheless, I believe we need an ergonomics regulation that provides reasonable protections for our workforce. The Secretary of Labor has indicated her willingness to promulgate a new regulation and I urge her to initiate the process immediately.

We need the business and labor communities to work together to craft worker safety

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

regulations that do not place unfair burdens on businesses to comply. If an ergonomics regulation is implemented in the future, I will introduce legislation providing tax credits to help businesses offset the cost of compliance. This would be a fair approach, one that provides reasonable worker protections without forcing businesses to choose between implementing ergonomics regulations or shutting down and relocating across our border.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 45 I would have voted “yea” in favor of H.R. 3, President Bush’s measure to reduce income tax rates, because currently we pay more in taxes than at any time since World War II. Taxes consume a staggering 38 percent of the gross income of the average family. Most families pay more in taxes than for food, housing, and clothing combined. This is wrong. Ending estate and marriage penalty taxes will be voted on soon and I will vote to end them both just like I did last year.

But honestly, Mr. Speaker, the income tax cut in H.R. 3 was a good tax cut but it was not perfect. Middle America, working Americans and Mississippians should receive more of a refund than this tax cut provides. The nation’s wealthiest should not get a full loaf while the rest of us get only crumbs. But, cutting taxes in Washington is next to impossible. Once a revenue stream is flowing into the federal government, it’s hard to reduce the flow. Cutting taxes for hard working Mississippians has been one of my priorities since taking office. We cannot afford to miss this chance to provide tax cuts for our families. More money in our pockets, not that of the federal government, is best for America.

I have other priorities that are essential for our nation’s future, too. Paying off the National Debt, restoring the promise of health care for our military retirees, standing with our family farmers, building a stronger military, providing prescription drug help for our seniors, protecting Social Security and Medicare, and making stronger schools for our children, deserve our attention and support. The debate in Washington has been about our ability to provide a huge tax cut and accomplish all these other goals. Can we have our cake and eat it too? The president says we can. I hope he’s right.

Cutting taxes is the right thing to do. Our priorities must be about building strong families and communities. This income tax cut bill now heads to the U.S. Senate. I am confident the Senate will consider all of our priorities, address the need to provide solid relief for middle America, and implement mechanisms to protect us—the taxpayers—from a return to deficit spending. The bill will then return to the House. We will once again have the opportunity to do the right thing. I am determined that we will.

CELEBRATION OF THE 200TH
ANNIVERSARY OF ARLINGTON

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 2001

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 200th anniversary of Arlington’s founding. This historical celebration commemorates what President George Wash-

ington, patriot George Mason, and other Virginians began when they donated land to the Federal Government to establish the new Nation’s Capital. Arlington County has had a colorful and illustrious past and holds the promise of an even greater future. Few other counties are as intricately linked to as many historic events of national significance as Arlington. From the first recorded encounter between Captain John Smith and the Nocostin Indians at present day Roosevelt Island; to prominent local residents who were integral in the fight for independence and our early history as a new republic; to Arlington’s role as a staging ground for Union forces during the Civil War; to becoming home for the bureaucracy created during the New Deal; to the country’s role today as a national model for smart growth and commitment to community and civic pride, Arlington stands as a model for the rest of the Nation.

As colorful and glorious as the past has been, we can look forward to an even brighter future. Today’s celebration not only acknowledges the enormous contributions Arlington has made to our democracy but also provides us with an opportunity to highlight the long overdue and comprehensive story of that same legacy.

Arlington House is known for being situated on land that once belonged to the commander of the Continental Army, but it was also home of the Confederacy’s most famous general. It was perhaps the Capital’s, and therefore the Nation’s, most visible reminder of the South’s most “peculiar institution.” A plantation fueled by slave labor, Arlington House stood within view of those who debated the Missouri Compromise and constructed the Dred Scott decision. It was also the site where the Federal Government established one of the first Freedman’s Village providing social services, education, and vocational training to former slaves whose later influence and success still touch us today.

I want to compliment the collective wisdom of the Arlington County Board and the Bicentennial Task Force for their decision to use this celebration as an occasion for launching efforts to help restore Arlington House and reopen the slave quarters. The two surviving quarters, which have been closed and boarded up for years, will now be reopened and include interpretative displays of the Freedman’s Village and its important impact on Arlington.

From this point forward, the Nation will know that the ground where Robert E. Lee stood was also the land upon which Harriet Tubman and Sojourner Truth tread. It is a gift I am pleased to support and hope to expand upon with my colleagues in Congress, as we attempt to procure additional Federal resources. Arlington should be proud of its great past, but because of its commitment to recognize and celebrate the contributions of all its residents, we will surely experience an even greater future.

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX
RELIEF ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2001

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this ill-conceived tax plan. Why, Mr. Speaker, do I so strongly object to this plan?

Let me count the ways:

1. Process.—The Ways and Means Committee has rushed this tax cut through without allowing the Budget Committee to do its work.

We have no idea how this cut meshes with our national priorities.

As its name suggests, the Budget Committee is charged with coming up with our national budget, yet they and the Congress have not been given time to do so.

Section 303 of the Congressional Budget Act states that the Congress may not pass tax cuts, or tax increases for that matter, without first passing a budget. Republican leadership is ignoring the law in order to rush this turkey through.

Ignorance here is bliss. We haven’t the least idea what the Congress is doing or how it affects the budget or the country.

2. The Surplus.—This entire tax plan is based on projected surpluses. I hate to milk a dead cow, but these are merely projections—we have not collected the surplus yet!

Any honest count shows that the President’s numbers don’t add up. If we take the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds out of the projected \$5.6 trillion surplus, we are left with \$2.5 trillion. Now, if we subtract \$1 trillion for the proposed “rainy day fund” we are left with \$1.5 trillion. Take \$1.6 out for the tax cut and we are \$100 billion in the red. There is no money for helping hands, education, Medicare Reform, Social Security reform, debt reduction, increased defense spending, health insurance for the uninsured.

We have been down this road before. In the 1980s we passed a reckless tax cut and a budget that did not add up. The result was that America was buried under a mountain of debt.

3. Fairness.—This is clearly an unfair and unfairly crafted tax cut. As usual, my Republican colleagues are looking out for their fat cat buddies. The top 1 percent, those making more than \$900,000/year, gets more than 43 percent of the tax cut. That is \$868 billion to the wealthiest Americans. The remaining 99 percent of the taxpayers get the crumbs left on the table, with over 85% of the taxpayers getting a tax cut far less than the \$1,600 the President promised.

4. History.—Recall, if you will, the years 1981 and 1982. The Congress, at the urging of President Reagan, passed a massive tax cut. Within one year, when the debt began to pile up, we realized what a drastic mistake we had made. The next year, President Reagan signed a tax increase.

George Santayana, whose writings and wisdom I have found to serve those in politics, counsels us: Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it. We must learn from the mistakes that fostered soaring inflation, and led us right into recession.

In closing, I would remind my colleagues that we have been down this road before. This