

EQUAL PAY DAY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Equal Pay Day. A woman would have to work until today, April 3, 2001 in order to earn the same salary of her male counterparts through December 31, 2000. Regrettably, the gap is even wider for Black and Hispanic women.

Perhaps even more troubling than the actual disparities are the poor explanations used to justify the situation.

Some blame pay inequity on women because they enter less lucrative professions. This assertion ignores the fact that traditionally female professions are purposely very underpaid. Professions such as teaching and nursing are undervalued and low-paying because they are traditionally female. Furthermore, the inequity exists within traditionally female fields. For example, female elementary school teachers still make 70 dollars a week less than men in the same position. Clearly, this reason is not a sound one.

Another popular justification assumes that equal pay for women translates into financial disaster and instability for the American family. This persistent myth states that equality will rob men of their jobs, lure women from their children, and is unnecessary for married women who benefit from their husband's salary.

Despite the calamity theories, equal pay is essential for working families. When we end pay discrimination against women, family incomes will rise. Working parents will have more to spend on household needs and more to save for their children's education and their own retirement security. Working parents may be able to spend less time at work and more time with their families, a very positive change for parents and children.

Many excuses and theories abound, but the truth overpowers every last excuse. There is no justification for pay discrimination against women. Let's rectify pay inequity this year, and render Equal Pay Day 2002 obsolete.

REINTRODUCTION OF HATE
CRIMES BILL**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2001, along with Representatives GEPHARDT, SKELTON, FRANK, BALDWIN, MORELLA, KOLBE, FOLEY, SHAYS and KELLY. As of today there are 180 original cosponsors.

In the year 2001, there are still too many messages to African-Americans and other minorities that we are not full participants in American democracy. Decrepit voting machinery in African-American communities disenfranchises our voters. Racial profiling continues unabated. Discrimination continues.

There have been over 50,000 hate crimes reported in the last five years, and nearly

8,000 reported last year alone. The gruesome, hateful murders of James Byrd and Matthew Shepard stand as symbols of the incidence of hate violence that has worsened since their deaths. Hate crimes don't only visit unspeakable violence on the immediate victims, but also send a message of a desired apartheid that its sponsors want to violently enforce. Today, organized hate and supremacist groups operate with greater sophistication, and across state lines.

While many of these crimes do and should get prosecuted at the state and local levels, many do not. Some local governments lack the resources to track interstate hate groups that perpetrate them. In other places, there may even be a lack of will. Ten states, for example, have no hate crime laws on the books, and another 21 have anemic hate crime laws.

If enacted, this legislation would give the federal government the jurisdictional tools necessary to assist local law enforcement in fighting the scourge of hate violence.

In instances where state and local governments do not have the capacity to prosecute such crimes, the legislation creates a federal backstop—the ability for the local U.S. attorney to ensure that justice will be done, deterring hate violence regardless of whether the victim happens to be engaged in a “federally protected” activity. And even in those cases, federal prosecution can only proceed if approved by the Attorney General.

Our primary desire is to see these crimes prosecuted by state and local governments more effectively. That's why the bill authorizes funds to support state investigative and prosecutorial efforts.

The bill is not and should not be partisan. There should be unanimous agreement that there will be “zero-tolerance” for the hate. This bill takes the first step in that direction.

HONORING RICO GIRON

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents who has demonstrated great heroism. This extraordinary individual is Mr. Rico Giron, of San Miguel County, who risked his own life to save the lives of two young drowning children. Upon hearing the cries of the drowning children at a lake, Mr. Giron raced his boat toward the younger brother and sister and dived into the water after them. After pulling the girl ashore, Mr. Giron plunged back into the water to rescue the other boy. Using every last ounce of strength and energy, Mr. Giron was able to pull the boy ashore before collapsing from exhaustion. Mr. Giron's valiant efforts saved the lives of these two young children. For this exceptional bravery, the Andrew Carnegie Hero Fund Foundation has awarded Mr. Giron the prestigious Carnegie Medal which recognizes those individuals who risks his or her own life to save or attempt to save the life of another person. Very few individuals are awarded the Carnegie Medal, hence this is a grand achievement and Mr. Giron deserves a hero's welcome. The quotation that adorns the Carnegie Medal truly describes Mr. Giron's act of bravery: Greater love hath no man than that

a man lay down his life for his friends. Please join me in recognizing the generous actions of Mr. Giron.

BUY AMERICA LEGISLATION

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation drafted to help preserve the U.S. textile industry. This legislation would seek to clarify the existing “Buy-America” provision for the Department of Defense, commonly known as the Berry Amendment.

The Berry Amendment currently requires the Department to purchase clothing, specialty steel, textiles, and food that is produced in the United States by U.S. companies. The intent behind the legislation is to guarantee the U.S. military a ready mobilization base of U.S. apparel manufacturers—a critical component for rapid military mobilizations. The language has been a feature of defense procurement for over 50 years.

However, as my colleagues may know, the Berry Amendment has recently resurfaced in the media following the decision by the Department of the Army to make the black beret a standard issue item for all Army personnel. The decision was controversial and short-sighted in its own right, but became further troubling when the Defense Logistics Agency decided to waive the Berry Amendment and allow the procurement of the berets from foreign sources—including a substantial number made in Communist China.

The decision was not made because of a lack of existing U.S. suppliers to provide the berets. Nor was it made because of a lack of other textile manufacturers who might be willing to tool up to meet the demand. Instead, it was made because the Army wanted all of its personnel to have the berets by its next birthday. A date important to the Army and the Nation as it relates to the founding of that branch of service, but otherwise arbitrary as it relates to the purchase of berets.

That decision was not just a slap in the face to the men and women who will be wearing the berets made by a potential enemy, but also to the U.S. textile industry who have long supported our men and women in uniform.

This controversial waiver highlighted the need to review the current law and look for ways to improve its effectiveness. The legislation I am introducing today seeks to do just that. Specifically, the bill would add a requirement that for any waiver of the Buy American provision, the Secretary of Defense must notify the House and Senate committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Small Business. The legislation also requires that after Congress is notified, 30 days must pass before the contract can be let. Finally, the legislation clarifies and recodifies the Berry Amendment under the permanent section of U.S. code relating to defense procurement.

Although the legislation does not eliminate the possibility of procuring this category of items overseas, it will improve congressional oversight of any Berry Amendment waivers. By raising the visibility of these waiver decisions, it is my hope that the Department of

Defense will increase their level of scrutiny and prevent them from making such poor decisions in the future.

GOVERNORS ISLAND
PRESERVATION ACT, H.R. 1334

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce H.R. 1334, the Governors Island Preservation Act. This legislation is a historic opportunity to preserve and protect the third and final jewel of New York Harbor, Governors Island.

Governors Island was owned and operated as a military facility by the British and American Armed Forces for more than 200 years. This national treasure has played an important role in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the American Civil War, World Wars I and II, as well as hosting the site of the 1988 Reagan-Gorbachev summit, during the Cold War.

In 1800, in order to provide for the national defense, the people of the state of New York ceded control of Governors Island to the Federal government, then, in 1958, transferred the island outright for only \$1.00.

The U.S. Coast Guard has now vacated Governors Island because of the high costs involved in maintaining its base there. This now vacated island is being maintained by General Services Administration with an annual appropriation and, by law, which must be disposed of by 2002.

At the end of last year, the first important step to preserving this national treasure was taken when Castle William and Fort Jay were designated national monuments.

Now, both New York State and New York City need our help to preserve and protect one of our nation's most important and beautiful landmarks, and to be able to turn Governors Island into a destination with significant open and educational spaces for public use.

The State and the City of New York have worked out a detailed plan which will protect the historic nature of the island while transforming the southern tip into a 50-acre public park, complete with recreation facilities and stunning views of the Statue of Liberty and the New York Harbor. New interactive educational facilities, including an aquarium and a historical village, are being planned, as is moderately-priced family lodging and a health center. The awe-inspiring opportunity we have to establish this new public space to complement both Liberty and Ellis Islands is unprecedented and mandates decisive action.

Accordingly, this Governors Island Preservation Act will open the doors to this opportunity by transferring the island back from the Federal Government to the citizens of New York for the same nominal price the Federal Government paid.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call upon all my colleagues in the House of Representatives, in asking their support for the Governors Island Preservation Act, H.R. 1334. Governor Pataki, our Senators, and Representatives NADLER, MALONEY, and myself, have all worked diligently to address every concern and to develop bipartisan legis-

lation which will open Governors Island up not only to the people of New York, but to our entire Nation.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
SOUTH SHORE ASSOCIATION FOR
RETARDED CITIZENS

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join today with people throughout Southeastern Massachusetts in celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the South Shore Association for Retarded Citizens.

What began in 1950 with a small group of parents in Weymouth seeking options for their children, has since grown into a distinguished and highly successful effort to provide services to more than one thousand people with special needs on the South Shore each year. From summer day camps to transitional employment programs; from early intervention services to residential and workshop facilities; from individual to family support programs—South Shore ARC has given all of us opportunities to realize and meet our full potential.

Throughout its history, South Shore ARC has been a leader in the community, utilizing public and private partnerships in its twofold mission of advocacy and the delivery of quality services. The organization has fought tirelessly for the rights of individuals with disabilities, and has been instrumental in the passage of legislation improving and expanding special needs education.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you and our colleagues to join with me in congratulating the South Shore Association for Retarded Citizens for fifty years of service to the people of Massachusetts. This organization has fostered positive working relationships with our community, and has improved the lives of thousands of adults and children with special needs. I commend them for their decades of hard work, and wish them many more years of success.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RESPONSIBLE
OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ENFORCEMENT AND RESPONSE
("ROVER") ACT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to improve the ability of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service to respond to a serious problem affecting federal lands in Colorado and other states.

Throughout the west, and especially in Colorado, increased growth and development has resulted in an increase in recreational use of our public lands. These recreational uses have, in some cases, stressed the capacity of the public land agencies to adequately control and manage such use. As a result, areas of our public lands are being damaged.

One of the uses that cause the greatest impacts are recreational off-road vehicles. The

results can include: damage to wildlife habitat; increased run-off and sediment pollution in rivers and streams; damage to sensitive high-altitude tundra, desert soils, and wetlands; creation of ruts and other visual impacts on the landscape; loss of quiet and secluded areas of the public lands; and adverse effects on wildlife.

Recreational off-road vehicle use on our public lands should be allowed to continue, but it must be managed to minimize or avoid these problems, by appropriate restrictions and putting some sensitive areas off-limits to vehicle use.

Most vehicle users are responsible—they stay on designated roads and trails, they are respectful of the landscape and they endeavor to tread lightly. However, there are a number of such users who do not obey the rules. Given the nature of this use (large, powerful motorized vehicles that are able to penetrate deeper and deeper into previously secluded areas), even a relatively few who violate management requirements can create serious damage to public land resources.

Yet, in some cases, recreational off-road vehicle users ignore these closures and management requirements. Often times, when these activities occur, the federal public land agencies do not have the authority to charge fines commensurate with the damage that results. For example, under BLM's basic law, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, fines for violations of regulations—including regulations governing ORV uses—are limited to \$1,000. That figure has remained unchanged for a quarter of a century, and does not reflect the fact that in many cases the damage from violations will cost thousands more to repair.

The bill I am introducing today would provide for increased fines for such violations—to \$10,000 or the costs of restoring damaged lands, whichever would be greater.

The need for this legislation is well shown by a recent article in the Denver Post by Penelope Purdy that outlines problems in New Mexico, Utah, and Idaho as well as some recent events in Colorado. As she reports, last August, two recreational off-road vehicle users ignored closure signs while four-wheel driving on Bureau of Land Management land high above Silverton, Colorado. As a result, they got stuck for five days on a 70 percent slope at 12,500 feet along the flanks of Houghton Mountain.

At first, they abandoned their vehicles. Then, they returned with other vehicles to pull their vehicles out of the mud and off the mountain. The result was significant damage to the high alpine tundra, a delicate ecosystem that may take thousands of years to recover. As noted in a Denver Post story about this incident, "Alpine plant life has evolved to withstand freezing temperatures, nearly year-round frost, drought, high winds and intense solar radiation, but it's helpless against big tires."

Despite the extent of the damage, the violators were only fined \$600 apiece—hardly adequate to restore the area, or to deter others.

Another example was an event that occurred last year above Boulder, Colorado, that has become popularly known as the "mudfest."

Two Denver radio personalities announced that they were going to take their off-road four-wheel-drive vehicles for a weekend's outing on