

NATIONAL WOMEN'S HEALTH  
WEEK

## HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2001

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues of the Women's Caucus to discuss the importance of women's health.

It is an especially appropriate topic because this week is National Women's Health Week.

As a Caucus, we are working hard to improve health for all women. From protecting Social Security and strengthening Medicare to working for equality for all women.

And we are working to add a reliable, affordable prescription drug benefit.

Today, there are 6 million more women in the United States than men. Women are 51 percent of the U.S. population.

And the projected life expectancy for women in this country is 80 years.

Therefore, we must ensure that the progress we have made to improve women's health continues.

To this point, I urge my distinguished colleagues to join me in the following measures.

I am working to improve the health and well-being of women—young and old.

On May 2nd, I joined with Mrs. MORELLA of Maryland, reintroduced the Osteoporosis Early Detection and Prevention Act, H.R. 1683.

May marks Osteoporosis Prevention Month. Osteoporosis is a disease characterized by low bone mass or brittle bones. The statistics are startling. 71 percent of women with osteoporosis are not diagnosed, leaving them at increased risk for fractures. And osteoporosis causes 300,000 new hip fractures each year. My bill would require private insurers to reimburse for bone mass measurement. Prevention and early detection are critical in combating this disease.

Last week, Congresswoman KELLY and I reintroduced the Cancer Screening Coverage Act, H.R. 1809, to give everyone a fighting chance in detecting cancer at its earliest stages. CASCA as we call this bill, applies to private health insurance plans and to the Federal Employees Health Benefits plan, requiring these plans to cover cancer screenings.

Cancer screening allows for the detection of cancer in its earliest form, when the cost of treatment is the least. And more importantly, it is estimated that the rate of survival would increase from 80% to 95% if all Americans participated in regular cancer screenings. The legislation we introduced has the power to save thousands of lives.

I am also working with my distinguished colleague, CONNIE MORELLA, to make women's health research a priority. We, joined by many members of the Women's Caucus, introduced the Women's Health Office Act, H.R. 1784, to make the women's health offices at the Department of Health and Human Services permanent.

And for our littlest people and their moms, I have introduced the Breastfeeding Promotion Act, which supports and protects mothers who choose to breastfeed. Everyday, new medical studies are released highlighting the positive health effects of breastfeeding for both mother and child. Just today, a new study was released showing that breastfed babies are less likely to become overweight children.

Again, let's celebrate National Women's Health Week. We must continue to work hard to ensure that the priorities of our nation include policies that protect and promote the health and well-being of women and their families. I urge my colleagues to join me on these measures.

## FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003

## SPEECH OF

## HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hyde amendment, which would prohibit foreign non-governmental organizations which receive population aid from the United States from using their OWN funds to provide abortion services or counsel women about abortion options.

This amendment would place an unfair restriction on family planning efforts in developing nations. How can a democratic country like the United States have in place a policy which has the very un-democratic effect of restricting free speech? The Hyde amendment would restrict the ability of foreign nongovernmental organizations to talk openly to patients about their health care options. It is simply unfair.

Reproductive health care is a matter of life and death in developing countries. Family planning programs provide critical health care services for women and families in the world's poorest regions. Taking away U.S. funds for foreign organizations who use their own money to counsel women about abortion options will do real harm to important international family planning efforts.

While opponents of international family planning may attempt to cast this vote as an abortion-related matter—it is not. It has been illegal to use U.S. funds for abortion overseas since 1973. This vote is about whether women overseas should have access to needed family planning information. I think they should and I urge my colleagues to vote against the Hyde amendment.

## IN RECOGNITION OF WILLIAM HENRY SEWARD

## HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2001

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, William Henry Seward was born in Florida, Orange County, New York on May 16, 1801; two-hundred years ago.

The son of Samuel Sweezy Seward and Mary (Jennings) Seward, he graduated from Union College in 1820, studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1822. In 1823, he

moved to Auburn, New York, where he entered Judge Elijah Miller's law office and, one year later, married Frances Adeline Miller, the daughter of Judge Miller.

Seward was interested in politics early in his career and became actively involved in the Anti-Masonic movement after 1828. With the backing of Thurlow Weed, the Whig newspaper editor, he was elected to the New York State Senate in 1830 where he served for four years. He was nominated by the Whigs for governor in 1834, but was defeated by William L. Marcy. From 1834 to 1838 he practiced law and served as an agent for the Holland Land Company, settling settlers' claims in Chautauqua County.

In 1838 Seward was elected governor of New York State and again in 1840. He favored internal improvements, public support of Catholic schools, and began to favor free soil and abolition positions. From 1842 to 1848 he again practiced law, first in the court of chancery and later in patent cases. He also defended cases involving fugitive slave laws.

In 1849 Seward was elected to the United States Senate, and increasingly built a reputation as an anti-slavery senator. After 1855, the Whig party merged into the Republican party, and Seward became one of the leading Republicans. He was passed over as the presidential nominee in 1856 and, though he was the front runner in 1860, Lincoln was given the nomination.

After Lincoln's election, Seward was appointed to the post of Secretary of State, a position he held until 1869 serving under both presidents Lincoln and Johnson.

As Secretary of State Seward was a central force in the administration. The major issues he dealt with during the Civil War years were the possibility of European intervention, the outfitting of Confederate cruisers in British ports, the Trent affair and the French invasion of Mexico. Seward was also interested in territorial expansion, and in 1867 negotiated the purchase of Alaska from Russia.

Seward was seriously wounded in the Lincoln assassination conspiracy, and after 1865 his health was not good. He retired from public life upon Grant's election, and despite his poor health, took a trip around the world in 1871. William Henry Seward died in Auburn on October 10, 1872.

## THE COMPUTER EQUIPMENT COMMON SENSE DEPRECIATION ACT

## HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2001

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I am joined by my colleague from Maryland, Congressman BEN CARDIN and several of our other colleagues, to introduce legislation that will return common sense to the Internal Revenue Code by changing the depreciation period for computer equipment.

The depreciation provisions in the Code have not been updated since the 1980s. Since that time, the technology available to manufacturers has literally exploded. Tax rules require businesses and manufacturers to keep their computer equipment "on the books" for five years. In highly competitive industries, the average economic life of the equipment ranges

from 14 and 24 months, far shorter than depreciation rules. This skewed limitation places manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage.

In a slowing economy, more flexibility is needed over capital investment choices. Many manufacturers would like to expand their businesses and increase employment opportunities. They would have greater opportunities to do so if the tax code recognized a more realistic economic life expectation for this equipment. Unfortunately, these business owners often put off investing in new equipment due to the unfavorable tax treatment they receive from the outdated computer depreciation schedule.

Specifically, the legislation we are introducing would update the tax code to acknowledge the rapid advancements in computer technology by changing the depreciation period for computer equipment used in manufacturing processes from five years to two years. We need to encourage businesses to make investments that will keep them competitive, not penalize them with an outdated tax provision.

Please join us in this effort to inject a little common sense into the Internal Revenue Code by cosponsoring the Computer Equipment Common Sense Depreciation Act.

**CHILD PROTECTION/ALCOHOL AND DRUG PARTNERSHIP ACT**

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 17, 2001*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reintroducing legislation today to improve the prevention, screening, and treatment of substance abuse for parents with children in the child welfare system. Regrettably, child welfare workers and judges are not always sufficiently trained in how to detect and cope with substance abuse problems. And of even greater concern, when accurate assessments are made, there is often a lack of available treatment. In fact, the Department of Health and Human Services reports that 63 percent of all mothers with drug problems do not receive any substance abuse treatment within a year.

To combat this threat to child safety and family stability, I am introducing the Child Protection/Alcohol and Drug Partnership Act, which would provide \$1.9 billion over the next five years to States that develop cooperative arrangements between their substance abuse and child abuse agencies to provide services to the parents of at-risk children. Bipartisan companion legislation has been introduced by Senators SNOWE and ROCKEFELLER.

Under the bill, funding would be disbursed to States based on the number of children in the State. To receive their allotment under the program, States would be required to spend a match starting at 15 percent in 2002, rising to 25 percent in 2006. In addition, they would be required to provide a detailed analysis of their current efforts to address substance abuse issues for families in the child welfare system and specify the additional steps they intend to pursue with the new funding (supplanting of existing funds would be prohibited). Funding could be used for a variety of specific activities, including: providing preventive and early intervention services for children of parents with alcohol and drug problems; expanding the

availability of substance abuse treatment, including residential treatment, for parents involved with the child welfare system; and improving the screening and assessment of substance abuse problems for families in the child welfare system.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this proposal, which is strongly supported by the Children's Defense Fund, the Child Welfare League of America, the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, and the American Public Human Services Association.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002**

**SPEECH OF**

**HON. DENNIS MOORE**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 9, 2001*

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on H. Con. Res. 83, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2002.

This conference agreement was developed in a manner which abused the congressional budget process. Consider the following:

The debate in the House on the tax cut contained in this budget resolution has already taken place. We were forced to vote on these cuts—which far exceed the levels contained in this conference agreement—months before we will understand the full impact of what we were considering.

The House was later forced to consider its version of the budget resolution prior to receiving the President's budget.

The Senate Budget Committee was never afforded the opportunity to consider this bill; rather the committee of jurisdiction was circumvented using a questionable procedure.

Minority House and Senate Members were explicitly noticed that they would not be included in negotiations between the two chambers to work out differences between the competing versions of the budget.

Finally, in the most recent example of an abuse of power, the House leadership filed late last week a resolution only moments before it was to be adopted in the dead-of-the-night, without a Congressional Budget Office analysis or a Joint Tax Committee scoring of the tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, in its haste to rush through a conference report before anyone had a chance to look at the details, two pages were lost that happened to contain language crucial to the compromise that persuaded moderates to agree to this budget. As a result, members, including the minority, were afforded the opportunity to examine this budget in detail over four days. This fortuitous event afforded me the opportunity to discover that the numbers in this budget simply do not add up and that there is much more missing than two pages.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement calls for \$661.3 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal year 2002. Instead of making recommendations for the level of funding for our national priorities, however, the conference agreement lists CBO baseline levels, and then uses a plug number of \$6 billion in a catchall

function known as “allowances” to make the numbers for 2002 add up.

These unrealistic discretionary spending levels will result in a year-end conflict over funding levels for appropriations bills, much like those we have seen in years past. Undoubtedly, we will soon be faced with a chaotic budget process that drags on into the fall that produces much higher spending than would have been necessary had we reached agreement on realistic spending levels within the context of the budget resolution.

Moreover, if one takes these spending numbers at face value, then this majority has broken its promise to increase funding for education and the critical research needs at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The majority will argue that the function numbers in the conference agreement do not represent intended policy and that increases for education and NIH can be provided by the Appropriations Committee.

But if appropriators can change the recommended levels, what purpose does this budget resolution serve? The troubling conclusion is that either these increases will come at the expense of other programs or we will once again far exceed the spending targets outlined in this resolution.

More troubling than the unrealistic spending levels are the items missing from this budget. Last week, the President established a Commission on Social Security reform and announced his commitment to pursuing a national missile defense system. Nobody knows how much either of these broad initiatives will cost and the budget fails to account for either of these items.

Also conspicuously missing from this conference report are funds for debt reduction. This budget commits funds dedicated to the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds to debt reduction without devoting a single dollar of our projected on-budget surpluses towards paying down our national debt. This is like a family using one credit card to pay off another and then claiming that their debt was paid. The American people will not be deceived by this manipulation.

Finally, there is one more missing page that explains how all of our other priorities, including education, emergencies, defense increases and future tax cuts, will fit into the so-called contingency fund. Indeed, the overall tax and spending totals in this budget will virtually eliminate the non-Social Security, non-Medicare budget surplus. Any additional expenditures as expected in defense; any downward revisions of the surplus projections that may occur due to our slowing economy, increased unemployment, decreased labor productivity, and lower-than-expected revenue collections; or, any additional tax cuts above and beyond those contained in this so-called agreement—and I have reason to believe that these will occur since the Secretary of the Treasury testified last week that he would be willing to consider tax breaks that go beyond the budget resolution on a case-by-case basis—will return this nation back to the era of deficits, tapping our Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds.

Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 2001, I sent the Chairman of the Budget Committee a letter indicating I could support the proposed budget resolution provided that the resolution cut taxes no more than \$1.25 trillion, set realistic spending levels, and maintained a commitment to debt reduction by ensuring that any