affecting an estimated 500,000–700,000 people annually. Allegations received by the Social Security Administration's Hotline involving potential fraudulent use of Social Security numbers for identity theft increased from 62,000 cases in fiscal year 1999 to over 90,000 in fiscal year 2000—almost a 50 percent increase in just one year. In fact, the Sheriff's office of Broward County, Florida, my home county, recently said that the number of reported cases of identity fraud is up 3,000 percent in the past year.

What's worse, the nightmare of identity theft continues for the victims years after their identity has been stolen. Studies show identity theft victims spend 2 years trying to remove an average $18,000 in fraudulent charges from their credit reports. Also, victims spent an average of 175 hours and $808 in out-of-pocket costs (not including legal fees) trying to fix their problem.

Identity theft is such a concern for consumers that two of our nation's leading insurance companies now offer policies insuring their customers from financial losses associated with identity and credit card theft. Customer surveys found that internet-related liabilities were high on the list of losses most insurance companies have yet to address. One insurer's web site included statistics from the credit reporting agency, Trans Union, who reports receiving a 15-fold increase in calls with questions or complaints about identity theft from 1992 (35,000 calls) to 1998 (554,450—over 1,500 calls per day).

Clearly, there is a need for a comprehensive law that will better protect the privacy of Social Security numbers and protect the American public from being victimized. That is why last year, I, along with Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. KLECZKA, and other Subcommittee members introduced H.R. 4857—the ''Social Security Number Privacy and Identity Theft Prevention Act of 2000.'' This legislation took a comprehensive approach to achieve this goal by addressing the treatment of Social Security numbers in both the public and private sectors.

While H.R. 4857 was approved by the Committee on Ways and Means at the end of last year, it was not considered by the full House of Representatives before the end of the session, due to its referral to other Committees of jurisdiction who did not take action on the bill.

Today, I re-introduce the ''Social Security Number Privacy and Identity Theft Prevention Act of 2001.'' This bipartisan, comprehensive legislation is very similar to last year's bill. In the public sector, the bill would restrict the sale and public display of Social Security numbers, provide for enforcement of the provisions, and establish civil and criminal penalties for violations.

In the private sector, the bill would restrict the sale, purchase, and display of Social Security numbers, limit dissemination of Social Security numbers by credit reporting agencies, and make it more difficult for businesses to deny services if a customer refuses to provide his or her Social Security number.

Based on the thoughtful comments we have received, this new legislation reflects a small number of fair and appropriate modifications, including the following:

Since the Federal Trade Commission does not have jurisdiction over financial institutions, our bill would now authorize the U.S. Attorney General to issue regulations restricting the sale and purchase of Social Security numbers in the private sector.

Similar to our provisions affecting the public sector, we make explicit our intent that the prohibition of sale, purchase, or display of Social Security numbers in the private sector would not apply if Social Security numbers are needed to enforce child support obligations.

To help prevent other individuals from suffering the same tragic fate as Amy Boyer, we include a new provision that prohibits a person from obtaining or using another person's Social Security number in order to locate that individual with the intent to physically injure or harm the individual or use their identity for an illegal purpose.

We have clarified the provision that would prohibit businesses from denying services to individuals who refuse to provide their Social Security number, including an exception for those businesses that are required by Federal law to submit the individual's Social Security number to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to co-sponsor this critically important legislation. We must act now to protect the privacy of Americans' Social Security numbers and to stop identity thieves from preying on those who have spent a lifetime achieving their good credit rating.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization. I supported the vast majority of President Bush's original plan to 'Leave no child behind' because it demanded accountability for results combined with greater freedom from Washington-knows-best regulations. However, the original bipartisan program of local control was gutted in committee and the resulting bill unwisely expands the size and scope of the federal role in education.

The President's proposal to free states and school districts from thousands of burdensome federal regulations in exchange for a commitment for increased performance (also known as Straight A's), along with the proposal to allow low-income children attending failing schools to attend a private school were removed from the bill. The President's proposal to consolidate nearly 60 separate elementary and secondary education programs into flexible funding programs that states and local schools could use to meet their most pressing needs was also rejected. When they removed the pilot program for school choice, I realized that this bill would offer few new options for better scholastic opportunities for poor, inner city and rural children. If we can't offer the hope of a brighter future to the children who need it the most, then what have we accomplished?

While I support flexibility in federal funds to local school districts and school choice to allow our children to escape failing schools, I could not endorse increased federal testing requirements. In 1994, Congress passed the Improving America's Schools Act that mandated states to annually test students in reading and math in at least one grade in each of three grade ranges (3-5, 6-9, and 10-12). Implementation of these tests was to begin in the 2000-2001 school year, with a possible one-year waiver. As of January 19, 2001, only 11 states have complied with this testing requirement, 14 have largely complied and applied for a one-year waiver, and 6, including North Carolina must make changes to come into compliance with this law. The remaining states are still not in compliance with this law. I could not in good conscience vote to add another layer of testing requirements onto states that have not been able to implement the first federal testing mandate enacted in 1994.

It was a sad day for me to oppose a bill that originally showed such promise and innovation for the teaching and achievement of our nation's children. H.R. 1, the bill that emerged from committee increased the budget of the Department of Education, an agency that has already demonstrated its inability to account for the use of its funds. Additionally, it stripped even more local control and flexibility over the use of federal money. I cannot vote for a bill that continues the status quo by expanding the role of the federal government in local education and throws even more taxpayer money to an inefficient bureaucracy like the Department of Education. I believe that parents and local education officials including principals and teachers—not bureaucrats in Washington—know what is best for our children.

If the original elements of choice, flexibility, and consolidation had remained in the bill, I could have and would have voted for it. But in its final form, the bill is nothing more than a burdensome, bureaucratic, big-government shell of its former self. I will continue to work for restoration of President Bush's balanced proposals, as this bill moves to negotiations to reconcile the House and Senate versions. Until that time, I feel that I have no choice but to do what is in the best interest of my district and the people of North Carolina by voting ''no'' on final passage of this particular education bill.

FUEL TAXES

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 2001

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, our country faces difficult energy policy issues. Every day, people fill their gas tanks in order to get to work and support their families. For every gallon of gasoline they buy, they pay federal, state and local sales and excise taxes. Current federal policy requires taxes to be paid on the income that pays for all of those sales and excise taxes. In my view, that is double, sometimes triple, taxation. That is wrong. Taxpaying Americans should not be required to pay income taxes on taxes that must be paid. Congress should make every attempt to eliminate from our books policies that do just that.

That is why I rise today to introduce legislation that would allow all taxpayers to deduct from their income level those taxes that are paid on gasoline. This means that people would not be forced to pay income taxes on those taxes that are paid for fuel that Americans need to get to work, go to school, attend church, drive to hospitals to see hurting loved ones, and other of life's necessities.

This is not a quick fix to our energy problems—by any stretch of the imagination. It is an attempt to help give some relief to taxpayers who are forced to pay exorbitant fuel costs caused, in most part, by federal regulatory requirements. Those costs, especially in Illinois, are compounded by state and local sales taxes that rise as a percentage of the overall price of fuel instead of the per gallon excise taxes.

I believe it is wrong to ask Americans to pay income taxes on money that they pay in other taxes, whether it is a federal, state or local tax.

HONORING THE ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER OF THE OCCASION OF ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. VAN HILLEARY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 2001

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the United States Air Force's Arnold Engineering Development Center at Arnold Air Force Base, Tennessee, which celebrates its 50th Anniversary on June 25, 2001.

The test center is named after 5-star General Henry 'Hap' Arnold, World War II commander of the Army Air Corps, and the father of the United States Air Force. In 1944, General Arnold asked Dr. Theodore von Karman to form a scientific advisory group to chart a long-range research and development program for the Air Force. After World War II, members of this group visited Germany to view its research and development facilities. They were disturbed to find that the German scientists were years ahead of the United States in the development of aerospace technology. Fortunately for us, Germany had made these technological advances too late in the war, and had to surrender before it could take full advantage of them. Even today, it is chilling to think what might have happened if the Axis powers had been able to hold out just a little longer.

General Arnold knew that America was unlikely to be that fortunate again, and determined that in order to keep America's Air Force prepared to fight and win our nation's wars, we needed a first class flight simulation test facility. In 1949, Congress authorized $100 million for the construction of such a facility at the Army's old Camp Forrest between Tullahoma and Manchester, Tennessee. On June 25, 1951, President Harry S. Truman himself dedicated AEDC, declaring that, ''Never again with the United States ride the coat tails of other countries in the progress and development of the aeronautical art.''

In the 50 years since, the world's largest and most complex collection of flight simulation test facilities had made good on that promise. AEDC's wind tunnels, jet and rocket altitude test cells, space chambers and ballistic ranges have played a vital role in the development and sustainment of every American high performance aircraft, missile and space system in use today. Twenty-seven of the center's 59 test facilities are unique in the United States. Fourteen can be found nowhere else in the world. But what makes AEDC special can't be measured simply in nuts and bolts. It also lies in the unsurpassed quality of the engineers, scientists, technicians, craftsmen and support personnel who work there.

Thanks in part to the tireless efforts of these dedicated men and women, the Cold War that President Truman and General Arnold prepared for has been won. But now, America faces an uncertain world of emerging threats, requiring the development of an advanced American space and missile defense, and a new generation of manned and unmanned aircraft. As it has since its inception, AEDC will lead the way in the U.S. Air Force's efforts to protect American liberty by remaining the world's preeminent aerospace power.

I salute the hard work of the men and women of AEDC, both past and present, and look forward to AEDC's next 50 years as America's premier flight simulation test facility.

RECOGNIZING RICHARD THOMAS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 2001

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Richard Thomas, who is retiring after 28 years as the viticulture instructor at Santa Rosa Junior College in Sonoma County, California

Mr. Thomas is the country's leading authority on wine grape production and has introduced growing techniques that have improved the crop quality and made Sonoma County one of the premier wine grape growing regions in the world.

During a yearlong sabbatical in New Zealand and Australia in the late 1980's, Mr. Thomas studied vine trellising techniques that revolutionized wine grape growing in California. By managing the grapevine's leaf canopy and lifting the vines to expose the grapes to air and sunshine, the fruit is more flavorful and is less susceptible to disease. By utilizing the technique taught by Mr. Thomas, growers are able to produce the highest quality of grapes. Sonoma County is now considered the world leader in canopy management.

Mr. Thomas has educated and trained the majority of people who own or manage vineyards on California's North Coast. According to his own estimates, 70% of Sonoma County's vineyards are either owned or managed by one of his former students.

In addition to his teaching duties, Mr. Thomas founded the Sonoma County Grape Growers Association and the Sonoma County Vineyard Technical Group.

He has coordinated the wine judging at the Sonoma County Harvest Fair, the West Coast Wine Judging in Reno, Nevada and the Central Coast Wine Judging in Santa Maria, California.

Mr. Thomas lectures throughout the country on wine grape growing and also writes a monthly column for Vineyard & Winery Management Magazine.

Mr. Speaker, because of Mr. Thomas' innumerable contributions to wine grape growing and specifically to the industry in Sonoma County, it is fitting to honor him today and to congratulate him for his many accomplishments.

HONORING JACK MURTAUGH

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 2001

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 30th, 2001 family, friends, community leaders and well-wishers will gather to congratulate Mr. Jack Murtaugh on his retirement from the Interfaith Conference of Greater Milwaukee, the last 12 as its executive director.

I have known Jack for many years, and have always admired his vision to unite persons of all faiths with a common agenda of social justice. Together with other community and religious leaders in the greater Milwaukee area, Jack has worked to move our community from awareness of issues such as poverty and discrimination to a platform of action.

Jack's service to Milwaukee and Wisconsin dates back to the 1960s when he founded the Center for Community Concerns and served as its executive director in Racine in 1968. In the '70s he was appointed to then-Governor Patrick Lucey's Task Force on Offender Rehabilitation and the Task Force on the Metropolitan Problem. Jack's work and his potential were recognized in 1971 when he was named one of ''Five Outstanding Young Men in Wisconsin'' by the Wisconsin Jaycees.

In an effort to seek global solutions to human rights issues, Jack took a five-month sabbatical traveling alone throughout Africa, including South Africa and Kenya, and South America. He made important connections with leaders in each country and village he visited and worked with them to increase understanding and dialogue among people of different faiths from diverse races and cultures.

Jack brought those lessons back to the states. In 1982, he joined the staff of the Interfaith Conference as program Director in 1982, and was appointed vicar for human concerns for the Milwaukee Archdiocese in 1987. In 1989, Jack was named Executive Director for Interfaith, where he has expanded the presence of the Conference in the Milwaukee community, strengthened relationships internally and externally, and re-affirmed the dedication of the Conference for staff and its many volunteers.

The greater Milwaukee community will acknowledge Jack's contributions by honoring him with the 2001 Social Justice Award from the Archdiocese of Milwaukee (5/01), and the 2001 Annual Philip E. Lerman Racial Justice Award from the YMCA (6/01).

Jack and his wife Lucia will continue to live in Milwaukee, and will continue to address issues of social and economic justice in defense of human dignity. I rise to commend Jack Murtaugh for his commitment to justice for all and for years of work to create compassionate care for those in need.