

Its first dozen years have ushered in significant change. Thousands of disabled Americans have joined the workforce, many for the first times in their lives. The ramps, curb cuts, braille signs and captioned television programs that were once novel are now ubiquitous.

However, despite such demonstrable progress, the ADA increasingly has become a legal lightning rod with courts issuing narrow interpretations that limit its scope and undermine its intent.

In its most recent term, for example, the United States Supreme Court issued a series of decisions involving the ADA, ruling against the claimant each time.

In *Chevron v. Echazabal*, the Court held that an employer can keep a worker from filling a job that could be harmful to the worker's own health, even though the ADA itself only allows employers to deny jobs to those who pose a "direct threat" to other workers.

Whether intended or not, this decision stands for the proposition that disabled Americans really cannot exercise independent judgment on what is best for them. Thus, *Echazabal* perpetuates the paternalistic attitudes that the ADA sought to combat.

In another devastating blow, the Court held in *Toyota Motor Manufacturing v. Williams* that a worker needed to show that her condition not only affected her on the job, but also prevented or restricted her from performing "tasks that are of central importance to most people's daily lives." Because the claimant in *Williams* had not sufficiently demonstrated how her disability limited her in performed tasks such as brushing her teeth, the Court said, she was not "disabled" under the ADA.

Is this really what Congress intended when it passed the ADA? That a determination of "disability" would require courts to examine whether claimants can brush their teeth? The answer is obviously no.

This decision has put disabled Americans who avail themselves of the law's protection in a Catch-22: They must demonstrate that their impairment is substantial enough so that it constitutes a disability under the ADA, but not so substantial that the claimant cannot do the job without a reasonable accommodation.

In other recent ADA decisions, the Supreme Court has stripped state workers of their right to sue for monetary damages for ADA violations, and held that corrective or mitigating measures such as eyeglasses or medication should be considered in determining whether an individual is "disabled" under the law.

The latter decisions have produced absurd results in lower courts. People with diabetes, heart conditions, mental illness and even cancer have been ruled "too functional"—with corrective or mitigating measures—to be considered "disabled."

Mr. Speaker, this is clearly not what Congress intended when it passed the ADA and President Bush signed it into law. We intended the law to have broad application. In fact, any person who is disadvantaged by an employer due to a real or perceived impairment by others may bring a claim under the ADA. That's because, simply put, the point of the law is not disability; the point is discrimination.

Justin Dart Jr., the gentle giant who worked tirelessly on behalf of the ADA and the disabled throughout the world, would no doubt agree.

Perhaps best known as the father of the ADA, Justin passed away on June 22nd. For

nearly five decades, he was one of the world's most courageous, passionate and effective advocates for civil and human rights.

Many called him the Martin Luther King of the disability civil rights movement. But he thought of himself in more humble terms—simply as a soldier of justice. I was fortunate to call him a dear friend.

As we commemorate this 12th anniversary of the ADA today and pay tribute to a wonderful man who devoted his life to promoting justice and equality for others, let's recognize that our work is far from finished. The series of Supreme Court decisions on the ADA remind us of that, and command us to begin discussing possible legislative responses.

We have come so far in the last dozen years. And we have poured a strong foundation for our house of equality, where Americans are judged by their ability and not their disability.

Yet, the promise of the ADA remains unfulfilled today but still is within reach. It falls to us now to carry on the fight and to realize Justin Dart's vision of a revolution of empowerment. Let's not rest until the work is done.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTIES AND THE COSTS OF WAR AGAINST TERRORISM ACT

HON. CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2002

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the attacks of September 11th, 2001 caused significant changes throughout our society. For our military services, this included increased force protection, greater security, and of course the deployment to and prosecution of the War on Terrorism in Afghanistan and elsewhere. Sadly, one of the first acts of our President was to waive the high deployment overtime pay of our servicemen and women who are serving on the front lines of our new War. The Navy estimates that the first year costs of this pay would equal about 40 cruise missiles. The total cost of this overtime pay may only equal about 300 cruise missiles, yet this Administration said it would cost too much to pay our young men and women what the Congress and the previous Administration had promised them.

In another ironic twist, the War on Terrorism has the potential to bring the U.S. military into American life as never before. A Northern Command has been created to manage the military's activity within the continental United States. Operation Noble Eagle saw combat aircraft patrolling the air above major metropolitan areas, and our airports are only now being relieved of National Guard security forces. Moreover, there is a growing concern that the military will be used domestically, within our borders, with intelligence and law enforcement mandates as some now call for a review of the Posse Comitatus Act prohibitions on military activity within our country.

In the 1960s, the lines between illegal intelligence, law enforcement and military practices became blurred as Americans wanting to make America a better place for all were targeted and attacked for political beliefs and political behavior. Under the cloak of the Cold

War, military intelligence was used for domestic purposes to conduct surveillance on civil rights, social equity, antiwar, and other activists. In the case of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Operation Lantern Spike involved military intelligence covertly operating a surveillance operation of the civil rights leader up to the time of his assassination. In a period of two months, recently declassified documents on Operation Lantern Spike indicate that 240 military personnel were assigned in the two months of March and April to conduct surveillance on Dr. King. The documents further reveal that 16,900 man-hours were spent on this assignment. Dr. King had done nothing more than call for black suffrage, an end to black poverty, and an end to the Vietnam War. Dr. King was the lantern of justice for America: spreading light on issues the Administration should have been addressing. On April 4, 1968, Dr. King's valuable point of light was snuffed out. The documents I have submitted for the record outline the illegal activities of the FBI and its ColtelPro program. A 1967 memo from J. Edgar Hoover to 22 FBI field offices outlined the COINTELPRO program well: "The purpose of this new counterintelligence endeavor is to expose, disrupt, misdirect, or otherwise neutralize" black activist leaders and organizations.

As a result of the Church Committee hearings, we later learned that the FBI and other government authorities were conducting black bag operations that included illegally breaking and entering private homes to collect information on individuals. FBI activities included "bad jacketing," or falsely accusing individuals of collaboration with the authorities. It included the use of paid informants to set up on false charges targeted individuals. And it resulted in the murder of some individuals. Geronimo Pratt Ji Jaga spent 27 years in prison for a crime he did not commit. And in COINTELPRO documents subsequently released, we learn that Fred Hampton was murdered in his bed while his pregnant wife slept next to him after a paid informant slipped drugs in his drink.

Needless to say, such operations were well outside the bounds of what normal citizens would believe to be the role of the military, and the Senate investigations conducted by Senator Frank Church found that to be true. Though the United States was fighting the spread of communism in the face of the Cold War, the domestic use of intelligence and military assets against its own civilians was unfortunately reminiscent of the police state built up by the Communists we were fighting.

We must be certain that the War on Terrorism does not threaten our liberties again. Amendments to H.R. 4547, the Costs of War Against Terrorism Act, that would increase the role of drug interdiction task forces to include counter intelligence, and that would increase the military intelligence's ability to conduct electronic and financial investigations, can be the first steps towards a return to the abuses of constitutional rights during the Cold War. Further, this bill includes nearly \$2 billion in additional funds for intelligence accounts. When taken into account with the extra-judicial incarceration of thousands of immigration violators, the transfer of prisoners from law enforcement custody to military custody, and the consideration of a "volunteer" terrorism tip program, America must stand up and protect itself from the threat not only of terrorism, but of a police state of its own.

There does exist a need to increase personnel pay accounts, replenish operations and maintenance accounts and replace lost equipment. The military has an appropriate role in protecting the United States from foreign threats, and should remain dedicated to preparing for those threats. Domestic uses of the military have long been prohibited for good reason, and the same should continue to apply to all military functions, especially any and all military intelligence and surveillance. Congress and the Administration must be increasingly vigilant towards the protection of and adherence to our constitutional rights and privileges. For, if we win the war on terrorism, but create a police state in the process, what have we won?

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION ACT

**HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, July 26, 2002*

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation (H.R. 1112, 106th Congress) that is intended to help solve the shortage of available, affordable child care facilities. In my congressional district in New York City, more than half of all women with pre-school children are in the workforce and the need for child care is enormous. This is not a local problem but one that is national in nature.

The "Children's Development Commission Act" or "Kiddie Mac," (H.R. 1112, 106th), will address this problem by authorizing HUD to issue guarantees to lenders who are willing to lend money to build or rehabilitate child care facilities. It also creates the Children's Development Commission which will certify the loans and create federal child care standards. Kiddie Mac will also give "micro-loans" to facilities which need to make the necessary changes to come up to licensing standards, as well as provide them with lower cost fire and liability insurance. Through some of the premiums paid by the lenders, a non-profit foundation will be formed which would focus on research on child care and development, as well as create educational materials to guide potential providers through the certification process.

It is late in the session but I urge my colleagues to consider the proposal and join me in enacting it this year or in a future Congress.

#### IN HONOR OF TEXAS EQUUSEARCH MOUNTED SEARCH & RECOVERY TEAM AND ITS FOUNDER, TIMOTHY (TIM) A. MILLER

**HON. NICK LAMPSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, July 26, 2002*

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tim Miller and the Texas EquuSearch Mounted Search and Recovery Team (TES).

Since Tim had horses of his own, and given a rash of missing persons in his area, many people suggested that he should start a horse

search and rescue team. Tim shared this idea with some friends and was amazed at all the positive interest and support received.

The first official TES officer meeting was held in August of 2000 and then the work started. Tim, and his faithful and incredibly supportive wife Georgeann Miller, never realized how difficult forming an organization like this could be; or that it would require giving up his business as a general contractor to devote himself full time to the founding and operation of TES. Two years later, I'm proud to say that Tim and his all-volunteer TES team are working harder than ever to help bring home loved ones who are missing.

Since Texas EquuSearch was formed, they have been on nearly one hundred searches in two short years. They have an admirable record of working constructively with our nation's local law enforcement agencies and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As these words were being written Tim and TES are on still another search near TES's headquarters in Dickinson, Texas.

TES was founded in loving memory of Laura Miller, Tim's daughter. The success rate of TES in finding missing people and returning many of them home alive is truly impressive. It is a living tribute to the spirit of Laura Miller. That spirit is alive and well in every volunteer of TES. The following words are Tim's own:

I know how important a search and rescue team can be. My daughter, Laura Miller was abducted in September of 1984. I went to the police department to report her missing and file a missing persons report. Five months prior to Laura's disappearance the remains of a young lady named Heidi Villareal Fye, were found on some property at an abandoned oil field on Calder Road in League City, Texas. I told the police officer taking the report of my concerns, and would they please check the area where she had been found, or tell me where it was located so that I might check myself. Of course they said Laura is sixteen, she ran away and will be coming back home. We called and drove to all of Laura's friends to see if anyone had seen her. Three days went by and I found out that Heidi had only lived 4 blocks from our house. So I went back to the police station to tell them my new worries about the close location of our houses and could they go and check the field where Heidi was or please take me to where it was located. Again they said Laura was sixteen and she had run away so we should go home and wait by the phone for her to call.

The days turned into weeks, weeks into months, several trips to the police station and still no Laura. Seventeen months later, kids were riding dirt bikes on Calder Road when they smelled a foul odor. They felt as though it was a dead animal but walked over to the area of the odor to see anyway. The odor was not a dead animal; it was in fact the remains of a female who had been there approximately two months. The police were called out to investigate, and during the investigation stumbled across the remains of yet another female some sixty feet from the other. These remains of the other girl found were those of my daughter, Laura Miller. The remains of the other girl found there have not been identified to this day and still is only known as Jane Doe.

These were by far the most frustrating and lonely seventeen months of my life and there was some feeling of relief when Laura was found, at least now we know. I often think of what would have changed back in 1984 when Laura disappeared, if there had been a Texas EquuSearch. Would Laura have been found alive? Probably not, but she would have been

found and there probably would have been some evidence on the scene to help the police in the investigation. Would Jane Doe have been murdered? My thoughts—probably not or at least not at that spot.

Mr. Speaker, the Texas EquuSearch Mounted Search & Recovery Team, was founded in loving memory of Laura Miller by her father Timothy A. Miller to search for our nation's missing and abducted children and adults. It has received help from the citizens of Houston, the State of Texas and the United States to successfully search for and find the lost, abducted, and missing. Our nation's communities and law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, have already recognized the significance and value of the Texas EquuSearch Mounted Search & Recovery. It is now appropriate that the People and the Congress of the United States of America applaud and urge on Texas EquuSearch to continue forward—assuring that "The lost are not alone".

#### ANIMAL FIGHTING ENFORCEMENT ACT

**HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, July 26, 2002*

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Animal Fighting Enforcement Act. This legislation targets the reprehensible and surprisingly widespread activities of dogfighting and cockfighting, in which animals are bred and trained to fight, often drugged to heighten their aggression, and placed in a pit to fight to the death—all for their amusement and illegal wagering of the animals' handlers and the spectators.

These are indefensible activities, and our state laws reflect public disdain for these forms of animal cruelty. Dogfighting is banned in all 50 states, and it is a felony in 46 states. Cockfighting is banned in 47 states, and it is a felony in 26 states.

Even though there is a something verging on a national consensus that dogfighting and cockfighting should be treated as criminal conduct, the industries continue to thrive. According to The Humane Society of the United States, there are 11 underground dogfighting publications. There are numerous above-ground cockfighting magazines, including The Gamecock, The Feathered Warrior, and Grit & Steel that promote cockfights, rally cockfighters to defend the practice, and advertise and sell fighting birds and the accoutrements of animal fighting.

Earlier this year, the House and Senate passed legislation to close loopholes in Section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act and bar any interstate shipment or exports of dogs or birds for fighting. That was a much-needed and long-overdue action by the House, and I commend the leadership provided on that legislation by Representatives EARL BLUMENAUER, TOM TANCREDO, and COLLIN PETERSON. Senators WAYNE ALLARD and TOM HARKIN led the parallel effort in the other chamber. The legislation was designed to help the states enforce their laws and provide a strong federal statement and statute against dogfighting, and cockfighting. In states where cockfighting is illegal, cockfighters had been using the loophole in federal law as a smokescreen to conceal their animal fighting activities; they