

are uninsured or come from disadvantaged backgrounds, these individuals should have the right to access to quality health care. That is why I support community health centers. These safety-net health care centers provide health care for predominately uninsured individuals, Medicaid beneficiaries and other vulnerable patients regardless of their ability to pay. Without CHC's many of my constituents that suffer from chronic disease like diabetes or cardiovascular disease would not have access to health care. They would not have the eye and foot exams to prevent blindness or amputation or the medications to help them control their blood glucose levels, blood pressure or cholesterol levels. Pregnant women would not have access to prenatal care and children would not have the vaccinations they require.

Until we can find a solution to universal health care, we must continue to support other systems of care that treat vulnerable populations. Safety-net health centers provide the essential preventative and clinical healthcare treatment services aimed at controlling and preventing the onset of chronic diseases, cancers and other anomalies that continue to plague New Mexican's in growing numbers.

TRIBUTE TO THE JENKINTOWN
UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. JOSEPH M. HOFFEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2002

Mr. HOFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Jenkintown United Methodist Church which is celebrating its 100th anniversary on November 1, 2002. One hundred thirty five years ago, the Jenkintown United Methodist Church was established to provide the people of Jenkintown with a local Methodist place of worship. The congregation is now celebrating its 100th anniversary in its current location.

Led by Rev. Jay R. Newlin, the church continues to be a vital and thriving community of faith. The Jenkintown United Methodist Church places a strong emphasis on outreach. It operates foreign missions in Africa and Indonesia, national missions in Appalachia, New Mexico, and works with several inner city Philadelphia churches.

Within the local Jenkintown community, the church is home to several ministries and missions. "Loaves and Fishes," a food cupboard established by the church in 1985 assists more than 40 families per week. The church is also host to weekly meetings to help those who struggle with addiction as well as their friends and family. A Community Teen Center was organized in 2000 as a drug-free and alcohol-free safe haven for local teenagers. The church also works with a retirement home on the Adopt-a-Grandparent program providing the opportunity for children and youth to participate in the local ministry.

I congratulate the Jenkintown United Methodist Church on its 100 years of service to the local, national and world community.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF
MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ
RESOLUTION OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2001

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the past thirteen months have presented challenges on several international and domestic fronts. The current economic conditions facing our Nation are impacting the very day-to-day activities of all Americans. In addition, America has enlisted in a war to prevent future terrorist attacks on our homeland. The events of 9-11-02, have opened our eyes to the kind of terror from abroad that many have endured from within.

Let me be clear—we must use our able resources to stop Al Qaeda from further terrorizing freedom-loving people.

After listening intently to the case for action that the Bush Administration has presented and talking with many of my constituents, I believe that there is insufficient information to warrant sending our young men and women into harm's way. I oppose the current Congressional resolution for the following reasons:

- (1) Lack of international support and cooperation;
- (2) Over-extension of military resources;
- (3) War against Al Qaeda is continuing;
- (4) No exit strategy has been defined; and
- (5) Cost is yet undetermined.

The Bush Administration has failed to provide sufficient evidence linking Saddam to Al Qaeda; therefore, a preemptive unilateral strike is not warranted at this time. The Administration has failed to define its goal with regard to the use of force in Iraq. Until that definition is outlined and the aforementioned points are addressed, a preemptive strike against a sovereign state is premature.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF
MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ
RESOLUTION OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2002

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, now that the House and Senate have both authorized the President to use military force against Iraq, it is more important than ever to listen to voices of wisdom about the costs of waging war and the challenges of keeping the peace. With that in mind, I commend to my colleagues the admonitions of a dozen older constituents—retired bankers, diplomats, journalists and college presidents—published recently in the Cape Cod Times:

TWELVE OLD MEN (ON CAPE COD) SAY "NO" TO A UNILATERAL STRIKE

"Older men," Herbert Hoover told the 1944 Republican National Convention, "declare war. But it is youth that must fight and die."

Our nation was, when Mr. Hoover made that statement, defending itself against fascists and militarists who had unleashed the dogs of war on us and our allies.

Most of us served in that war, and we have vivid memories of it. Many of our friends—youth at the time—fought and died in defense of their country. But we and our allies prevailed, and freedom survived.

Then, with the Marshall Plan, our nation waged peace, helping rebuild and democratize the countries we had defeated. In time, those countries became staunch allies.

Today we are on edge of a different sort of war. Our President, under pressure from our allies and a few members of his own party, has with apparent reluctance asked the U.N. to pressure Saddam Hussein to live up to a number of Security Council resolutions. But Mr. Bush's vice-president, his national security adviser, his secretary of defense, and others, have made it clear that even though Iraq has agreed to let arms inspectors do their work, the White House objective still is a so-called "pre-emptive strike" intended to bring about the Iraqi regime change we failed to accomplish when we went to the defense of Kuwait, when the first President Bush was in the White House.

Now—before more young men and women are ordered into battle by those older men who see war as a solution to the world's problems—is a time for the other older men, such as ourselves, to raise our hands and say to those who lead our nation: "No!"

"No" to the pre-emptive war Mr. Bush and Mr. Cheney are, for whatever reasons, seeking to justify.

"No" to those in Washington who would rain death and destruction on the Iraqi people in order to rid them of their leader.

"No" to the notion that the immediate rewards such a war might accomplish will outweigh the furies it surely would incite, and the long-term chasm it would create between the West and the Muslim world.

"No" to plunging into a new war and taking on the responsibility of occupying a conquered Iraq, while we still have not rolled up the Al Qaeda terrorist network, while Afghanistan shows signs of slipping into a bloody anarchy, and while there still is no real progress toward calming the violence in Israel/Palestine.

We believe that as a member of the family of nations, the United States of America must, rather than rushing headlong into war, help establish an international consensus on dealing with whatever threat Iraq poses.

We agree with our President that the U.N. resolutions against Iraq need to be respected and enforced. But such resolutions must be enforced by the U.N., or by U.N. approval of action by its member nations.

We have seen too many wars. One Vietnam experience was enough. We believe that now, as always, war should be our nation's last option, not our first. And we believe that waging war on violence must begin at home, by raising our voices against a unilateral "pre-emptive strike."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3295,
HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2001

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, today we consider legislation that was intended to fix the problems in our election system. As the Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I have been particularly concerned about how such election reform would protect the voting rights of Hispanic American citizens. And I thank

Congressman CHARLIE GONZALEZ, who chairs the Hispanic Caucus' Civil Rights Task Force, for his leadership and assistance on this issue. His dedication to advancing the interests of current and future Latino voters deserves great praise.

Today, I join my colleague in urging this House to vote against the conference report of the Help America Vote Act. Last year, I voted against this bill because despite some of the progress it made, it failed to provide key safeguards that would ensure every voter would be able to cast a ballot and have that ballot counted.

Now, almost one year later, we have a bill that has emerged from conference which includes some major improvements but also unfortunately includes some major new obstacles to Latino voters. Some of these obstacles came from the bill passed by the other body, and others were added in conference for the first time and at the last minute.

Together, these obstacles create a bill that on balance will hurt Latino voters more than it will help. It is a sad irony that this is the end result of a process that began as an effort to address the voting difficulties of the 2000 general elections, where many minority voters were denied their right to vote because of faulty voter lists, intimidation, a lack of voter education, or other obstacles. Rather than take bold, unequivocal strides towards expanding civil rights protections and welcoming our nation's fastest growing bloc of minority voters, this bill is full of half-steps and backward steps that will dampen the voice of the Hispanic American electorate.

The major obstacle to Latino voters in this bill is the inclusion of a new voter identification requirement. This will be the first time in contemporary election law history that an identification requirement is federally mandated. The bill requires a voter to show valid photo identification, a copy of a current utility bill, a bank statement, government check or other government document that shows the name and address of the voter.

While it sounds reasonable to require identification at the polls in order to combat fraud—an effort I certainly support when done with genuine intent to make the voting process fair—the requirements in this conference report would particularly disenfranchise low income people, especially women and the elderly, who, for example, live in multi-person households and are less likely to drive, and therefore do not possess a driver's license, do not receive a utility bill in their name and may not have any of the other forms of identification listed in the bill.

In the past, such provisions have been overturned in federal court for violating the Voting Rights Act. Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Justice has prohibited such identification requirements because of the disparate impact they have on minority voters.

In addition to the identification requirement, which was in the other body's bill, new impediments to Latinos were added into the bill at the eleventh hour during conference. The most egregious of which is the creation of the "citizenship check-off box" mandate.

The conference agreement now imposes on states a new mandate that they cannot register voters who inadvertently miss checking off the citizenship box on their voter registration forms. This mandate does not apply to those who fail to mark the age check-off box.

This inconsistency makes no sense, as both citizenship and age are equal requirements to being eligible to vote. There is no acceptable reason why one criteria should be treated differently than the other.

Under this provision, it is entirely plausible that a citizen who is otherwise eligible to vote, who mistakenly misses the check-off box on citizenship, will either not be notified of the error or not be notified with sufficient time to rectify the mistake before the state cut-off date for registration.

Therefore, this change in the law could result in a state or local registrar targeting the voter registration forms of those with surnames that some people consider "foreign," to find any that left the citizenship box blank and then invalidate them, without ever telling the applicant. When the voter shows up to vote, he or she will not be on the voter rolls and then if offered a provisional ballot, that ballot will never be counted, because only the provisional ballots of successfully registered voters are counted.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, this conference report adds barriers to voter registration efforts through adding needless administrative red tape. Under the conference report, someone who registers to vote, who has been issued a current and valid driver's license, must include the license number on the registration form. Therefore, if citizens happen not to have their license with them when they register to vote, their voter registration form will not be processed. This constitutes a weakening of existing voter rights law, and creates barriers to the effectiveness of voter registration drives, as citizens would have to register at a later time if they happen not to have their driver's license with them on their first attempt to register.

For those who have not been issued a driver's license, the bill requires the last four digits of their social security number, which is then cross-checked against the Social Security Administration database—a database riddled with errors, especially in recording the names of Hispanic women.

And for those people with weak memories, who could easily forget their Social Security number, incorrectly record that number, they will have their voter registration form invalidated.

Besides these obstacles, the bill does include some improvements to our election system: more access to provisional ballots; the ability to verify a ballot before casting it; the required posting of voting information; and the creation of statewide voter list databases. However, a great deal of the bill's new benefits will be unavailable to many Latinos and others because of the new barriers the bill erects.

On balance, this bill does not deserve our support. It is not better than no bill at all. I urge all my colleagues to vote against this conference report and revisit election reform in the next Congress, where we can hopefully do the job right.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2002

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3295, the Help America Vote Act of 2002.

Chairman BOEHLERT and Chairman EHLERS of the Science Committee have already spoken about the need for voluntary, technology-neutral standards that address the accuracy, integrity and security of voting products and systems. They have explained and clarified the intent of the standards and research and development provisions in H.R. 3295. I fully agree with and support their statements.

In 1975, long before any other federal agency had looked at our voting equipment, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) reported on the technical deficiencies of voting systems in use. If we had heeded the recommendations of the 1975 report and NIST's subsequent 1988 report, we wouldn't be debating this bill today. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) will be an objective and technically qualified voice in the development of performance-based technical standards and guidelines. In addition, NIST will provide needed technical guidance on the research and development projects needed to improve our voting systems.

I would like to thank Chairman BOEHLERT and Chairman EHLERS for working with me in the initial development of the provisions related to technical standards and a research and development program. I especially want to thank my good friend STENY HOYER, the Ranking Member on the House Administration Committee, and Chairman NEY for their strong advocacy in retaining these provision in the final conference report. I also want to congratulate them on successfully concluding a long and difficult conference.

In closing, I would like to remind everyone that the basic cornerstone of trust that Americans place in our government is their belief and faith in the accuracy, integrity, and reliability of our voting systems. H.R. 3295 will strengthen the public's confidence in our voting systems.

I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 3295.

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER HOEKSTRA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2002

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are here today to consider H.R. 5601, the "Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2002" which reauthorizes and improves the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA), the Adoption Opportunities program, and the Abandoned Infants Act.

While I recognize and am disappointed that we were not able to come to agreement on all issues of the original bill, H.R. 3839, the bill