

before us shows our effort and commitment to ensure that programs aimed at the prevention of child abuse and neglect continue. I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides for their hard work and efforts in developing this mutual compromise in the bill before us for consideration today.

I especially want to thank the full committee chairman, Mr. BOEHNER, for his support of this bill, and Mr. GREENWOOD for his diligence in ensuring that infants born addicted to alcohol or drugs receive necessary services.

I want to also thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. ROEMER, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. MILLER, for their cooperation in working towards this alternative bill before us today.

This bill provides for the continued provision of important federal resources for identifying and addressing the issues of child abuse and neglect, and for supporting effective methods of prevention and treatment.

It also continues local projects with demonstrated value in eliminating barriers to permanent adoption and addressing the circumstances that often lead to child abandonment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill emphasizes the prevention of child abuse and neglect before it occurs. It promotes partnerships between child protective services and private and community-based organizations, including education, and health systems to ensure that services and linkages are more effectively provided.

The bill retains language that appropriately addresses a growing concern over parents being falsely accused of child abuse and neglect and the aggressiveness of social workers in their child abuse investigations. It retains language to increase public education opportunities to strengthen the public's understanding of the child protection system and appropriate reporting of suspected incidents of child maltreatment.

The agreement continues to foster cooperation between parents and child protective service workers by requiring caseworkers to inform parents of the allegations made against them, and improves the training opportunities and requirements for child protective services personnel regarding the extent and limits of their legal authority and the legal rights of parents and legal guardians.

It also ensures the safety of foster and adoptive children by requiring states to conduct criminal background checks for prospective foster and adoptive parents and other adult relatives and non-relatives residing in the household.

Lastly, this bill expands adoption opportunities to provide for services for infants and young children who are disabled or born with life-threatening conditions, and requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the annual number of infants and young children abandoned each year.

I again want to thank my colleagues for their work on this bill and urge them to join me in support of this effort to improve the prevention and treatment of child abuse by supporting H.R. 5601, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2002.

KEEPING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SAFE ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES C. GREENWOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2002

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the adoption of H.R. 5601, The Keeping Children and Families Safe Act. I am pleased that after the House passed a similar version of this bill in the Spring with overwhelming support, we have the opportunity to make this critical legislation a reality.

The Keeping Children and Families Safe Act, in combination with other federal child welfare statutes, assists in our national efforts to protect children from abuse and neglect. The Act requires that the Federal-State child welfare system supports and improves the infrastructure of child protective services, develops statewide networks of community-based family support and child abuse prevention programs, and supports demonstration projects to determine how best to improve the well being of abused or neglected children.

The bill continues to provide important Federal resources for identifying child abuse, neglect, and family violence, and for supporting effective methods of prevention and treatment. It also continues local projects with demonstrated value in eliminating barriers to permanent adoption and addressing the circumstances that often lead to child abandonment.

I believe this bill strikes a successful balance between providing appropriate treatment services, such as a plan of safe care for infants affected by illegal substance abuse, and accountability, such as the report that the Secretary of Health and Human Services must submit describing the extent to which States are implementing the policies outlined in the bill.

I want to thank Congressmen PETE HOEKSTRA and TIM ROEMER in this effort, Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Select Education, as well as Chairman BOEHNER and ranking member MILLER of the full Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5601, and I reserve the balance of my time.

NATIONAL FOREST ORGANIZA- TIONAL CAMP FEE IMPROVE- MENT ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2002

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5316 is the culmination of a year and a half of work by parents and volunteers who wanted to save the camps that serve under-privileged children and disabled adults.

The Forest Service is in the midst of pricing off forest lands, the very camps that serve these children and adults. Government should not be making a profit on disadvantaged children. We should charge these camps a mod-

est fee that pays for the paperwork and maybe a little extra if the camps use a lot of land. But not \$71,000 per year, which could happen in at least one instance if this bill is not enacted.

If we, the Congress, cannot change a law that requires the Forest Service to charge exorbitant use fees on youth camps and camps for disabled adults, fees that almost certainly will lead to the camps closing down their operations, then what laws should we pass?

This bill before us today reforms and improves the fee structure used by the Forest Service for non-profit recreational camps—camps operated by organizations such as the Girl Scouts and church groups. Blame should not be attached to "Scrooge-like" Forest Service officials. Let's face it; the re-calculation of fees is required by a law enacted by Congress. But the result is the same. Fees will dramatically increase for camps across the nation. In one case in Tucson, Arizona, the fee would go from \$4,500 to \$71,000 per year.

The Tucson Citizen put it well in a recent editorial:

With so many arms of government raising fees on just about every service known to taxpayers, one might start to wonder how their general tax dollars are being spent . . .

Ever vigilant for new revenue-raising opportunities, the Forest Service then proposed raising the rents on national forest land that is used by nonprofit organizations for summer camps. Targeted cash cows include the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, religious and men's groups. The Forest Service pulled that one off by borrowing a trick from local governments loathe to commit political suicide by raising tax rates. They accomplish the same thing, however, by reappraising the value of land, making it subject to higher taxes under the old rates once it's deemed more valuable.

We must establish a new, common-sense fee system that is rational and will allow camps to remain on forest lands while providing a fair return to the American taxpayer. Surely, there can be no better use of Federal land than by under-privileged children and disabled adults.

The National Forest Organizational Camp Fee Improvement Act will establish a new fee system based on acreage used by the camps, providing incentives to make the most efficient use of the Federal lands. To prevent large spikes in fees, the camp's fee would be 5%—a reasonable rate of return to the U.S. Government—of the value of the land based on rural land values, not developable land values.

Therein lies the key. We are not going to turn these camp sites inside our beautiful national forests into suburban housing tracts. So, why should the fee be based on a value of the land which will never be realized, rather than the only alternative use to a camp site, which is agricultural uses?

The land value we propose to use is a statistic calculated by USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS). NASS is not part of the Forest Service, thus ensuring it is independent and appraises the value fairly. The NASS valuation is based on previous sales of farmlands. This is a departure from the current methodology, where valuation is determined by future probable sale prices of land for development. Further, the land value is a 5-year rolling average of agriculture lands by County, thereby taking into account geographical differences and the need to even out large fluctuations in fees over time.

This legislation also provides two discounts to the base fee to maximize the number of underprivileged children and disabled adults who attend camp. There is a 100% reduction proportionate to the number of participants who are physically disabled or children at risk, and there is a discount of 60% to recognize the benefits to the community of organizational camps serving certain character-building youth programs.

But even worthy organizations operating camp sites should pay the administrative cost of a permit. So, there is a minimum fee required that represents, on a regional forest basis, the average cost to the Forest Service to administer the permit. This fee is expected to be approximately \$300 to \$500 per year.

Our Federal lands are an important resource for our Nation. It's only right that we should give priority to children to learn, play, and enjoy these areas. We want them to grow up appreciating outdoors and environmental values, and to have a childhood filled with positive wilderness experiences.

This bill benefits camps of all types in every corner of America.

There are 320 camps in 25 States and Puerto Rico affected by this bill—from Arizona and California in the west, to Minnesota in the north, Florida and Tennessee in the south, and New Hampshire in New England.

This bill is supported by the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, various church groups, and the Forest Service. Even the Forest Service agrees that the current law is not fair. The administration supports this bill. In a letter dated October 9, 2002, USDA Under Secretary Mark Rey wrote:

The Administration supports H.R. 5316 and your efforts to revise the existing Forest Service organizational camp permit fee structure. . .

The Forest Service became concerned last year when it learned that some camp permit fees in Arizona would increase substantially as a result of the new appraisals and fee calculations required under the current system. Such increases would create significant financial burdens for many permit holders and could cause a number of sponsoring organizations to terminate and close their camps. These fee increases and possible camp closures are unacceptable to the Forest Service, just as they are to you. . .

Enactment of H.R. 5316 would provide sponsoring organizations and the Forest Service the mechanism to set and adjust the fee in a manner that would continue these important, long-term relationships that provide immeasurable benefits to America's youth.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not express my thanks and appreciation to the many folks in Tucson, Arizona, who have advised me and my staff on this fee structure change.

Dillard Broderick from the Church of Latter Day Saints has been an especially strong, stable force in the effort to Save the Camps.

Gail Gurney from the Sahuaro Girl Scout Council has worked tirelessly to do whatever was necessary to help.

Lou Salute from the Boy Scouts, David English from Southern Pines Baptist Camp, Bob Lofgren from Amphitheater Men's Club, and Lori Block from St. Mark's Presbyterian Church round out the phenomenal people who volunteer part of their lives to help children and want nothing more than to give back to the community.

I am proud that the House of Representatives is doing its part to help these kids, their parents, and the volunteers.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

BENIGN BRAIN TUMOR CANCER REGISTRIES AMENDMENT ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2002

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to have witnessed real, grass root's effort and hard work come to fruition in the passage of S. 2558, The Benign Brain Tumor Cancer Registries Amendment Act, by unanimous consent of the House this evening.

In January of 2001, I introduced H.R. 239, The Benign Brain Tumor Cancer Registries Amendment Act. A little over a year later, Senator JACK REED introduced the Senate companion, S. 2558.

The origin of this bill goes back to my constituent, Lloyd Morgan, a brain tumor survivor. Lloyd is from Berkeley, and I first met him at a town hall meeting.

That day, Mr. Morgan brought to my attention the fact the National Program of Cancer Registries does not collect data on benign brain tumors and the critical problems that this public health oversight creates.

I agreed to introduce legislation to correct the problem and soon after introduced The Benign Brain Tumor Cancer Registries Amendment Act.

The bill is very simple. With the passage of S. 2558, "benign" brain tumors will for the first time be included in the data collection of cancer registries. Medical system organizations use cancer data in funding decisions, investigations, research, and care facilities. Because data is not being collected on benign brain tumors, these tumors do not receive critical research funding. Of course, lack of research directly impacts both survivors and patients.

Additional research is vital because of the threat to life that both benign and cancerous

brain tumors present. Brain tumors are the second leading cause of cancer death for children and the third leading cause of cancer death in young adults ages 15–34. The greatest increase in brain tumors has been among people 75 years of age or older.

Only 37 percent of males and 52 percent of females survive five years following the diagnosis of a primary benign or malignant brain tumor. Each year, approximately 100,000 people in the United States are diagnosed with a primary or metastatic brain tumors. Nationwide, the incidence of brain tumors has increased by 25 percent since 1975 and the reasons for this increase are unknown.

For many types of tumors, the distinction between benign and malignant is significant. For tumors of the brain, this distinction is not as clear. A tumor, whether malignant or benign, is a collection of cells that grow as rapidly as malignant tumors, however based on location and size, even benign brain tumors can be life threatening.

Benign brain tumors account for almost 40 percent of all brain tumors. Not including these tumors in the cancer registry underestimates the incidence of brain tumors in the general population. All brain tumors, both cancerous and benign, are potentially life threatening.

What would the passage of the Benign Brain Tumor Cancer Registries Act mean for my constituent Lloyd Morgan? In his words it means: "that the doctors pronounced that would surely end my life within days or hours of discovery (they were afraid to move me by gurney to surgery because my brain was about to split in two) will now be counted. It also means that Jan McCormack who has watched her sister Carla deteriorate and is now on a death watch in hospice care from a "benign" brain tumor will be assured that her sister's tumors and ultimate death will also be counted. It means that Jeff Licht's situation where his "benign" brain tumor has come back 4 times after it was "completely" removed the first time will provide data on re-occurrence. And it means that for countless others who suffer devastating brain deficits and shortened lives because of "benign" brain tumors will now have their tumors and their untimely deaths count. And by counting and having information on these "benign" brain tumors we may finally find the information that has been missing to point the way toward causation and therefore prevention of these devastating illnesses."

I sincerely appreciate Mr. Morgan for bringing this significant public health oversight to my attention, and for his tireless efforts in support of the legislation we initiated and ultimately passed here on the floor of the House tonight.

The passage of this bill truly represents democracy in action.