

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO JERRY RICH

HON. JOHNNY ISAKSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 2002

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend an American who exemplifies the opportunities and possibilities our free enterprise system brings to all Americans and, like so many Americans, an individual who has taken his success and its rewards and found a way to share it in a meaningful way.

I am pleased to rise today and commend Mr. Jerry Rich of Sugar Grove, Illinois, and I am very pleased to be joined by Speaker DENNIS HASTERT in this tribute. As the age of technology dawned in the 1970s, Jerry Rich applied his entrepreneurial spirit and personal dedication to develop a technology system capable of providing those in the financial markets with the ability to monitor disparate information on a single screen. Jerry Rich's innovation is now shared in the capital markets and on Wall Street by everyone. His innovation and success ultimately led to a merger of his company with Reuters and retirement from his business in 1988. But like so many Americans, Jerry Rich applied his success to his passion, and his passion to benefit America's youth.

Jerry Rich bought eight farms and combined them into what is now known as Sugar Grove Estate. A passionate golfer, Jerry set out to build and develop a unique golf course, and unique it is. Originally nine holes with three separate tees, Rich Harvest Links is now an eighteen-hole championship golf course, ranked by Golf Magazine as one of the top ten new private golf courses in America. Rich Harvest Acres has a staff of forty-five attending to this challenging 7,446-yard, par 72 golf course. While Rich Harvest Links is one of the most exclusive in America, currently with twenty-five members and a plan for twenty-five more in the future, it also is a golf course that Jerry Rich shares with amateur golfers in the great State of Illinois.

Jerry is very active in the youth program, "Hook a Kid on Golf," which introduces youths to the game of golf and has spread to twenty-nine states in America and Canada. He started a foundation that funds the operation for "Hook a Kid on Golf" in Illinois where, last year alone, one thousand five hundred children attended five-day clinics.

Jerry Rich embodies everything the American entrepreneurial spirit represents. Throughout his life he has taken risks, applied knowledge, sought innovation and built a business. From its success he has been rewarded, and with that success he shared with others. This is what America is all about, and Rich Harvest Links is not just a tribute to golf, but a tribute to a great man of Illinois who cares: Jerry Rich.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN REPOSITORY SITE APPROVAL ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2002

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, after careful consideration, I have decided that I cannot support this resolution.

The resolution would approve the site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, for a high-level nuclear waste repository. This is the site with which the Governor of Nevada has submitted a notice of disapproval under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended. Congressional approval of the joint resolution would override the governor's objections and would endorse the decision of the President approving the site. Under the law, the Energy Department would then be required to request the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to issue a construction license for the repository.

In my opinion, to vote for the resolution would mean voting to make a premature decision, based on incomplete science and without adequate consideration of all the important factors involved. I do not think that would be a responsible course or in the public interest.

The President's decision evidently was based on the recommendation of Energy Secretary Abraham, who said that he was convinced that sound science supports the Yucca Mountain site.

In reaching that conclusion the Secretary evidently relied on the Energy Department's comprehensive performance assessment. However, in recent months three other agencies have issued reports that cast serious doubt on that conclusion.

Last September, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste reported that, among other things, the system-performance assessment used assumptions that "mask a realistic assessment of risk" and that its analyses were "assumption-based, not evidence-supported."

Then, in December, the General Accounting Office identified more than 290 relevant issues, including such matters as the geologic integrity of the site and the flow of water through the site, and concluded that "DOE will not be able to submit an acceptable application [to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission] within the express statutory time frame for several years because it will take that long to resolve many technical issues."

In January of this year, the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board reported that it had "limited confidence in current performance estimates" underlying the Energy Department's recommendation and that it considered the technical bases for those estimates to be "weak to moderate"—far from a ringing endorsement, especially for a project of such scope and importance.

Those are not the only analyses that give me pause. Another appeared just last month

in a Science magazine article by Rodney C. Ewing, a faculty member at the University of Michigan, and Allison McFarlane, who is in the Security Studies Program at MIT. In the article, Dr. Ewing and Dr. McFarlane note that "the passive properties of the [Yucca Mountain] repository site do not provide a long-term barrier to radionuclide release." That means there will be a need to rely on other things—engineering fixes—to prevent such releases. They say that the choice of Yucca Mountain as a repository site "is based on an unsound engineering strategy and poor use of present understanding of the properties of spent nuclear fuel," and that "there are other unresolved technical issues," including "the continuing controversy over the frequency and impact of volcanic activity" at Yucca Mountain.

And they conclude that "a project of this importance, which has gone on for 20 years, should not go forward until the relevant scientific issues have been thoughtfully addressed . . . To move ahead without first addressing the outstanding scientific issues will only continue to marginalize the role of science and detract from the credibility of the DOE effort."

I agree with that conclusion, which is why I am troubled by what seems to be a rush to judgment on the part of the Administration.

I do think that there are very important considerations that argue in favor of establishing a repository for the kind of high-level nuclear wastes that are at issue here, particularly the potential role of such a repository for disposition of military wastes such as spent fuel from our Navy's nuclear-powered vessels and in connection with our efforts to avoid proliferation of nuclear weapons.

However, I think questions about Yucca Mountain in the context of homeland security are not clear-cut.

On the one hand, the Administration points to the fact that more than 161 million Americans now live within 75 miles of a site where highly radioactive materials are stored and that while these facilities "should be able to withstand current terrorist threats . . . that may not remain the case in the future," as Secretary Abraham wrote in his February 14th letter to the President, and would be "better secured . . . at Yucca Mountain, on federal land, far from population centers, that can withstand an attack well beyond any that is reasonably conceivable."

On the other hand, there is something to be said for the argument that transporting large quantities of such materials over long distances would multiply the current opportunities for terrorist attacks because the vehicles doing the transporting would be attractive targets that could not always be totally concealed.

Further, I am not convinced that the Administration has adequately made the case that Yucca Mountain is the right site for such a repository or that "a repository at Yucca Mountain is indispensable" for our energy security, as Secretary Abraham also claims in his February 14th letter to the President.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

So, as things now stand, I am not persuaded that the case has been made for selection of the Yucca Mountain site, and I therefore am not ready to override the Governor's objections by voting for this resolution.

TRIBUTE TO THE JOHN BOOTH
SENIOR CENTER

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 2002

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents for her commitment to our senior citizens.

Since 1965, the John Booth Senior Center has served the folks of East Baltimore. When first opened, the center was only one of 350 senior centers in the United States. Today, thanks to the efforts of its tireless director, June Goldfield, the center not only offers a community gathering place but a support service for East Baltimore's older citizens, enabling many of them to stay in the community as active, vital participants.

June began her full time employment with Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks almost 15 years ago and has dedicated herself to preserving and enhancing services for seniors. The center boasts unending activities and instruction as well as a close relationship with Hopkins Bayview Medical Center, which offers medical assistance to members. The ethnic food festival, prepared by center members, is among the most enjoyable activities.

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating June Goldfield on her public service and wishing her well in her retirement.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SMALL ENTERPRISE
PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 2002

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Small Business Enterprise Paperwork Reduction Act, a bill to relieve the burden of regulation compliance documentation.

Federal regulations are set to ensure worker safety and to protect public health and the environment. This nation's small businesses—representing 99 percent of all employers and constituting half our economic product—place a high value on compliance with regulations. Unfortunately, these requirements disproportionately burden small businesses, which spend millions of hours annually meeting federal paperwork and record-keeping requirements to prove that they have complied with regulations.

The time and effort spent by businesses and taxpayers to meet paperwork demands are estimated to equal almost 10 percent of the nation's Gross Domestic Product. Clearly, this is a waste of time and resources better spent creating jobs and furnishing goods and services.

Federal paperwork consistently ranks among the top 10 problems for small busi-

nesses. Time spent filling out forms, takes small business owners away from conducting our nation's business. It takes doctors away from patient care. It takes restaurant owners away from serving patrons. It takes your auto mechanic away from fixing your transmission.

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (PRA), since amended, seeks to minimize the cost and burden imposed by federal paperwork requirements and to maximize the usefulness of the information collected. The PRA of 1995 required reduction of paperwork burdens government-wide. Unfortunately, the burden did not decrease since 1995—in fact, it has increased by nearly 180 million burden hours during Fiscal Year 2000. This is the second largest one-year increase since the act was passed. It is also an outrage.

The PRA established the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) within the Office of Management and Budget to review and clear agency information collection requirements. Unfortunately, OIRA has been diverted from its original mission by an Executive Order that makes it a central clearinghouse for agency rulemaking actions. Review of regulations now takes up most of OIRA's time and resources.

This legislation seeks to bring OIRA back towards its original mission—to ensure that Federal agencies do not over-burden businesses and the public with requests for information and documentation.

The Office of Management and Budget listed a total of 710 PRA violations for Fiscal Year 2000.

This legislation will strengthen the PRA by requiring OMB to do more to enforce the law on paperwork burden violations.

In addition, by making violations of the Paperwork Reduction Act a more public matter, it will increase public awareness and force agencies to focus on the burdens they impose on small business.

Lastly, this legislation requires federal agencies and OMB to track the paperwork burdens on small businesses by industry type. Congress and the public should be aware of what burdens are being placed on our small businesses by Federal agencies.

Small businesses create 75 percent of the new jobs in America. To protect this economic dynamo, we must be careful about the burdens we place on these firms. If the burden of government paperwork becomes too great, it will stall the very engine of economic growth that has made America strong. This legislation is designed to tighten the load, so that small businesses can get back to work providing jobs, goods and services in their communities.

NATIONAL CORRECTIONAL
OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES WEEK

HON. JOHN E. SWEENEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 2002

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as a co-chair of the Correctional Officers Caucus, to honor the men and women working in our correctional facilities. On a daily basis, correctional personnel perform a wide range of jobs, from the routine to the extraordinary. Their work often goes unnoticed, but the efforts of correctional officers and employees

were never more apparent than on September 11, 2001.

Following the horrific terrorist attacks, the New York Correction Department immediately sent personnel to assist in rescue operations. Department staff controlled traffic congestion enabling emergency vehicles to reach Ground Zero and assisted firefighters by delivering fuel to needy fire trucks. They built a small "tent city" equipped with heat, electricity, telephone and fax lines to provide additional support services for the temporary morgue at Bellevue Hospital. The Department also conducted security clearances and issued thousands of photo ID cards to secure access to Ground Zero and other restricted areas.

Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks, correctional officers and employees were deployed 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to assist in various rescue and recovery efforts.

I have introduced H. Con. Res. 390 to recognize the week of May 6th as National Correctional Officers and Employees Week, in gratitude for the courage and professionalism of the New York City Correction Department in the face of tragedy, as well as the daily work of all correctional officers and employees who perform their jobs with dedication and resolve.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to honor our Nation's correctional officers and employees. I urge my colleagues to recognize these men and women by cosponsoring this important resolution.

EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH
ISRAEL IN ITS FIGHT AGAINST
TERRORISM

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK GREEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 2002

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer these comments for the RECORD to supplement my vote on House Resolution 392—the resolution in support of Israel in the war against terrorism—which this body approved on May 2.

I voted in favor of the resolution because I believe what it said was both substantially accurate and needed to be formally declared by this Congress and this Nation: that there is no acceptable justification for terrorism in general and suicide bombing in particular. No one—no nation, no organization—can ever be perceived as gaining any advantage militarily, diplomatically, or politically from this reprehensible tactic.

I offer these comments because I'm afraid the resolution told only part of the story. What the resolution said wasn't nearly as controversial as what it didn't say. Because while it did incorporate some language addressing the humanitarian concerns of the Palestinian people, even the most ardent supporter of the current government in Israel would have to agree that the resolution was not as balanced as it could, or should, have been.

That's why I voted against ordering the previous question on the rule for this resolution. To put it simply, I hoped we could open up the debate on the resolution to include additional language. In my opinion, we could have made the resolution more balanced, portrayed a