

community in the Manzano Mountains. He was the first son and one of nine children born to Aurelia Chavez and Andres Jaramillo. Like many children reared in the 1920s and early 1930s, the Great Depression forced Mr. Jaramillo to grow up quickly. Economic hardships were abundant, and there was always someone's situation that was worse than his. The Depression taught Jaramillo the importance of helping others, and throughout his life he was known to lend a helping hand to those in need.

In 1941, at the age of 17, Mr. Jaramillo joined President Franklin Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps Camp, a New Deal program designed to create jobs and rebuild America's roads and infrastructure. He and his troop of Company 2867, Camp SCS-27-N, maintained New Mexico's treasured forests and streams. As a devoted son and brother, he shared his meager wages with his family.

During World War II, Mr. Jaramillo was called to serve his country. After completing his basic and advanced infantry training at Fort Bliss, Texas, he was deployed to Europe where the Germans had invaded the Allies. On D-Day, June 6, 1944, U.S. servicemen landed on Omaha Beach in France. Jaramillo was among the first wave of servicemen who landed on Omaha Beach. Unlike countless troops, Jaramillo survived the Normandy invasion only to be severely wounded by a hand grenade 6 weeks later. He was hospitalized for 4 months before returning to the U.S.

His near fatal wounds affected him all the days of his life. By the age of 20, Mr. Jaramillo's decorations and citations included the Combat Infantry Badge, the European-African-Middle Eastern Service Badge, the Good Conduct Badge, the Victory Medal, and the Purple Heart, which he received when he was wounded on July 12, 1944. On August 19, 2000, Mr. Jaramillo received the Jubilee Medal of Liberty issued by the Governor of Normandy, publicly recognizing the sacrifice and service of veterans who served in the Normandy invasion between June 6 and August 31, 1944.

"I am very proud to receive this recognition and I am thinking about the men who went to France and never returned," said Jaramillo in his acceptance remarks. Upon his honorable discharge in 1946, Jaramillo returned to his home in New Mexico. In 1947 he married Jennie Vallejos, a friend of his two sisters, Sally and Aurora, and together they raised four daughters and two sons: Ida May, Pete Jr., Maria Rita, Maria Leonella (Nellie), David, and Lynda. He also had four grandchildren: Eddie Jaramillo, Jason Griego, and Billy and Selena Manzanares.

He was a good provider, devoted father, grandfather and son-in-law. Jaramillo served as a surrogate father to numerous nieces and nephews, providing guidance and support. In 1980,

Mr. Jaramillo retired after completing 30 years of Federal service. He received many commendations for his outstanding performance and rarely missed a day of work. His last assignment was with Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Mr. Jaramillo enjoyed the simple things in life, his family, the sun upon his face, grape juice, chocolate, a country breakfast and, yes, Sunday drives. An avid reader, he liked to keep up with current events. Above everything, Pete exemplified a life of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you.

May he rest in peace.

SLAVE MEMORIAL IN OCALA, FLORIDA, AND OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as many Members did this weekend, I am sure, I spent the Fourth of July back home with the people of the Sixth Congressional District. I had the privilege of joining others in my hometown community at the unveiling of a slave memorial in Ocala, Florida. The local community leaders believed that "Florida could not have existed and grown as it did without the hard work, courage, sacrifice and sometimes genius of black men and women."

For this reason, a monument was erected to honor the lives of the slaves who bear great responsibility for the prosperity we enjoy in the State of Florida. However, this is not only true in Florida; but, Mr. Speaker, I think it is true across this country. Lest this connection continue to go unrecognized, I along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) introduced the Slave Memorial Act. Both of us and many of our colleagues have long been involved in efforts to heal the legacy of slavery. This is the latest incarnation of our desire to contribute to the healing of our Nation. This bill would authorize the process for establishing a national slave memorial to honor the nameless and forgotten men, women and children who were slaves. It will hopefully enjoy a position of prominence in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial.

Papa Stewart, a former slave, once said, "I want you to promise me that you're going to tell all the children my story." This is a conjecture, but I believe that what Papa Stewart is asking for is not that the children be told just so that the horrors of slavery could be avoided in the future, but I also believe he was earnestly asking for the recognition of the humanity of these individuals. We need to believe that there is something more meaningful than just our physical being. He is asking that this story, their humanity, be valued and told. In the telling of his story, we communicate our respect, our compassion and sensitivity to it. Papa

Stewart's is a story that we are indeed in need of telling and hearing in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in this new world that we have entered since September 11, it is becoming easier to remember that evil is an ever present reality. It is now easier to remember that hatred and bigotry are always and everywhere wrong. We gather to remember that the commission of monstrous sin requires not our consent but only our indifference. Of these things many of our ancestors are guilty. We can certainly say of slavery that it was "one more wrong to man and one more insult to God." And as a means of ensuring that we never see the same, we propose a memorial in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial. We do this as a testament to slavery's "many thousand gone."

Each slave was an individual and a child of God. Not only do they deserve our remembrance, we owe them our respect. The legacy of our Nation includes many people, including those who were victims but chose not to be victimized. As Americans, we naturally understand this universal story of resilience and strength; and with this memorial we have the opportunity to thank the people who so greatly contributed to an American cultural understanding of perseverance and, of course, independence.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest desire that a slave memorial will play a part in healing the legacy of slavery. It is said that symbols are the natural speech of the soul, a language older and more universal than the words that we use every day. Hopefully, this memorial will speak in a language more easily understood than simple words. We stand here today to honor the slaves themselves and the men who fought to end their slavery. This discussion cannot stop with the troubles of those who were enslaved, but must continue on to celebrate their deliverance.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it seems like every day we hear a new story of executives who misled their investors and their workers and stole millions of dollars. These executives are called irresponsible. They are accused of mismanagement or unorthodox business practices. But these corporate leaders are not unorthodox. They are criminals, plain and simple. They have stolen more money than any thieves I have ever heard of, and their crimes have real victims. The victims of these corporate crimes are workers like the workers at Enron who just wanted an honest job with a fair expectation of job security. For all their hard work, these workers got 10 minutes to clear out their desks. In

some cases they were even denied their severance packages if they refused to sign documents giving up the right to sue Enron for defrauding them.

Defrauding workers and forcing them to give up their legal rights is not irresponsibility; it is a crime. Even workers who never had anything to do with Enron were hurt by the collapse of that company. As Enron declared bankruptcy, public employees in 30 States lost anywhere from \$1.5 billion to \$10 billion from their pension plans. Stealing money from public employee pension plans is not irresponsibility; it is a crime.

Even those of us who had absolutely nothing to do with the Enrons or WorldComs of the world are hurt by corporate crime. The unethical behavior of executives at WorldCom, which was recently forced to admit it had invented \$3.8 billion in earnings, has had a devastating effect on the company's stock price. But the stock market as a whole has also suffered from the lack of confidence created by widespread corporate abuse. Less than 3 percent of all publicly traded companies missstate their earnings, but this small group casts doubt on the statements of other more ethical businesses.

A free market system cannot function if investors do not trust executives; and, therefore, the crimes of WorldCom and Enron are crimes not only against stockholders but against the very system that allowed these companies to flourish. Ask not for whom the bell tolls, corporate America, it tolls for thee. But this talk of corporate crime obscures the real crime that has taken place in this country.

The crime of Enron, like so many other corrupt corporations, is not that they broke the rules; it is that they wrote the rules. On everything from energy regulation to tax policy, Enron and its fellow energy companies got the best laws money can buy. Enron received a \$254 million check, courtesy of the American taxpayer, when the Bush administration changed the rules governing the corporate alternative minimum tax. Because with this deficit-laden budget, corporate tax cuts come directly from the Social Security trust fund, this was the legal equivalent to picking the pockets of senior citizens in order to pad the pockets of corporate executives. Enron also was allowed to vet candidates for the chairmanship of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Nation's number one energy watchdog.

Furthermore, companies like Enron and Halliburton are the intended beneficiaries of policies from the opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to the annihilation of the Superfund trust fund, which was supposed to ensure that corporate polluters paid some share of the cost of cleaning up their mess. The Superfund example gives us an especially revealing look at how corporate campaign contributors are treated by their friends in government.

If I poisoned hundreds of thousands of my fellow citizens in order to enrich myself and my friends, I would probably go to jail for the rest of my life. If, however, Halliburton spills oil all over a pristine area, ruining the land and making local residents sick, they do not even have to pay to clean it up. The taxpayer gets the bill.

Even after the collapse of Enron and the exposure of billions in fake earnings at WorldCom, this administration and many in Congress are working to protect their corporate patrons from any real accountability. The Oxley accounting bill, which the House passed on April 24, does nothing to protect against corporate abuse and bring back public confidence in corporate governance. In some cases, the bill even makes it more difficult to enforce auditing regulations. In its most glaring failure, this bill leaves the wolf in charge of the henhouse by ensuring that no independent agency has any power to effectively police.

I have full confidence this Congress and this administration can work together to prevent future Enrons and future WorldComs, and I look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle to make sure that we have corporate ethical governance in this country.

MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago a constituent of mine approached me to complain about her Medicare bill. I assumed this would be a typical complaint about either how much she was paying for premiums or how much she paid for services. Boy, was I wrong. Her complaint was worse. She was concerned not about her cost but about how much Medicare was paying for a particular product she uses. As a diabetic, she is required to wear special shoes that need shoe inserts. At one time, the only type of insert available was custom made. However, with the wide use of these products, coupled with advancements in technology, many of these inserts are now available off the shelf which are the ones that she gets for herself.

Looking at her bill, I found that Medicare was paying, on average, \$50 a pair for these inserts. This is the insert, a simple Styrofoam insert. The shoes she is required to wear are \$134. The inserts for the shoe, over \$50 apiece. She is required to pay a portion of that and Medicare reimburses, for three sets of diabetic shoe density inserts, \$190. \$190 for these inserts. In total, the provider was getting over \$50 per pair for simple inserts. If you go to the local pharmacy or grocery store, you will discover that these off-the-shelf orthodontics cost only about \$10. Even these inserts, which I purchased

at CVS, a local pharmacy, not to do a plug for the pharmacy, but you can get them anywhere you want, they are Dr. Scholl's, these were \$16. They look state of the art. They have all kinds of descriptions on them, a strong heel pad.

I am not an orthopedic surgeon; I am not a podiatrist. I am a simple average person who had my own business in Florida, and I know how to comparative shop. I think we all do. But this is outrageous. If Medicare paid that amount for the \$16, we would have saved substantially. She would have been thrilled and delighted. That is why she brought it to my attention, because she felt as a senior citizen, talking about Medicare and the need for prescription drugs, that we will never be able to solve the problems inherent in Medicare if we do not get our acts together and start finding ways to prevent these kinds of horrific overexpenditures of the Federal Government.

But why do they do it? Let us ask the basic question. Why did people charge such an outrageous sum of money for these, what I will call, rather inadequate inserts? Because Congress told them to. We wrote into the statute what price should be paid for these products, assuming at the time that the only available insert was custom made. Now that off-the-shelves are available, Medicare is stuck.

In today's Washington Post, there is an article talking about the rising cost of health care and the choices many employers, including the government, will have to make if these skyrocketing costs are not placed under some control. Two weeks ago, Congress began to address this problem when we passed H.R. 4954, the Medicare Modernization and Prescription Drug Act of 2002. However, we need to do more. We need to look at the entire Medicare program from top to bottom and allow the marketplace, not Congress, to determine prices. The only way we can save both the Medicare program and our health care system in general is to stay out of the business of setting prices and establishing controls.

I look forward to working with Chairman THOMAS and others as we continue to debate this very important issue. The Republicans, when we proposed prescription drug coverage, we recognized that within Medicare, for its solvency, we needed to do more and should be able to do more to provide for these benefits for our constituents, our seniors, and do so without robbing and causing taxes to have to be increased on existing working Americans. If we continue down this path and allow this kind of ripoff to take place, if we allow an insert to be over \$60 a pair paid for by the Federal Government, then we will be walking away from our responsibilities to our seniors, we will bankrupt Medicare, and we will cause significant disparity for seniors.

We believe we have an answer, but we believe we have to act now. There is no