

early waves of the Peace Corps. President John F. Kennedy asked our nation's citizens to "ask not what this country could do for you, but what you can do for your country." Sargent Shriver was a living demonstration of the way to serve and the spirit it took to launch the new and bold idea of the Peace Corps.

Peace Corps began under Sargent Shriver's directorship on March 1, 1961. Today, over 170,000 Americans, including six members of Congress, have served in 136 countries. Many volunteers who served under Sargent Shriver have become Ambassadors, Presidents of Universities, and Chairmen of major corporations.

Sargent Shriver began his public service in the United States Navy where he earned the rank of Lieutenant Commander. Following his naval career, Sargent Shriver dedicated himself to the societal problems facing the youth of the country—organizing the National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency in Washington and serving as the President of the Chicago Board of Education. He continued to foster quality social programming through the creation of VISTA, Head Start, Community Action, Foster Grandparents, Job Corps, Legal Services, Indian and Migrant Opportunities and Neighborhood Health Services. In addition, Sargent Shriver has served on the Board of many humanitarian organizations, including as President of the Special Olympics.

Sargent Shriver's dedication to living his ideals, and making them a reality has inspired subsequent generations to do the same. His invaluable contributions to the formation and longevity of the Peace Corps has brought hope to people around the world and has educated generations of Returned Peace Corps Volunteers, such as myself, in the necessity and value of public service. The Peace Corps continues to be a means for understanding the cultures, and languages of the world while recognizing the differences between different countries.

The vision of peace that Director Shriver has committed so much time and energy to has only become more important during this time of war. Director Shriver once wisely said, "I say what our nation needs now is a call to peace and service—peace and service on a scale we have scarcely begun to imagine." Mr. Speaker, today I honor Sargent Shriver and wish him the very best in the coming year.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF BOB SINCLAIR TO SAVING LIVES IN TENNESSEE

**HON. JOHN S. TANNER**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 21, 2003*

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of a tireless public servant, Mr. Bob Sinclair. The service he has provided over the years through the Henry County Ambulance Service has touched—and saved—many lives in our community.

Mr. Sinclair is a decorated veteran of World War II and a former employee of the Tennessee Valley Authority, but it is his dedicated work for the Henry County Ambulance Service that makes him stand out among the rest.

He started his service on January 1, 1969, the first day of operation for the ambulance service, which was one of the first countywide ambulance services in Tennessee to also offer an emergency medical technician training program. Sinclair volunteered for rotating shifts so his workers could get the training they needed to become paramedics. The service was originally based in the Paris Fire Department, and hearses purchased from the Ridgeway Morticians were used as ambulances.

Mr. Sinclair remained diligent, however, and helped the ambulance service grow, becoming director in 1970 and remaining there until 1985, when the service was assigned to the Henry County Medical Center. Mr. Sinclair is now a member the HCMC Board of Trustees and has also been a longtime member of the Henry County Commission.

Mr. Sinclair continued to give his time and devotion to the Henry County Ambulance Service and overcame many obstacles, such as funding and vehicle replacement issues. He helped make the ambulance service what it is today.

Time and time again, Mr. Sinclair has given his time and dedication to his community, and this will continue to be appreciated. Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the accomplishments and dedication of a fine leader, Mr. Bob Sinclair.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 21, 2003*

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber on September 3, 2003. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 460, 461 and 462. On September 4, 2003, I missed rollcall vote 467 and would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

INTRODUCTION OF THE "METROPOLITAN CONGESTION RELIEF ACT"

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 21, 2003*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce legislation that strengthens our commitments to the public and their local decision-makers in both urbanized and rural areas of this nation.

The "Metropolitan Congestion Relief Act" proposes a number of simple adjustments to the TEA-21 law, which as you know is now under discussion in the House Transportation Infrastructure Committee. Two days ago, the leaders of the Committee introduced legislation setting forth a six-year reauthorization plan for TEA-21, legislation that I am proud to cosponsor.

My legislation compliments the Committee legislation and proposes key adjustments to current congestion-related programs. This legislation would ensure that our national policy

more fully engages and supports local elected leaders and the communities they represent. We need to engage the public and local decision-makers to address the nation's many transportation challenges.

The proposals in this legislation include two initiatives that follow the basic thrust of the Committee's TEA-21 renewal package.

First, this legislation invests more in our local decision-makers, those who now lead our nation's very important metropolitan economies and those in non-urbanized areas. Secondly, it further strengthens the partnership set forth in the 1991 ISTEA law that began devolving resources and decision-making to the nation's larger metropolitan areas. Finally, this legislation continues to place more responsibility where it belongs, with local community leaders and metropolitan planning organizations. These are the entities most challenged by pressing transportation needs, be it traffic congestion, air quality degradation or the rising demands of global competition.

These selected reforms and adjustments will yield results for all areas of our states. In those provisions targeted to metropolitan areas, all taxpayers and areas will benefit as these additional commitments will improve the performance of our existing assets and help us use available transportation dollars more efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk for a minute about the key features of this legislation and what it does and does not do.

First, it does not affect the allocation of resources from any of TEA-21's formula highway programs to the states, which is to say that it is policy neutral on the donor/donee issue. For the record, I am one member who has an interest in seeing more equity among the states, and this legislation does not disrupt any of these important efforts.

Second, the law this legislation amends is the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. As we make progress on equity among the states, we should also make some greater strides in providing some modest assurances of equity to local areas and local taxpayers within our states. Here in this chamber and in the Transportation Committee we talk often about "fair share" among the states, and yet there is nothing in current law that addresses how equity is assured at the sub-state level.

Let me illustrate this point further from the perspective of my district and the Dallas-Fort Worth region. As each new fiscal year arrived under TEA-21, local decision-makers in my region were certain that they would determine the fate of about 2½ cents of every highway formula dollar coming to the State of Texas. This is an inadequate commitment to a region that accounts for nearly one out of every five Texans and, in recent years, more than one out of every three new jobs in the State. By the donor/donee yardstick, this amounts to my local decision-makers having the certainty and direct control over about 10–12 cents on every federal highway dollar that is generated from local taxpayers and returned to the state. This is simply inequitable and can no longer be justified.

My legislation proposes to deliver more certainty to all areas of the state, both large and small, helping make some modest gains in ensuring more funding equity for the public in their local areas.

The legislation directs that Surface Transportation Funds provided to each of the states,

either through the STP or indirectly through the unprogrammed share of the Minimum Guarantee program, be directed to local areas, following existing law using the fair share distribution to urbanized and non-urbanized areas. All areas within the states will have more funding certainty as a result.

Third, the Metropolitan Congestion Relief Act enhances our federal surface transportation policies by enlisting local decision-makers and their substantial transportation assets under their control more fully into the TEA-21 partnership.

In addition to directing more STP and Minimum Guarantee resources to metropolitan planning organizations and other local areas under ongoing state-directed programs, the legislation specifically directs states to work more directly with local decision-makers, particularly in the larger urban areas, in deciding on investments in the National Highway System. This is a critical asset for all of us and one where local governments either own a share of these facilities or where locally-owned facilities are substantially affected by NHS facility investments.

Let me provide some additional background on this and related points. One of the weaknesses of the current Federal policy is that it relies too heavily on overburdened State transportation agencies. Overall, States own the smallest share of the Nation's transportation facilities relative to local governments and yet are given direct control over an overwhelming share of Federal transportation dollars. On average, for each highway dollar that a State receives, only six percent is guaranteed to reach local decision-makers, those in metropolitan areas of 200,000 or more where more than one out of every two Americans live.

Let me explain further. Presently, local governments—cities, towns and counties—directly or indirectly through regional agencies own and/or operate more than three-quarters of the Nation's roads and streets, about one-half of the Nation's bridges, more than ninety percent of all transit systems and about the same share of the Nation's airports, most of the train stations, port facilities, traffic signals, public parking structures, sidewalks and trails, and so on. Let us not forget that 63 percent of urban area highways in the Federal Aid System, which includes those facilities generally eligible under Federal TEA-21 programs, are owned by local governments. Yet, existing policy directs virtually all of the resources to State highway and transportation departments.

In aviation, Congress rightly directs resources to the agencies, be it the State, region or local government who own and operate airports. In transit, Congress rightly directs resources to the level of government who delivers these services. In flood control, the State, region, or local agency responsible for the improvements receives the funding. And so on.

As this Congress seeks to address the burdens of congestion the need for smarter and more balanced transportation investments to give taxpayers more for their dollars, we must recognize that we have reached the point where it is impossible to achieve these outcomes without more fully involving our local transportation partners. This means bringing local elected officials—mayors, city council members, county executives and commissions, and others—more fully into this partner-

ship. This legislation makes some modest adjustments and empowers these critical officials in the transportation partnership.

Finally, this legislation specifically addresses the needs of local areas with the most air quality and congestion problems. It does so by directing States to allocate Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program (CMAQ) funds to local areas that are in non-attainment or maintenance of applicable national ambient air quality standards. Specifically, it requires States to pass these funds to local areas on a fair share basis where metropolitan planning organizations are in place. Simply put, States earn CMAQ funds based on local air problems and the legislation makes sure that funds are passed through to these areas. Recently, this chamber debated the extension of the compliance deadlines in some Texas cities and other places, all the while my own State of Texas had piled up more than \$270 million in unspent CMAQ funds that could have helped improve air quality in my area and others in the State. This provision will make sure that the local areas that carry these requirements under Federal law are certain to receive their fair share of the resources that are provided.

There are also two new initiatives in the legislation that address congestion. One is a new \$2 billion annual formula program aimed at the Nation's most congested metropolitan markets, as analyzed by the Texas Transportation Institute. This program will target resources to areas of the Nation with clear congestion needs. The other program will provide modest resources of \$500 million annually to local governments to support incident management programs.

Let me speak to the need for these targeted programs. Every taxpayer and every community in our States benefits if we make some selected investments that improve the performance of our Nation's most productive economic centers. All of our economic data shows that our metropolitan areas are truly the economic engines of our State economies and help drive overall U.S. economic growth. They now account for the overwhelming and disproportionate share of the Nation's new jobs, personal income and total economic output. This legislation speaks directly to the pressing needs of these city and county metropolitan areas by investing immediately in congestion relief strategies and programs that will pay substantial dividends to the economic bottom lines of our State and the Federal Government. These initiatives, coupled with other provisions in this legislation, will help us extract more economic output from these areas.

This investment in our regional economic engines will also position our Nation more favorably in the global competition of world trade. For instance, consider my own district, the Dallas Metro area, not including the adjoining Fort Worth Metro area. The Dallas Metro area produced more goods and services—about \$170 billion in 2001—than 29 States. This output exceeded that of many countries, such as Denmark or Hong Kong. This legislation is about recognizing the importance of the role local decision-makers play in steering these vital economic units and the value of tapping the vast range of our Nation's broadest asset base. In the end, our Federal policy needs to go beyond the Federal/State partnership of the 1950s that was built around the Interstate era. The 1991 ISTEA made

some strides to update our institutional arrangements, and this legislation builds on those improvements.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is nonpartisan. It represents an effort to establish a fair and equitable distribution of our Federal transportation dollars.

HONORING C. K. WILLIAMS

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 21, 2003

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, this week C. K. Williams was honored with the National Book Award in Poetry for his book "The Singing: Poems".

The National Book Award, established in 1950, has become one of the most significant literary prizes in the country and comes with a \$10,000 cash award. A creative writing professor at Princeton University since 1995, C. K. Williams has authored 14 books of poetry over his long and distinguished career and in 2000 he received the Pulitzer Prize in poetry for his work "Repair".

Charles Kenneth Williams was born in Newark, New Jersey in 1936. He started writing poetry at the age of 19 and has said that "Poetry didn't find me, in the cradle or anywhere else near it: I found it. I realized at some point—very late, it's always seemed—that I needed it, that it served a function for me—or someday would—however unclear that function may have been at first."

Mr. Speaker we all are very lucky that C. K. Williams found poetry and its clear to me that he has served a function to those of us who have had the pleasure to read his wonderful poetry. At times his poetry delves in to the dark areas of despair and our eventual mortality. As such his poetry is thought provoking, deeply moving, and at times extremely personal.

Again, I congratulate Mr. Williams on his award, and I deeply thank him for the contributions he has made through his poetry to enrich our society. C. K. Williams continues in the long great tradition of other New Jersey poets such as Walt Whitman, William Carlos Williams, Alan Ginsburg, and Robert Pinsky, and he is certainly one of the best poets that New Jersey has to offer today. And as the National Book Selection Committee, The Pulitzer Committee, and other juries make clear, C. K. Williams is one of the best. I am so pleased to have a poet of such talent and mettle both writing and teaching in my district.

Mr. Speaker I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of the title poem of C. K. Williams's award winning book, which is entitled *The Singing*.

THE SINGING

I was walking home down a hill near our house on a balmy afternoon under the blossoms  
Of the pear trees that go flamboyantly mad here every spring with their burgeoning forth  
When a young man turned in from a corner singing no it was more of a cadenced shouting  
Most of which I couldn't catch I thought because the young man was black speaking black  
It didn't matter I could tell he was making his song up which pleased me he was nice-looking