

While there is no current, nationwide shortage of blood, regional and local shortages do occur. It is not hard to imagine that a major national trauma, such as a terrorist attack, disease, or natural disaster, could strain the blood supply even further. Since blood cannot be manufactured, the system is reliant on people to donate their blood.

Mr. Speaker, donating blood is a small but entirely selfless act that does nothing but help those who need it most. Congress should support this endeavor, and encourage people to give blood as often as they can.

This legislation provides a \$50 tax deduction for individuals who donate blood, with a maximum deduction of \$150 a year. This maximum reflects the advice of blood bank centers and institutions that encourage people to give blood three times a year. This relief is a small reward for people who do give, and an encouragement for those who might need that extra little push to attend a blood drive.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and call on the House to bring it expeditiously to the floor.

HONORING DENNIS CONNER, A WORLD-RENOWNED SAILOR, ON HIS RESTORATION OF THE LEGENDARY YACHT "COTTON BLOSSOM II"

HON. JOHN B. SHADEGG

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 2004

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound pleasure that I rise to commend to the Nation Dennis Conner, of America's Cup fame, an outstanding American yachtsman, competitor and sailing icon, in admiration and appreciation of his magnificent restoration of the historic wooden yacht *Cotton Blossom II*. Mr. Conner's expertise and dedication to preserving yachting history are to be commended. His extraordinary efforts are a testament to his uncompromising devotion to excellence and authenticity.

Thanks to Dennis Conner's vision and generosity, *Cotton Blossom II* is an elegantly restored masterpiece that honors our country's rich yachting heritage and the classic art of wooden boat building.

Cotton Blossom II was designed in 1924 by Johan Anker, the leading "Q" Boat designer of the time. She was built for Lawrence Percival of Boston at the Jensen Shipyard near Oslo, Norway. *Leonore*, as she was first named, was delivered to Marblehead in October 1925. She was later sold to Walter Wheeler and christened *Cotton Blossom II*. Wheeler campaigned her with great success out of Stamford, CT. Among her many racing victories were the Vineyard Race and the Astor Cup for the New York Yacht Club. She was named the NYYC Boat of the Year in 1939, and her half model is displayed in the Club's Model Room.

Twenty-three years later, this well-designed yacht continued to win major races under the stewardship of owners Ed and Gloria Turner of the San Diego Yacht Club. *Cotton Blossom II* successfully spanned the dramatic changes that had taken place in the sport since the 1920s as she became a familiar sight winning all the major races at the club, including the Lipton Trophy, and was named SDYC Boat of

the Year in 1963. Her half model is displayed in the club today.

As a young man and rising star in the sailing world, Dennis Conner sailed extensively on *Cotton Blossom II*. When he had the good fortune of acquiring *Cotton Blossom II*, Mr. Conner assembled a team of the finest craftsmen and shipbuilders to restore her with meticulous care to her original condition.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues in the People's House join me in commending Dennis Conner and his talented team of skilled craftsmen for preserving U.S. maritime history with the restoration of the legendary wooden yacht *Cotton Blossom II*.

RECOGNIZING SENATOR HAROLD L. CASKEY

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 2004

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, a long and distinguished career in public service is coming to an end in the Show-Me State. Missouri State Senator Harold L. Caskey will retire at the end of the year. He has served the people of the 31st District since 1976.

He was born in Bates County. After graduating from Central Missouri State University with honors in 1960 with a B.A. in Psychology and Sociology, he attended University of Missouri-Columbia where he received a Juris Doctorate in 1963. He also was a member of the Order of the Coif.

From 1968 to 1972, Mr. Caskey served as the prosecuting attorney for Bates County. Then he was the Butler city prosecutor from 1973 to 1974. After serving in this position, he was an assistant professor in Business Law and Criminal Law at Northeast Missouri State University, now Truman State University, from 1975 to 1976.

Mr. Caskey was first elected to the Missouri Senate in 1976. During his accomplished tenure in the Missouri Senate, he served in many positions. He was the Senate Assistant Majority Floor Leader, Senate Majority Caucus Chair, Senate Majority Floor Leader, and Minority Caucus Chair.

Mr. Caskey awards and honors include the 2002 Access Award from the American Foundation for the Blind, the 1997 National Legislator of the Year from the National Industries of the Blind Workshop, the 1999 University of Missouri School of Law Alumnus of the Year and the National Freedom Righter from the National Rifle Association. Additionally, the Missouri Deputy Sheriffs' Association named an award for him—the Harold Caskey Freedom Award.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of this House will join me in thanking Mr. Caskey for his life of public service.

HONORING THE SAINT NICHOLAS RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 2004

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the Reverend George Lardas, members of the congregation, and the Stratford, CT, community in extending my sincere congratulations to the St. Nicholas Russian Orthodox Church as they celebrate its 75th anniversary. This is a remarkable milestone for this community treasure and I am proud to help them celebrate this momentous occasion.

The St. Nicholas Russian Orthodox Church was founded in 1929 by Russian emigres who came to Stratford to work for Igor Sikorsky. The legendary Igor Sikorsky, the father of the modern helicopter, was a founding member of the church as well as one of its staunchest supporters throughout his life. With nearly all the members employees of Sikorsky's company, a Russian community quickly grew around the church. Soon, what began as a neighborhood church in a Lake Street home moved to its present location and today welcomes congregants from several surrounding communities as well. The striking golden cupolas of the church, a unique characteristic of the building, along with the warm and welcoming arms of the congregation have made St. Nicholas a lasting landmark in Stratford.

Our churches play a vital role in our communities—providing people with a place to turn to for comfort when they are most in need. By strengthening our bonds of faith, St. Nicholas gives its members a place to find their spiritual center and to solidify and support their values. The members of St. Nicholas' have also given much to the town of Stratford. Throughout the years, as their membership grew so did their commitment to the enrichment of our community.

It is with great pride and my heart-felt congratulations that I rise today to join with the congregation and the Stratford community in celebrating the 75th anniversary of the St. Nicholas Russian Orthodox Church—a true community treasure.

MARRIAGE PROTECTION AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 2004

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to submit into the RECORD additional material regarding the debate about whether marriage is in decline in the Netherlands. Some members suggest that the Stanley Kurtz material is not relevant or is not accurate. I submit into the RECORD the following article written by Mr. Kurtz that addresses his critics on this point.

DUTCH DEBATE

There's a new development in the story of Europe's marriage meltdown. Recently, a

group of five scholars in the Netherlands issued a letter addressed to "parliaments of the world debating the issue of same-sex marriage." The Netherlands was the first country to adopt full-fledged same-sex marriage, and this letter is the first serious indication of Dutch concern about the consequences of that decision. So it's worth quoting the letter at some length. After citing a raft of statistics documenting the decline of Dutch marriage, here is some of what these scholars had to say: "...there is as yet no definitive scientific evidence to suggest the long campaign for the legalization of same-sex marriage contributed to these harmful trends. However, there are good reasons to believe the decline in Dutch marriage may be connected to the successful public campaign for the opening of marriage to same-sex couples in the Netherlands. After all, supporters of same-sex marriage argued forcefully in favor of the (legal and social) separation of marriage from parenting. In parliament, advocates and opponents alike agreed that same-sex marriage would pave the way to greater acceptance of alternative forms of cohabitation.

In our judgment, it is difficult to imagine that a lengthy, highly visible, and ultimately successful campaign to persuade Dutch citizens that marriage is not connected to parenthood and that marriage and cohabitation are equally valid 'lifestyle choices' has not had serious social consequences...

There are undoubtedly other factors that have contributed to the decline of the institution of marriage in our country. Further scientific research is needed to establish the relative importance of all these factors. At the same time, we wish to note that enough evidence of marital decline already exists to raise serious concerns about the wisdom of the efforts to deconstruct marriage in its traditional form."

You can read an interview with two of the letter's signers here, and a front-page news story about the letter in the Dutch paper, *Reformatorisch Dagblad*, here.

UNDENIABLE DECLINE

During last week's Federal Marriage Amendment debate, many senators referred to the Dutch scholars' statement, and to marital decline in Scandinavia and the Netherlands. Of course, you probably haven't heard about that, because, for the most part, the American press has refused to report the story.

Even so, gay-marriage advocates are worried. M. V. Lee Badgett, research director for the Institute for Gay and Lesbian Strategic Studies, has issued a new critique of my work on Scandinavia and the Netherlands. In "Unhealthy Half-Truths," I refuted Badgett's first attack. Now she's back. Badgett's critique of my work is long on statistical tricks and short on engagement with my actual argument.

The bottom line is that neither Badgett nor anyone else has been able to get around the fact that marriage in both Scandinavia and the Netherlands is in deep decline. In Scandinavia, that decline began before same-sex registered partnerships were established, but has continued apace ever since. In the Netherlands, marital decline accelerated dramatically, in tandem with the growing campaign for gay marriage.

The strategies for evading these hard truths don't work. Gay-marriage advocates regularly cite steady or improving rates of marriage and divorce in Scandinavian countries to prove that all is well. I've shown repeatedly that these numbers are misleading. Scandinavian marriage numbers are inflated by remarriages among the large number of divorced, for example. Scandinavian divorce

numbers omit legally unrecorded breakups among the ever-increasing number of cohabiting parents. Total family dissolution rates in Scandinavia are actually up. I've made these points before, but Badgett and others just keep citing the misleading numbers.

European demographers know perfectly well that marriage in Scandinavia is in deep trouble. British demographer David Coleman and senior Dutch demographer Joop Garssen have written that "marriage is becoming a minority status" in Scandinavia. In Denmark, a slight majority of all children are still born within marriage. Yet citing the 60 percent out-of-wedlock birthrate for first-born children, Danish demographers Wehner, Kambskard, and Abrahamson argue that marriage has ceased to be the normative setting for Danish family life.

ALL ABOUT THE FAMILY

Badgett uses several tricks to dodge the problem of out-of-wedlock birthrates in excess of 50 percent. Most cohabiting parents eventually marry, Badgett emphasizes. Because of that, if you look at the number of Norwegian children who are actually living with their own married parents, it is 61 percent. Well, that is certainly more than half, but a number that low hardly means that Norwegian marriage is strong. And as I showed in "Unhealthy Half-Truths," in Norway's progay-marriage north, the numbers of Norwegian children actually living with their own married parents is now almost certainly at or below 50 percent.

Of course, the fact that "most" cohabiting parents in Scandinavia eventually marry slides over the core point. A great many parental cohabiters break up before they ever decide to marry—and they do so at rates two to three times higher than married parents. So many cohabiting parents break up before they ever decide to marry that demographer Mai Heide Ottosen has said, "to be a child of young [Danish] parents nowadays has become a risky affair."

Badgett cites a study showing that American children spend even less time in total with their own married parents than Norwegians. But that study's Norwegian data comes from the 1980s. Since then, America's family disruptions have leveled off while Norway's have worsened. In any case, staging a family-stability contest between America and Scandinavia misses the point. American families are unstable because of our high divorce rates and sky-high rates of underclass single parenting. The fact that our family system has weakened is precisely the problem. America's already significant family vulnerabilities would be pushed beyond the breaking point if Scandinavian-style parental cohabitation spread here. Today, more than ten percent of American children are born to cohabiting parents. And studies show that cohabiting parents in America break up at a much higher rate than they already do in Scandinavia. So a spike in Scandinavian-style parental cohabitation in America would deal a major new blow to our already vulnerable family system.

Badgett ignores my points about the differences between Norway's socially liberal north and it's more conservative and religious south. The parts of Norway where same-sex unions are most accepted have by far the highest out-of-wedlock birthrates. That helps make my causal point. It also helps explain why Norway's out-of-wedlock birthrate is rising more slowly now—something Badgett makes much of. Rising Norwegian out-of-wedlock births have hit a wall of resistance in the recalcitrant, religious south.

In any case, at very high levels, the out-of-wedlock birthrate has to rise more slowly.

That's because super-high out-of-wedlock birthrates signal a radical shift in the way parents think about marriage. In the early stages of Scandinavian-style cohabitation, parents think of first, and even second born children as tests of a relationship that might someday eventuate in marriage. But as parental cohabitation grows in popularity parents have two or more children without getting married at all. So out-of-wedlock birthrates rise more slowly as they move beyond the 40- and 50-percent marks because they are pushing through the final and toughest pockets of cultural support for marriage. That's why the slow but steady increase in Norway's already high out-of-wedlock birthrates is so frightening. It shows that even the resistant and conservative south is beginning to accept parental cohabitation, while the liberal north is beginning to abandon the idea of marriage altogether.

Okay, says Badgett, let's provisionally grant Kurtz's distinction between high and low-out-wedlock birthrate countries. Even given that, says Badgett, out-of-wedlock births have been "soaring" in some traditionally low out-of-wedlock birthrate nations (Ireland, Luxembourg, Hungary, Lithuania, and several other eastern European countries). And none of them but the Netherlands has gay marriage. So how could gay marriage be the cause of higher out of wedlock birthrates in the Netherlands when comparable countries that don't have gay marriage have similar rises?

Gay marriage is not the only cause of rising out-of-wedlock birthrates. I never said it was and it doesn't take a demographer to realize that lots of factors contribute to husbandless women having babies. In fact the out-of-wedlock birthrates that are rising so rapidly in the countries Badgett cites are rising for a distinct and clear reason. These nations are economically and culturally modernizing. For good or ill, they are increasingly adopting postmodern sexual mores, yet provide only limited access to contraception and/or abortion. That juxtaposition of divergent and even contradictory family and sexual systems creates problems. In Ireland, for example, sexual mores are loosening. Yet the Irish still tightly restrict contraception and abortion. That combination has pushed out-of-wedlock birthrates way up.

Something similar is happening in Lithuania, and in other eastern European countries. In a recent study of contraceptive availability in Europe, Erik Klijzing found that contraceptives were far less available in Lithuania and Bulgaria than in other European countries. Some eastern European nations have as little access to contraception as third-world countries. Curiously, of all the countries Klijzing studied, only in Lithuania do educated people have even less access to contraceptives than uneducated people. That fits the model of a culturally modernizing population with loosening sexual mores, but poor access to contraception. The result is soaring out of wedlock birthrates. (Some will use this to argue for more contraception. Others will argue for abstinence education and a renewal of tradition. My point here is simply that, either way, changes in sexual practices and attitudes have consequences.)

Badgett does list a country that doesn't have limited contraception: Luxembourg. But while Luxembourg's out-of-wedlock birthrate is rising, it's moving up only about half as fast as rates in Ireland, Lithuania, and the Netherlands.

Hungary is the only country that Badgett lists besides the Netherlands that has widely available birth control but a rapidly rising rate of out-of-wedlock births. This does seem to be related to greater cultural individualism. But another factor is the economic

stress that has hit eastern Europe as a whole since the collapse of Communism. Under Communism, governments allotted good apartments to married couples. In the post-Communist era that incentive to marriage has disappeared. Large apartments are now too expensive for many couples to afford in stressed economic times. What used to be an incentive to marriage has turned into a disincentive. Yet nothing of this sort is happening in Holland.

THE EVIDENCE IS CLEAR

So the real question raised by Badgett's comparison is why Holland should be virtually the only traditionally low out-of-wedlock birthrate country in which couples have easy access to birth control where out-of-wedlock birthrates are now "soaring"? I'm grateful to Badgett for (inadvertently) drawing this additional factor to my attention. Rather than weakening my point, it greatly strengthens it. It is clearer than ever that something very unusual is happening in the Netherlands. Demographically, we have a kind of Dutch exceptionalism—and the key difference is that the Dutch added gay marriage to their precarious balance between socially liberal attitudes and traditional family practices. Gay marriage—not restricted contraception or the collapse of Communism—upset that balance, with the result that the out-of-wedlock birthrate began to zoom.

The decline of marriage in the Netherlands in tandem with the growing success of the Dutch movement for gay marriage is the clearest example of gay marriage's impact on marital decline. Badgett does her best to evade the problem by claiming that the increase in non-marital births began before Dutch registered partnerships took effect in early 1998. That is a weak argument, since an increase of two-percentage points in the out-of-wedlock birthrate for seven consecutive years is rare. It was anything but inevitable that a two-percent increase in non-marital births in 1997 would be followed by six consecutive increases at the same level. In any case, the final vote to establish registered partnerships took place in 1997.

But the deeper point is that the meaning of traditional marriage was transformed every bit as much by the decade-long national movement for gay marriage in Holland as by eventual legal success. That's why the impact of gay marriage on declining Dutch marriage rates and rising out-of-wedlock birthrates begins well before the actual legal changes were instituted. The recent statement by five Dutch scholars takes exactly that position.

Badgett has no trouble accepting the idea that gay marriage might be an effect of an increasing cultural separation between marriage and parenthood. But how could gay marriage be a product of this cultural trend without also locking in and reinforcing that same cultural stance? I've offered abundant cultural evidence that the message conveyed by gay marriage does in fact reinforce acceptance of parental cohabitation.

The Dutch scholars are right. Many factors are in play in European marital decline, and more research is needed to separate out the relative importance of the various factors. But continued marital decline in Scandinavia and the Netherlands has already provided us with enough evidence to call the wisdom of same-sex marriage into serious doubt.

CHARLOTTE SPARROW CHIAVETTA MAKES HER MARK ON THE WORLD

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 2004

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John Bryan and Rebekah Sparrow Chiavetta on the birth of their first child, Charlotte Sparrow Chiavetta. Charlotte was born on Thursday, October 7, 2004, and weighed 6 pounds and 13 ounces. Faye joins me in wishing John and Rebekah great happiness during this very special time in their lives.

As a father, I know the joy, pride, and excitement that parents experience upon the entrance of their child into the world. Representing hope, goodness, and innocence, a newborn allows those around her to see the world through her eyes... as a new, fresh place with unending possibilities for the future. Through a child, one is able to recognize and appreciate the full potential of the human race. I know the Chiavettas look forward to the changes and challenges that their new daughter will bring to their lives while taking pleasure in the many rewards they are sure to receive as they watch her grow.

I welcome young Charlotte into the world and wish John and Rebekah all the best as they raise her.

COCA-COLA RECOGNITION

HON. HENRY BONILLA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 2004

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the classic beverage producer, Coca-Cola Company. Coca-Cola has been involved in its community and our Nation since the founding of the company. Through involvement in programs such as "Reading is Fundamental" and the U Promise Program, they have continually served the public. This history of public service was recently recognized when the Coca-Cola Company was awarded the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, USHCC, Corporation of the Year Award at the 25th Annual National Convention and Business Expo in Austin, TX.

As the company's promise states, "The Coca-Cola Company exists to benefit and refresh everyone it touches." Such a recognition of the Coca-Cola Company by USHCC only reinforces the commitment Coca-Cola has made to make their promise come true.

The Coca-Cola Company strives to reach out to the Hispanic community through a variety of programs. These programs primarily focus on education, which Coca-Cola believes is a "powerful force in improving the quality of life and creating opportunity for people and their families around the world." Of close to 30 programs, three—the Art of Harmony, the Coca-Cola First Generation Scholarship Program, and the Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program—stand out in exemplifying the company's determination and willingness to "benefit and refresh." Through programs such as these, Coca-Cola has encouraged students who may not have a family history of going to college, or the financial stability to succeed

once they get there, the means and motivation to excel.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the Coca-Cola Company as the recipient of the USHCC Corporation of the Year Award and bring to light their outstanding efforts within the Hispanic community.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4520, AMERICAN JOBS CREATION ACT OF 2004

SPEECH OF

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strident opposition to the conference report on H.R. 4520, the so-called "Jobs Creation Act." This bill does nothing to create jobs at home, and actually provides incentives for corporations to move jobs offshore. The conference report is a \$140 billion solution to a \$57 billion problem, and how the Republicans intend to pay for this solution is both a sham and a disgrace.

Repealing the extraterritorial income, ETI, regime is absolutely necessary to avoid retaliatory duties imposed by the European Union. This tax scheme was found to be illegal by the World Trade Organization because it unfairly advantaged U.S. corporations in the international arena. Given that judgment, my preferred approach was to simply repeal the tax and save \$57 billion for America's taxpayers.

That's what should have happened. But, even if one felt that the corporations shouldn't be penalized for the WTO ruling, keeping them whole after the ETI repeal would cost \$57 billion. Unfortunately my colleagues have decided to go much further. They are replacing that illegal regime with \$140 billion in unnecessary corporate tax cuts and extraneous provisions that have no business in this bill.

This bill isn't only loaded with expensive, unnecessary tax breaks, it then goes so far as to induce U.S. companies to move even more jobs overseas through its bizarre tax incentive structure. During this jobless economic recovery, we cannot afford to give corporations even more incentive to ship jobs offshore. But, I guess this is consistent with the Bush administration and Republican belief that outsourcing jobs is good for America. I disagree.

This bill also gives U.S. companies a tax break on the profits they have previously made by shipping jobs offshore. In fact, corporations are temporarily allowed to repatriate foreign profits at a rate of 5.25 percent. Why would we ever give companies a tax holiday so they can line the pockets of executives and investors? That doesn't create jobs, it just breeds more corporate greed.

The Republicans will claim that this bill is fiscally responsible because it is paid for. In reality the \$80 billion in closed loopholes and other revenue raisers are just a pipe dream. Two of the biggest revenue raisers in the bill make it much harder for individuals to take the charitable deduction for donating property to non-profit organizations. I thought this was a corporate tax bill. I guess the Republicans think it is OK to raise taxes on charitable individuals so that billion-dollar corporations can