

to lose their health care coverage. Because AHPs are exempted from state insurance laws, AHPs can “cherry pick” the healthiest employees and deny coverage to those who are more costly to cover. This would drive up insurance premiums for everyone who remains in state-regulated insurance plans, making health insurance less affordable and forcing people to drop their insurance because of rising costs. I recognize the frustration and struggles faced by the self-employed and small business owners trying to provide health care to their employees, but AHPs are not the answer to the uninsurance crisis, if they will result in more people becoming uninsured.

Similarly, the House will consider a medical malpractice bill that will fail to lower health care costs for Americans. Proponents of this bill claim that rising costs of medical malpractice insurance and “excessive litigation” are driving up health care costs so much that caps must be instituted, placed on the amount of money a victim of malpractice can receive for a lifetime of pain and suffering or other non-economic damage.

Unfortunately, these caps will have little effect except to limit patient rights to sue for medical injury. Numerous studies have shown that medical malpractice awards, legal fees, and other costs account for less than one percent of the nation’s health care spending. This bill represents nothing more than a false promise.

Soaring malpractice insurance rates need to be addressed with two principles in mind. First, do no harm to the victims of medical errors. Second, start addressing insurance abuses by focusing on the malpractice insurance industry, not the victims of medical malpractice. Narrow federal caps on non-economic damages are not the way to address the problems with malpractice insurance.

Health care costs are rising for many reasons. Given the relatively small role that medical malpractice verdicts and settlements play in rising health care costs, this bill is really more of a distraction that is keeping us from making headway on the real culprits. Congress should leave regulation of insurance and tort law to the states. Congress should not spend its time demonizing victims and their advocates.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of underlying issues that come up when considering America’s health care crisis: uninsurance, underinsurance, affordability, and quality, just to name a few. All Americans deserve quality, comprehensive, and affordable health care, and I look forward to the day when we will consider legislation that truly responds to these challenges.

**EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS
WITH RESPECT TO COMMEMORATION
OF WOMEN SUFFRAGISTS**

SPEECH OF
HON. DEBORAH PRYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2005

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate women suffragists. As one of the eighty-three women serving in the House and Senate, the Women’s Rights Movement was, and continues to be, in my opinion, one of the most inspirational series of events to occur in United States history.

The battle for suffrage, fought by the early women’s rights leaders was thought to be the most effective way to change an unjust system. Constant barriers were thrown ahead of them, and degrading stereotypes were placed upon them.

Challengers of women’s suffrage claim that women were less intelligent and less able to make political decisions than men. The women of the suffrage movement dismissed these accusations with the ratification of the 19th Amendment, giving women the right to vote. Now, women utilize this freedom more so than men. Among citizens, women’s voting rates have surpassed men’s ever since the 1984 presidential election. 54 percent of the 2004 presidential election votes belonged to women and 46 percent of the votes to men.

Women like Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Caddy, Sojourner Truth, and Susan B. Anthony were the pioneers of the suffrage movement. They took risks and broke laws in order to pave the way for the new generation of suffrage leaders like Carrie Chapman Catt, Maud Wood Park, Lucy Burns, Alice Paul, and Harriot E. Blatch. All of these women devoted their lives to this cause. That is why it is so important that we devote a day to honor these women.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO EXEMPT HAWAII FROM THE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME LIMITATION ON PARTICIPATION IN CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2005

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill that exempts my State of Hawaii from the adjusted gross income limitation on participation in Farm Bill conservation programs. These programs assist and incentivize producers and landowners to preserve and conserve the dwindling agricultural lands of our country.

These invaluable programs include the following:

Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), which provides annual rental payments to replace crops on highly erodible and environmentally sensitive lands with long-term plantings that protect the soil. Hawaii is attempting to access this program, the largest of all the conservation programs, by developing a Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, which is awaiting approval by the USDA.

Conservation Security Program (CSP), which provides financial and technical assistance for improvements in conserving environmental resources on farmland that meets certain soil and water quality criteria standards.

Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), which provides cost share payments to producers and landowners to plan and install structural, vegetative, and land management practices on eligible lands to alleviate conservation problems, with 60 percent of funds allocated to livestock producers.

Farmland and Ranchland Protection Program (FRPP), which assists state and local governments to acquire easements to limit conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses.

Grassland Reserve Program (GRP), which retires acres from grazing under arrangements ranging from 10-year agreements to permanent easements and permits the delegation of easements to certain private organizations and state agencies.

Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP), which uses permanent and temporary easements and long-term agreements to protect farmed wetlands.

Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP), which provides cost sharing and technical assistance for conservation practices that primarily benefit wildlife.

These programs have become increasingly important in Hawaii, where funding has risen from around \$4.9 million in 2003 to \$14.2 million in 2005. Unfortunately, especially in the case of the Conservation Reserve Program, Hawaii’s ability to access these programs has been severely limited by the application of the adjusted gross income limitation (AGI) placed on the programs by the 2002 Farm Bill to Hawaii’s unique conditions. As a result, many of the lands that would deliver the highest environmental benefits are excluded because of this provision.

In Hawaii’s case, there are compelling reasons why an exemption from the AGI limitation is not only fair but necessary for these programs to achieve their desired goals. By way of background, during the writing of the 2002 Farm Bill some groups called attention to the fact that some very wealthy individuals were receiving payments under Farm Bill conservation programs. As a result, a limitation was put in place making individuals and corporations with annual incomes of \$2.5 million or more ineligible for participation in Farm Bill conservation programs unless 75 percent of that income comes from farming, ranching, or forestry.

This adjusted gross income (AGI) provision seriously disadvantages Hawaii because the major portion of our agricultural lands are owned by families or corporations with diversified holdings. In many cases, these entities have remained engaged in ranching or farming, despite low profit margins, due to a connection to long traditions in ranching, farming, or other activities.

Large agricultural landholdings in Hawaii typically date back more than 100 years and follow the traditional Hawaiian land division of ahupua’a, where land parcels extend from the mountain to the sea, based on the ancient Hawaiian recognition of the interconnectedness of these environments. As a result, we have properties where the upper lands might be used for ranching, the middle lands for crops or residential development, and the lower, oceanside lands for hotels and business developments. Therefore, we have ranches where income from ranching is supplemented by a shopping center and restaurant. A portion of the ranch land may, and in many cases in Hawaii does, harbor endangered plant and animal species. Taking these marginal lands out of cattle production and assisting with reforestation of native species can have a tremendous impact on the prospects of survival for Hawaii’s endangered species. But regrettably, the AGI provision has meant that federal funds to assist in these efforts cannot be used to provide what could be enormous environmental benefits. Thus, as a result of our particular history, we in Hawaii are denied access

to a very valuable tool to encourage conservation on many of these marginal agricultural lands.

In addition, as one of the most isolated land masses in the world, Hawaii has a wealth of unique animal and plant species; regrettably we are also the endangered species capital of the United States. Our 255 listed plant species represent approximately one-fourth of the total number of endangered species in the United States. They also comprise more than one-fifth of the entire Hawaiian flora. An Hawaii's endemic birds make up one-third of the list of endangered bird species. Our unique and beautiful endangered birds would benefit greatly from restoration and protection of native forests using funding from the Farm Bill programs. These programs would also help to control runoff into streams and coral reefs providing habitat for more unique endemic species.

Finally, Hawaii should receive special consideration out of simple fairness. Hawaii, especially my Second district, is a rural agricultural state. Despite this, in part because of the AGI limitation, Hawaii comes in dead last of all the states in terms of federal assistance received as a percentage of agricultural production. In fact, we receive less than 1 cent per dollar of production value compared with 17 cents for North Dakota and an average of 6 cents nationwide.

As a prime example, Hawaii has only ever had 21 acres enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program, which covers some 39.2 million acres nationwide. The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) was enacted in 1985 and has grown to become the biggest USDA conservation program, costing just under \$2 billion annually in recent years. Under this program, producers bid to retire highly erodible or environmentally sensitive land from production during national signup periods. The Farm Service Agency ranks bids based on their estimated environmental benefits and cost to the government. (I have no doubt that Hawaii would deliver very high environmental benefits, especially when one considers the impact on coral reefs and endangered species.) Successful bidders receive annual rental payments, as well as cost sharing and technical assistance, to install conservation practices. Almost all the enrolled land is retired for 10 years. Enrollment is limited to 25 percent of the crop land in a county.

In July 2004, Hawaii's Governor Lingle submitted the "Hawaii Conservation Reserve Enhancement and Coordinated Conservation Plan." The proposal is currently under review by the Farm Service Agency.

If approved, the plan will restore 30,000 acres of native forest—10,000 acres in riparian buffers along streams and 20,000 acres in large blocks in groundwater recharge and sediment source areas. The plan covers the islands of Maui, Hawaii, Molokai, Lanai, Kauai, and Oahu. The principal goals of the project are to improve water quality in streams, reduce flow of polluted runoff to near shore waters and coral reefs, and restore terrestrial and aquatic wildlife habitat.

Unfortunately, the proposal has been stalled because of concerns that not enough suitable land will be eligible under AGI limitations.

Hawaii's agriculture has many unique characteristics due to our isolated location, land use patterns dating from the days of the Kingdom of Hawaii, tropical climate, and year-

round growing season. Few USDA programs address our special needs, and we do not benefit from any of the general commodities programs. Hawaii has traditionally received relatively little assistance from the Farm Bill conservation programs, although they seek to address problems that are central to our islands: protecting water quality, preserving endangered species, and controlling invasive pests.

An AGI exemption for Hawaii would remove a barrier that effectively eliminates roughly 80 percent of Hawaii's agricultural land from participation in conservation programs. I ask my colleagues for their support for this exemption to help to protect Hawaii's special environment and vulnerable endangered wildlife both on the land and in our nearshore waters and to provide Hawaii with equal and full access to the great benefits of these programs.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
PARISH OF ST. LOUIS THE KING

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 2005

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker today to honor the parish of St. Louis the King Roman Catholic Church for 50 years of serving the communities of Marquette, Harvey, Lakewood, Hiawatha Shores, Sand River, Beaver Grove, Mangum, West Branch, Skandia, Dukes and Sands. The parish has provided opportunities for thousands of people to seek faith, conduct outreach, and engage in fellowship and worship.

On June 30, 1954, Most Reverend Thomas L. Noa D.D. announced the formation of the new parish, St. Louis the King. That day, Rev. David Harris was appointed Administrator. Less than a month later on July 18th Father Harris said his first mass in Chocoley Township Hall beginning one of many "firsts" to take place for the young congregation.

That first year, St. Louis the King would rejoice in their first baptism of Eileen Marie Williams, daughter of Albert Williams and Frances Casimir; mourn their first death of Larry Wayne Lajeunesse, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Lajeunesse; witness their first marriage of Leonard Lemieux, son of Wilfred Lemieux and Lorette Gauthier, and Marion Tounsignant, daughter of Alfred and Lucelle Santamore; and celebrate their first Holy Communion of thirteen boys and seven girls.

After a year of memorable firsts, the parish would also celebrate the ground breaking for the new church on July 20th, 1955 on land obtained from Fred Greenleaf, a member of the parish. While the congregation patiently waited for the completion of the new church, St. Louis the King would continue to evolve confirming their first class of fourteen boys, twelve girls and nine adults by Bishop Thomas Noa on November 5th, 1956.

The fruits of their labor and reward of their patience was realized on December 25th, 1959 when members of St. Louis the King heard their first mass in the new church. Solemn High Mass of the Nativity was delivered with a sermon given by Rev. Mr. Allen Mayotte of the parish. He would be ordained six months later becoming the first parish son ordained to the priesthood from the St. Louis the King Parish.

Many improvements have been made to the church through the years, but the most important development has been the learning experience parish members have gained from the past 50 years of growing together. As people who started as individuals and families bound together by their faith, they have now created a larger body of Christ united in their Catholic faith. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the St. Louis the King Roman Catholic Church on their first 50 years as a parish and in wishing them success in the future as they continue to grow, love, and live their faith.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 2005

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the significance of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Next week will mark the fortieth anniversary of the passage of that historic act of Congress and there will be commemorations and remembrances of this anniversary throughout the nation, including a march in Atlanta being led by our colleague, the Honorable John Lewis—a civil rights legacy in his own right. While August 6th will signify prominent strides that this country has made in terms of equal rights, the 40th anniversary of the Act's passage will also highlight considerable room for improvement and work to truly guarantee that right to vote to all Americans.

The Act is a reminder of the oppression suffered by the Black community between Reconstruction and the Civil Rights Movement that Blacks could be utterly denied the most basic constitutional right to vote without any recourse to assert and obtain that from any of the branches of the United States government, including the Judiciary. The right to vote is fundamental to political empowerment under our Constitution and democratic form of government. Its denial effectively deprived citizenship to African-Americans in the Jim Crow era.

Despite the promises of the Fifteenth Amendment, most Black Americans were routinely denied the right to cast ballots in federal and state elections, particularly in the South. This denial was a function of both the state government and of local individuals determined to maintain their hold on political power in this country. It was another element of the fear and torture that existed throughout this country to intimidate and discourage Blacks from pursuing their most basic rights in this country.

Individuals were denied the opportunity through official and unofficial channels to cast their ballots. Literacy tests, poll taxes, grandfather clauses, and gerrymandering were but a few of the mechanisms used by the state to prevent Black Americans from voting and electing leaders to represent their interests while lynchings, threats and intimidations, and Ku Klux Klan marches asserted the will of bigots to oppose the equal treatment of all Americans.

Faced with these startling realizations and a mobilized Black community, President Lyndon Johnson advocated for the Voting Rights Act