

with their parents on long deployments overseas. We should not segregate military kids from schools when stationed here in their own country. Military kids also tend to be high achievers with parents that on average are model citizens. They tend to pull up the academic and athletic achievements of the schools they attend.

With thousands of servicemen and women risking everything overseas, I can think of no better way to set their minds at ease than by taking care of their families back home. This support should begin with assuring our soldiers that their children are receiving a quality education. There are 15 million school children in this Nation who are eligible for Impact Aid. Enrolled in one of the 1,300 eligible school districts, these children depend on their schools to provide them with an education and their parents depend on the schools to act as a community of support while they are deployed.

In my district, 36 percent of all students attending North Chicago's School District 187 are "Impact Aid" children. Currently, there is no guarantee that North Chicago will receive the maximum amount that Impact Aid has promised to provide for its students. We must guarantee our servicemen and women a quality education for their families.

But an even more pressing issue occurs at two other school districts in my district. About one in twenty students in School District 225 (Glenview), as well as School Districts 112 and 113 (Highwood/Highland Park), are Impact Aid children. Due to the current funding formulas, District 225 only receives \$110,000, and Districts 112/113 \$100,000. The money they receive is 90 percent short of the cost of educating these children. This shortfall creates a strain on the school districts overall.

The quickest way to take a soldier or sailor's mind off their mission is to have them worrying about their children's education. Kids from military families come from some of the hardest working, most patriotic families, but the schools they attend sometimes face short funding. This is because of the way we fund our Nation's schools. Impact Aid honors our commitment to military. It guarantees that those families who serve to protect our freedom are in turn protected by the federal government.

We should support the Impact Aid program because it is the right thing to do to make sure schools near military bases are adequately funded. We should also support this program because it is important to the future of our country's defense. The United States established the all-volunteer military thirty years ago. After decades of experience, we now know that the children of military personnel are the most likely to join the military. This means that the Impact Aid program is not only helping families now on active duty but also educating young men and women who are the most likely to become the future backbone of the armed forces.

This bill was the first piece of legislation that I introduced in the 107th Congress. We attracted above 20 co-sponsors. In the 108th Congress, we attracted above 40 co-sponsors. Clearly the time is coming when this bill must become law.

Our constitution commands that the first job of the federal government is to "provide for the common defense." As we improve the pay and benefits of men and women in uniform,

we must also support their kids and the local schools they attend. This may take many years to accomplish but the time is now to support schools that educate the children whose parents wear our Nation's uniform. Let us recognize our duty to America's children and to our military.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION  
THAT IS IMPORTANT TO RANCHERS  
AND CONSUMERS

**HON. STEPHANIE HERSETH**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 26, 2005*

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleague, Representative BARBARA CUBIN of Wyoming, to introduce a piece of legislation that we believe is vitally important for the ranchers of our states and for consumers across the country.

On December 29, 2004, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced regulations that would enable certain countries, including Canada, to qualify as "minimal-risk regions" for the disease bovine spongiform encephalopathy or BSE. Thus, on March 7, 2005, Canadian cattle will again be allowed into the United States after a 19-month moratorium on those animals due to a BSE outbreak in that country. Since the announcement of that rule, the government of Canada has discovered and confirmed two additional cases of BSE in that country's cattle herd. Despite this fact, USDA has not announced an intention to reexamine the rule or to postpone the date that it will open our borders to Canadian cattle.

Language to require country-of-origin labeling (COOL) for certain meat and perishable agricultural products was included in the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, also known as the 2002 Farm Bill. Under that law, this provision was set to become operational on September 30, 2004. Unfortunately, Congress has postponed the implementation date for COOL until September 30, 2006. Even more distressing, opponents of COOL have begun an effort to replace the mandatory COOL program with a voluntary one.

Mandatory COOL is important policy for several reasons. First, it would distinguish American meat products from those that are being imported into this country. This would enable American ranchers and pork producers and others to promote domestically produced meat products that rancher in my state believe are superior to meat and live animals produced in other countries.

Secondly, it will give American consumers information that they have repeatedly stated they want about the origin of the meat that they buy at the grocery store. American consumers know where virtually all of their consumer goods are manufactured, but not something as important as the food that they provide for their families. They want this information and they should have access to it.

Providing consumers with access to country-of-origin information becomes particularly important in light of our Department of Agriculture's intention open the border to animals from a country that has recently found multiple cases of BSE.

This bill would prevent USDA from opening the Canadian border to cattle imports until

after a mandatory COOL program is up and running. Consumers want this information, and producers will benefit from having this information available. It is good policy and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO  
COMMEMORATE THE SPIRIT OF  
CESAR E. CHAVEZ: "SI SE  
PUEDE"

**HON. BOB FILNER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 26, 2005*

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember a great American leader and hero, Cesar Chavez. He was a husband, father, grandfather, labor organizer, community leader and symbol of the ongoing struggle for equal rights and equal opportunity.

Cesar was the son of migrant farm workers who dedicated his life to fighting for the human rights and dignity of farm laborers. He was born on March 31, 1927, on a small farm near Yuma, Arizona, and died nearly 12 years ago in April of 1993. Over the course of his 66-year life, Cesar Chavez' work inspired millions and made him a major force in American history.

In 1962, Cesar Chavez and his family founded the National Farm Workers Association which organized thousands of farm workers to confront one of the most powerful industries in our nation. He inspired them to join together and non-violently demand safe and fair working conditions.

Through the use of a grape boycott, he was able to secure the first union contracts for farm workers in this country. These contracts provided farm workers with the basic services that most workers take for granted, services such as clean drinking water and sanitary facilities. Because of his fight to enforce child labor laws, farm workers could also be certain that their children would not be working side by side with them and would instead attend the migrant schools he helped to establish. In addition, Cesar Chavez made the world aware of the exposure to dangerous chemicals that farm workers and consumers face every day.

As a labor leader, he earned great support from unions and elected officials across the country. The movement he began continues today as the United Farm Workers of America.

Cesar Chavez' influence extends far beyond agriculture. He was instrumental in forming the Community Service Organization, one of the first civic action groups in the Mexican-American communities of California and Arizona.

He worked in urban areas, organized voter registration drives and brought complaints against mistreatment by government agencies. He taught community members how to deal with governmental, school and financial institutions and empowered many thousands to seek further advancement in education and politics. There are countless stories of judges, engineers, lawyers, teachers, church leaders, organizers and other hardworking professionals who credit Cesar Chavez as the inspiring force in their lives.

During a time of great social upheaval, he was sought out by groups from all walks of life and all religions to help bring calm with his non-violent practices. In his fight for peace,

justice, respect and self-determination, he gained the admiration and respect of millions of Americans and most Members of this House of Representatives.

Cesar Chavez will be remembered for his tireless commitment to improve the plight of farm workers, children and the poor throughout the United States and for the inspiration his heroic efforts gave to so many Americans.

We in Congress must make certain that the movement Cesar Chavez began and the timeless lessons of justice and fairness he taught are preserved and honored in our national conscience. To make sure that these fundamental principles are never forgotten, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. In the words of Cesar and the United Farm Workers, *si se puede*—yes, we can!

HONORING THE LIFE OF 1LT  
NAINOA K. HOE, USA

**HON. DARLENE HOOLEY**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 26, 2005*

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the life, passion, and patriotism of Nainoa K. Hoe, First Lieutenant, United States Army, a fallen American hero.

Although I have shared the stories of selflessness and sacrifice of our fallen soldiers before, this time is different.

First Lieutenant Hoe never lived in the Congressional District I represent. Truth be told, he never lived in Oregon. But his wife Emily, her family, and their friends were hopeful about the day he might.

His widow is a senior at Western Oregon University; she is proud of him and his contribution. Her greatest concern has been for her husband's men, his family, and the friends in their life.

It seems that bravery, commitment to service, and honor were personality traits shared by husband and wife. The young Hoe family will not get the years they deserved, but they are an example of love that we should all strive to emulate.

Just days ago, First Lieutenant Hoe was killed while leading his platoon on a foot patrol in Mosul. With him, the dreams of a radiant young couple with so much to offer—so many things to live and do—were buried in the sand of a country in transition.

Sadly, First Lieutenant Hoe was almost home. His rotation nearly completed, he was scheduled to return to the Pacific Northwest on February 6, 2005.

Though proud of his contribution to the long-term stability of Iraq and its people, he was an excited newlywed, looking forward to building a family, winning a position at the FBI, and enjoying the freedoms he had worked so hard to protect.

For Nainoa, courage was a family value. He believed that military service was an expected privilege; a duty that he proudly discharged. He reveled in his role as a commander of a combat platoon—a duty similar to the kind his father Allen Hoe completed during his time in Vietnam.

First Lieutenant Hoe believed there was nothing more important—no duty more sacred—than defending the ideals of this Nation, of fighting for a cause greater than him.

He believed these things knowing full well it meant risking his life, liberty, and his own happiness.

I believe we live in a smaller world these days. It grows smaller with each tragedy such as this. Every life matters—especially when it holds such promise.

Oregonians today are feeling the loss. Let us commit ourselves, here—in this chamber—to work even harder and do our part to make sound decisions about matters of peace and war; to be worthy of the trust Nainoa K. Hoe placed in our hands.

Let us pledge ourselves to being worthy of the sacrifice Nainoa freely offered; we owe him, and those that will follow, nothing less.

FREE SPEECH AND FREEDOM OF  
THE PRESS

**HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 26, 2005*

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, a Congressman from Ohio entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent newspaper account concerning his legal proceeding against Representative JIM McDERMOTT, my friend and colleague from Washington State. I was struck by this.

This story began with two newspaper accounts over 7 years ago. If we are going to reflect on this, I think it is only fair that Members of the House and the American people have access to the same basic information, so they can make up their own minds.

In this spirit, I am entering into the RECORD, and I would urge everyone to read, newspaper accounts carried by the New York Times and the Atlanta Journal Constitution. These stories disclosed efforts by then-Republican Speaker Newt Gingrich and Republican Members to skirt an agreement Gingrich had reached with the Ethics Committee.

At issue today are substantial issues concerning Free Speech and Freedom of the Press. The Courts have yet to render a full and final decision. While the legal process is underway, I believe we serve this House and the American people best by taking the time to be fully and fairly informed.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1997]

GINGRICH IS HEARD URGING TACTICS IN ETHICS  
CASE

(By Adam Clymer)

On the day in December when Newt Gingrich admitted bringing discredit on the House, his lawyer told Republican leaders that the Speaker had promised an ethics subcommittee not to use his office and his allies to orchestrate a Republican counterattack against the committee's charges.

That was part of the price for the subcommittee's agreement to accept his admission of guilt and spare him the potential humiliation of a full-scale public trial.

But that same day, even before the charges had been made public, Mr. Gingrich held a telephone conference call with other House leaders in which he made suggestions for a statement that the leaders would issue immediately after the subcommittee's charges were disclosed.

He also suggested the timing of various responses to Democratic attacks. The politicians agreed among themselves how they could use their opponents' comments to at-

tack the subcommittee's findings indirectly without technically violating the agreement that Mr. Gingrich's lawyers made with the ethics subcommittee.

The call was taped by people in Florida who were unsympathetic to Mr. Gingrich and who said they heard it on a police scanner that happened to pick up the cellular telephone transmissions of one of the participants. It was given to a Democratic Congressman, who made the tape available to The New York Times. Mr. Gingrich's office today did not question the authenticity of the conversation, but insisted that it did not violate any agreement with the ethics subcommittee.

The Speaker and his allies acknowledged at the time that their conversation was a bit "premature," since the subcommittee had not yet even voted on the charges against Mr. Gingrich. Nevertheless, they talked about how to handle inevitable Democratic attacks, how to time the day's events with newspapers, news agencies and the evening television news in mind, and—above all—how to avoid making all that look as if Mr. Gingrich was pulling the strings.

In the Dec. 21 conversation, Mr. Gingrich's lawyer, Ed Bethune, said, "it is very important for me to be able to say to the special counsel and if necessary to the committee members that we—and by that I mean the other attorney, Randy Evans, and I, and Newt—have done everything in our power to try to stop all things that might be construed in any way as an orchestration attempt by Newt Gingrich."

Mr. Gingrich, Mr. Bethune and the others discussed their tactics in a conference telephone call, a transcript of which was made available by a Democratic Congressman hostile to Mr. Gingrich who insisted that he not be identified further.

The Congressman said the tape had been given to him on Wednesday by a couple who said they were from northern Florida. He quoted them as saying it had been recorded off a radio scanner, suggesting that one participant was using a cellular telephone. They said it was recorded about 9:45 A.M. on Dec. 21.

The tape, in which the voices of Mr. Gingrich and other Republican leaders are clearly recognizable, was plainly a recording of a conversation that took place before the subcommittee released its charges and Mr. Gingrich's admissions.

The call capped a week of elaborate bargaining over the framing of the charges—and Mr. Gingrich's admission—that the Speaker had brought discredit on the House by giving untrue information to the ethics committee and by failing to get proper legal advice about the way he used money from tax-exempt foundations for a college course and televised town meetings with political overtones.

Mr. Gingrich's admission of guilt avoided a full-scale trial in which the details would have been televised nationally. In return, the committee's special counsel, James M. Cole, insisted on a promise that the Speaker would not use his allies to mount a counterattack against the subcommittee's case, since its rules forbade Mr. Cole and members from answering such attacks.

The tone of the conversation was optimistic. The Speaker and the other leaders believed that a coordinated response could enable them to limit political fallout.

And the talk, one of many that day, ended on a light note. After the basic outlines of the statement the leaders would issue had been agreed on, Representative Dick Army of Texas, the majority leader, had another suggestion for how Mr. Gingrich could handle the menacing accusation that he had deliberately lied to the committee: "I am not