

While some in Hollywood may know him as Julia Roberts' history teacher, Coach Orrell is most famous in Cobb County for his colorful history reenactments. His reenactment of the Battle of Vicksburg is legendary among his students as he crawls on his belly with imaginary rifle in hand, moving in and out of imaginary trenches. Mr. Orrell's desk has represented many ships, including the Alabama and the Bismarck. He knows how to get the very best out of every one of his students because he makes history enjoyable and memorable.

□ 2000

Mr. Orrell honed his skills at West Georgia College, where former Speaker of this House, Newt Gingrich, was his teacher. Mr. Orrell's gifts of teaching earned him two Campbell High School Teacher of the Year honors and five Star Teacher awards. He served as a social studies department head at Campbell High School for 15 years and at South Cobb High for 2.

He started teaching AP courses, advanced placement, in 1982 in the earliest days of the program and served as a successful example for the budding AP program across the State of Georgia.

As much as he loves teaching gifted students, Coach Orrell will be the first to tell us that the greatest moments of his teaching career have been helping those students in need, students that were disconnected from the school community and disillusioned with learning. He found great joy in restoring their hope and belief in the value of education. He let them know he believed in them and they had the capacity to learn and to achieve their goals.

Mr. Orrell has influenced his students and even other teachers. He leaves each school a better place to teach and learn than when he arrived. And his departure on Friday will be no different.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to join me in congratulating Coach Windy Orrell for his service to teaching, providing inspiration to future leaders, and helping make Cobb County a standard bearer for Georgia education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLE of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

ELLSWORTH BRAC ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my profound disappointment and flat disagreement with the Department of Defense's recommendation to close Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota as a part of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. This recommendation is as misguided as they come.

While the BRAC process is necessary to ensure that our Armed Forces can efficiently and adequately serve our military needs at home and abroad into the 21st century, this decision does not accurately reflect the value of Ellsworth to that cause.

As Lead Wing for the Aerospace Expeditionary Force, the 28th Bomb Wing at Ellsworth Air Force Base played a decisive role in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. As they did in Kosovo and Afghanistan, the B-1 and her crews from Ellsworth Air Force Base performed superbly. During Operation Iraqi Freedom, B-1s played a vital role in helping liberate Iraq by dropping more than half the satellite-guided munitions. Ellsworth once again demonstrated that it is the backbone of America's bomber fleet and the base has fulfilled its missions admirably. This is a modern, well-equipped installation that has served our country for decades and is prepared to serve for decades to come. Ellsworth has substantially upgraded its infrastructure since the last round of base closures, which will allow Ellsworth to accept new missions and continue to grow. Rather than closing, Ellsworth is well situated to receive additional assignments.

In addition, Ellsworth's geographic and strategic strengths are many. Located in western South Dakota, Ellsworth is strategically positioned and is not threatened by urban encroachment or crowded air space, major factors that have not been given appropriate weight by the Department of Defense. In addition, the base is close to bomber training facilities in the region.

I am also concerned the Secretary of Defense did not adequately consider the benefits of locating military bases in rural regions. A disproportionate number of bases recommended for closure realignment resulting in a disproportionate number of lost jobs are in rural States such as Alaska, Maine, North Dakota, and South Dakota. This oversight is part and parcel of a continued disregard for not only the needs of rural America but the unique value and strengths rural America offers to our country as a whole.

Additionally, commencing a round of base closures during a time of war is questionable strategy and could be harmful to our national security. The current round of domestic base closures should wait until after the De-

partment of Defense completes its plans to bring troops back to the United States from overseas bases. I am also concerned about the risks associated with consolidating all of our B-1 bombers in a single location.

Furthermore, I am concerned that we are making base closure decisions prior to the Quadrennial Defense Review for 2005. The Quadrennial Defense Review analyzes force structure, modernization plans, military infrastructure, and the defense budget to help establish a roadmap for defense programs. It cannot be ignored before assessing base realignments and closures.

Finally, the economic impact of closing Ellsworth Air Force Base on South Dakota would be dramatic. Our State would lose our second largest employer and an estimated \$278 million a year. The loss of nearly 4,000 jobs would set South Dakota almost a year back in statewide job growth.

I have invited the chairman of the BRAC Commission, Anthony Principi, and other members of the commission to visit Ellsworth Air Force Base and hold one of their regional field hearings in Rapid City, home to Ellsworth. A visit to Ellsworth will allow the commission the opportunity to see what those of us from South Dakota already know: the B-1 bomber and Ellsworth Air Force Base are irreplaceable and crucial to our national security.

As the BRAC Commission moves forward and reviews the Department of Defense's recommendations, I am confident the BRAC Commission will realize the Department of Defense deviated substantially from their established base closure criteria when recommending Ellsworth for closure and will support removing it from the list.

THE FILIBUSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week the Senate has returned, and I believe America's eyes will focus on whether or not this Congress has the integrity and respect for the institution to be reminded of the principles of democracy, which is that where there is a majority and a minority, a democratic nation respects the power, or at least the rights, of the minority.

We have heard this discussion about nonnuclear and nuclear and filibuster center around some suggestion that those who are opposing the elimination of such would, frankly, be considered antireligious, antipatriotic, and antidemocratic, as I listened to my good friend on the other side of the aisle even cite the Constitution to suggest that the Constitution provides the right of an up-or-down vote on Presidential judicial nominees.

The Constitution is large and small. Small in words, but large in its power. And it does say that the Senate gives

the advice and consent on the Supreme Court judges. It does not extend it to what we call Article III judges; but by inference, we would imagine that the Senate gives the advice and consent to the President on nominations, which includes the Supreme Court and made by inference these nominations.

But this question of filibuster is not issue oriented. It is not about judges being confirmed or wars being fought. It is about protecting the minority.

I might suggest to my good friends that I wish that we had participated in a filibuster in the fall of 2002 when this administration came to this Congress and argued that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and that those weapons were pointed at the very heart and soul and minds of Americans and we were under immediate danger. It was a very difficult time. So many of us questioned the intelligence of the evidence, asked whether or not there were other alternatives or other options, asked the administration to go to the United Nations, and there was a lukewarm response.

Based upon the loss of life that we have experienced over the last 3 years, the amputees, the young men and women who have come home traumatized, needing mental health services, those who committed suicide, the families who buried their loved ones, I wish that the rights of the minority had been protected. But, more importantly, I wish that those who had the privilege of filibuster had stood on the floor of the House and filibustered this decision to go to war.

So there is value to that. There is value to the idea of protecting the rights of the minority. And that value, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a democracy. So I am saddened that the leader of the other body would even think that because they have not been able to get their way, the majority, that the rights of the minority should be extinguished or denied.

Let me say again this is not a question of a pointed rejection of the President's right to nominate. This is the sanctity and integrity of a procedure that allows the minority to be heard in opposition to the decisions being made by the majority.

I want to remind my colleagues that I stand here as an African American who lived for a very long time as a second class citizen in the United States of America. No, not me personally in terms of age, but the history of African Americans first came as two thirds of a person. The laws were against us. So in the early 1960s after Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, President Lyndon Baines Johnson brought to this Congress the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the 1965 Voter Rights Act. And, Mr. Speaker, what were called the Dixiecrats and others took to the floor of the Senate and filibustered those bills, and they talked and they talked and they talked and they talked. If there ever was a time for us to begin to look at why that procedure should be eliminated, that was the time.

But those of us, young as we might have been, our advocates, our lawyers, our organizations from SCLC to the Urban League to APRI to the NAACP, organizations that had marched with Martin Luther King, never for once stood up and said get rid of the filibuster which protects the rights of minorities. It is not time at this time to do that, Mr. Speaker. If the judges cannot pass muster, protect the rights of the minority, it is not an issue of the judges and an issue of the war. It is a right of the minority to be protected, and the filibuster does that. And I ask the Senate to step away from any nuclear option and respect the integrity of this place.

SOCIAL SECURITY, PRIVATE ACCOUNTS, AND PAY EQUITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 of this year, we observed Equal Pay Day, a day that indicates just how far into each year a woman must work to earn as much as a man earned in the previous year. Because women on average earn less than men, they must work longer for the same pay.

While many of my colleagues have addressed the impact of the pay gap on working women, I want to call attention today to how Social Security reduces this inequity for women in retirement in a way that private accounts will not.

It is no surprise that women are particularly wary of President Bush's proposed private accounts for Social Security. Women are more likely than men to depend on Social Security for their financial well-being, not only in retirement but throughout their lives, through survivorships and disability benefits.

The vast majority of Social Security recipients are women, representing almost 60 percent of all beneficiaries age 65 and over. And an even higher percentage of women that are seniors and are in older age groups are on Social Security. Unfortunately, women still make less money than men, about 76 cents on the dollar, and usually work fewer years than men. Social Security provides proportionately higher benefits for lower earners; so the progressive benefit structure counteracts the pay and pension gaps that women experience during their working years.

As this chart shows, women typically earn about 24 percent less than men. Since their lifetime earnings are lower than men's, they receive smaller Social Security benefits than men, but the gap is narrower. The typical woman's Social Security benefit is only 17 percent lower than the typical man's, narrowing the gap by almost one third. In contrast, private accounts would preserve the wage gap. The typical woman would accumulate 24 percent less in her private account than the typical man.

By taking time out of the workforce to raise children or care for ailing parents or spouses, women typically lose more than a decade of earnings.

□ 2015

This second chart shows the impact that time out of the workplace would have on private account accumulations. A man born today with average earnings throughout his career who diverted 4 percent of his earnings into a private account would accumulate about \$204,000. A woman who earned 24 percent less each year would only accumulate about \$155,000. If she took 10 years out of the workforce, her private account accumulation would drop to about \$112,000, just over half what the typical man would accumulate. If she only took 5 years out of the workforce, her private account accumulation would drop to about \$132,000, 35 percent less than what the typical man would accumulate.

Women are also more likely to work part-time, less likely to be covered by an employer-sponsored pension plan, and more likely to work in low-paying fields. As a result, they have lower lifetime earnings, making Social Security a larger portion of their retirement income.

Because women earn less, they would have less to invest in private accounts than men and more to lose from the substantial benefit cuts under the kind of privatization plan the President supports. The President's preferred plan requires cutting guaranteed benefits by more than 25 percent, even for middle class workers, and even for those who choose not to invest in private accounts. Meanwhile, those that do choose a private account also would be hit with a privatization tax of 70 percent or more of the value of their account, which would be deducted from their Social Security benefits upon retirement. Because Social Security helps level the playing field for women, cutting their benefits would make it even harder for women to achieve financial security in retirement.

Without Social Security, more than half of white and Hispanic senior women and almost two-thirds of African American senior women would live in poverty. Also, because women live longer, whatever they are able to save in private accounts would have to be stretched to cover more years in their senior years. Unlike private savings, you cannot outlive Social Security, and the benefits are not eroded over time by inflation.

The President is having a hard time convincing the American people, especially women, that private accounts would be better for American families than Social Security, and rightly so. It has touched so many of our lives. Social Security is an insurance program, not an investment plan, and private accounts would destroy much of the insurance value of the program.