

To qualify to receive this prestigious award, a family must have been ranching or farming on the same Nevada property for at least 100 years, and the property must be a working ranch or farm with 160 acres or with gross annual sales of at least \$1,000.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate and honor the following recipients who have not only shown a commitment to land, but a commitment to family and our land. Blue Eagle Ranch, Tonopah; Bunker Farm, Inc., Bunkerville; Ferraro Cattle Company, Paradise Valley; Green Springs Ranch, Duckwater; Heise Family Ranch, Gardnerville; Krenka Ranch, Ruby Valley; Laura Springs Ranch, Gardnerville; Riordan Ranch, Jiggs; Snyder Livestock Company, Inc., Yerington; Stodieck Farm, Minden; Wilkinson Little Meadow Ranch, McDermitt.

The success, sustainability, and longevity of these ranches and farms stand as an example, to those in agriculture and beyond, of what commitment, determination, and hard work can accomplish.

LET YOUR DEEDS MATCH YOUR APOLOGIES

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2005

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, In politics apologies are always important. We need more apologies and less fiction among nations and groups. We need apologies that help to avoid wars. Apologies can never be adequate substitutions for restitution or reparations; however, apologies offer their own alternative satisfaction. The present German nation has apologized for the Nazi German Holocaust. But the Koreans and Chinese are not happy with the rather muddled apologies of the Japanese for the atrocities of World War II. And, of course, no one has ever apologized for the Atlantic Slave Trade and two hundred and fifty years of slavery in America. Despite the fact that there is still a huge apology gap in our civilization, we must applaud small apologies wherever they occur. We applaud Republican National Committee Chairman Mehlman for his recent statement to the NAACP apologizing for the "Republican Southern Strategy". This speech was given still more credibility when House Judiciary Committee Chairman Sensenbrenner, at that same NAACP Conference, pledged to lead the fight for the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act. Mehlman's apology appears to perhaps be a sparkplug for the launching of a new Republican offensive to capture more Black votes. A suffering Black community challenges the Party of Lincoln to show us some concrete policy and program deeds to match the apologies. Listen to the plea of the following RAP poem:

APOLOGIES ARE REAL COOL

To apologize
Is real cool
But don't play
The Black agenda
For no eager fool.
Don't rush to play,
Delay thumping your chest,
Push your words
Into the action test:
Jobs right now we need,

Hungry mouths we have to feed,
Lots of ills But can't buy pills.
Prison terms often repeat
Homeless shelters
Are never neat.
Tax cuts we can't eat,
Iraq war dollars wasted
Spell school repair defeat.
Right now!
Take the action test.
Show us the Bush best.
For any apology
We grant a pat
On the Republican back;
From Democrats
The slavery apology
We desperately lack.
To apologize
Is real cool
But don't play
The Black agenda
For no eager fool.

USA PATRIOT AND TERRORISM PREVENTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 3199) to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes:

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly believe that the United States needs to be vigilant in protecting our nation and combating terror; however, we must be careful that we do not unnecessarily sacrifice our civil liberties in pursuit of our enemies.

While many of the provisions were needed, both then and now, when Congress passed the original PATRIOT Act in October 2001, we rightfully placed sunset clauses on certain provisions that infringed on our civil liberties and granted extraordinary powers to federal authorities. These sunset clauses were incorporated in order to provide us with the opportunity to reexamine and reevaluate whether the need for such invasive powers continues to outweigh their sometimes overly intrusive nature.

Rather than providing Congress with the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of a measure and correct any abuses, the PATRIOT Act Reauthorization would renew two of the original sunset provisions for a period of ten years and make the rest of the temporary provisions permanent. This would effectively remove all Congressional oversight over the PATRIOT Act. As a result, Americans would forever forfeit some of their most cherished privacy rights and precious civil liberties.

One of these provisions gives federal investigators authority to examine and access individual records at libraries and bookstores. Under this measure, federal authorities do not have to demonstrate probable cause of criminal activity or of an individual's connection to a foreign power. In addition, libraries and bookstores are prohibited from informing patrons that the government is monitoring their reading transactions. While there is broad bipartisan opposition to this provision, the Republican leadership, in a gross abuse of the democratic process, failed to allow even a

vote on an amendment that would repeal this egregious provision.

Measures like this are not going to help us prevail in the war against terrorism. Instead, we should be providing our law enforcement agencies with sufficient risk-based funding, so that they can be adequately equipped to protect our homeland. Yet, the Bush administration continues to cut funding for state and local law enforcement, the men and women in our communities who serve on the front lines of domestic security.

I too am committed to keeping our nation safe while we are fighting the war on terror. But at the same time, it is just as imperative that we protect our constitutionally guaranteed civil rights. A free society is what makes our nation great, and now, more than ever, it is crucial that we protect our civil liberties with unshakable resolve.

HEALTH CARE WEEK

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2005

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my disappointment in the bills that the House of Representatives is considering during this so-called "Health Care Week."

While I applaud House leaders for turning their attention to the health care crisis, I do not believe that the bills we are considering will solve the problem we face, and I fear that some of these measures may actually worsen the crisis. I look forward to the day when we will consider real solutions to ensure that all Americans have access to quality, comprehensive, affordable health care.

According to the latest figures released by the Census Bureau, 45 million Americans are uninsured. Millions more are underinsured. Just last month, the Commonwealth Fund released a study estimating that there are 16 million Americans who are underinsured—meaning their insurance would not adequately protect them in the event of catastrophic health care expenses. That means that 61 million Americans either have no health insurance or have insurance coverage that leaves them exposed to high health care costs. Sixty-one million is nearly 21 percent of all Americans, or one in five. Put simply, this is unacceptable.

Unfortunately, the health care legislation that the House will consider this week fails to address our nation's health care crisis. These bills will not do anything to provide quality, comprehensive, and affordable health care to these 61 million Americans or to the millions more who constantly worry about losing their health care.

As in years past, I remain opposed to proposals to create "association health plans" or AHPs. AHPs purport to offer affordable health care to small business owners and employees, but this is accomplished by exempting insurers from state insurance and consumer protection laws including benefit mandates, solvency standards, and pricing rules. This evasion of state laws could be devastating to the consumer who thinks that they have comprehensive coverage only to discover, after the fact, that their policy offers a bare bones minimum of benefits.

In addition, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that AHPs will cause 10,000 people

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 EX- EMPT HAWAII FROM THE AD- JUSTED GROSS INCOME LIMITA- TION ON PARTICIPATION IN CON- SERVATION 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