DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ASSISTANCE AND BILL OF RIGHTS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 2000

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4920, the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000. The legislation would improve service systems for individuals with disabilities, including state developmental disability councils that assist individuals with disabilities, protection and advocacy systems for individuals with disabilities, and university affiliated programs for research and public service programs. I am pleased to see that others here in Congress are taking up this fight, particularly Rep. RICK LAZIO, the sponsor of this legislation we are now considering.

Rep. LAZIO has done an outstanding job of bringing the need for this legislation to the attention of Members. Under his leadership, H.R. 4920 has been crafted to provide many quality services for individuals with disabilities. Mr. LAZIO's bill builds upon the programs in current law to create a well-rounded approach toward assisting individuals with disabilities.

I also find it very appropriate that we consider this legislation on the 10th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act. In its ten years, the ADA has done much to improve the daily lives of individuals with disabilities. The ADA has helped move these individuals into the mainstream of American life.

The Committee I chair has jurisdiction over several laws that provide assistance and protections for individuals with disabilities, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Throughout my time in Congress, I have consistently fought for improved programs and funding for individuals with disabilities.

I am particularly pleased with the increases in funding for IDEA that we have seen over the past five years, although we still have a long way to go.

I am pleased to support this bill.

THE REGISTER GUARD

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 2000

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an Opinion Editorial written by my predecessor, former Congressman Jim Weaver. In the article, printed in the Register Guard, Wednesday, July 26, 2000, Weaver discusses his encounters with Governor Bush's newly appointed running-mate, Dick Cheney. I recommend Jim Weaver's well-crafted, thought-provoking article to my colleagues for its insight and importance.

CHENEY HAS SHOWN HE'S SOFT IN NATURE, BUT TOUGH ON ISSUES

(By Jim Weaver)

Dick Cheney and I were members of the House Committee on the Interior in the 1970s and 1980s. We sat opposite each other on the upper tier of the committee bench, he on the Republican side, and I on the Democratic side.

Cheney was always cordial, even gentle in demeanor, willing to discuss any matter and listen to other views. I grew to like him and conferred with him often.

While writing a book on the U.S. House of Representatives, he discovered that an ancestor of mine, James B. Weaver, had conducted a filibuster in the House in 1888 on the Oklahoma Land Bill. As I, too, had filibustered a bill, he told me the story. I appreciated his personal consideration.

So it always surprised me that when decisions were actually made in the committee, Cheney was hard as steel, and uncompromising on the hard-fought issues over forest preservation, revision of the 1872 mining act, grazing on public lands or nuclear power. He was three or four places down from the ranking Republican on the committee, but there was little question as to who controlled the Republican side—Dick Cheney. This very strong, highly intelligent, determined man kept the Republicans unanimous against any environmental incursions the Democrats attempted.

The chairman of the committee at that time was Mo Udall of Arizona. He bent over backward to conduct the committee fairly and to give the Republicans every parliamentary opportunity. His reward, offered by Cheney and his cohorts, was constantly and vehemently to accuse him and the Democrats of tyranny and railroading our bills. I only wish we had done so.

After the accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear plant in 1979, a House committee was chosen to conduct an investigation. I was named chairman and Cheney vice chairman. It was an intensive inquiry and resulted in many revelations. Cheney was an admirable person to work with. Conscientious and penetrating, Cheney helped make the inquiry the best of the presidential, Senate and House investigations.

But when the committee reported its findings, Cheney wrote a minority report to accompany my majority report.

My report blamed the accident on the extreme technological complications of nuclear power while Cheney, as did the other reports, blamed ''human error.'' Cheney concluded with the NRC estimate that the accident would take a year and $60 million to repair. My report predicted 10 years and $1 billion dollars. Ten years later and more than a billion dollars spent, they were still cleaning up the last remnants.

I think Cheney would make an outstanding Republican vice president; actually, an outstanding Republican president. If I were a dyed in the wool Republican, I could not find a better person to vote for. But I am not a Republican.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM L. JENKINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 2000

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 439, on motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea''; on rollcall No. 440, on motion to suspend the rules and pass Illegal Pornography and Prosecution Act, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea''; on rollcall No. 441, on passage disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea''; on rollcall No. 442, on agreement to providing for consideration of H.R. 4942, making appropriations for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2001, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

AMERICORPS

HON. CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 2000

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following two articles for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and recommend that all members read and consider them when looking at the issue of AmeriCorps. These articles were brought to my attention by former Pennsylvania Senator Harris Wofford, and I hope that members find them helpful when considering reauthorization of AmeriCorps.

[From The Hill, June 21, 2000]

WHY I CHANGED MY MIND ABOUT AMERICORPS

(By Dan Coats, former Republican Senator from Rhode Island)

When I was in the Senate, I did not support the legislation that created AmeriCorps because of my fundamental belief in private voluntary service and my skepticism about government-based solutions. I thought that government-supported volunteers would undermine the spirit of voluntary service and that new federal resources might subvert the mission and the independence of the civic sector.

My faith in the civic sector has not diminished one bit; in fact, it is stronger today than ever before. However, I have changed my mind about AmeriCorps. Instead of distorting the mission of the civic sector, AmeriCorps has proved to be a source of new power and energy for nonprofit organizations across the country.

My changed view about AmeriCorps is in no small measure because of the leadership that Harris Wofford, my Democratic former Senate colleague from Pennsylvania, has given to that program. Wofford and I did not vote on the same side very often in the Senate, and we still differ on many issues. But his leadership of AmeriCorps has convinced me that I should have voted with him on this issue.

First, thanks to Wofford's steadfast commitment to place national service above partisanship, AmeriCorps has not become the political program that some of us initially feared. Second, he shares my belief that the solutions to some of our most intractable problems lie in the civic sector. Accordingly, he has set AmeriCorps to the work of supporting, not supplanting, the civic sector.

I have seen firsthand how AmeriCorps members have provided a jolt of new energy to the civic sector from my experience as president of Big Brothers Big Sisters of America. As Millard Fuller, founder of Habitat for Humanity and another former skeptic of government-supported volunteers, also discovered, the leadership provided by full-time AmeriCorps members is a key addition for nonprofit and faith based organizations that are tackling the most difficult community and human problems.

AmeriCorps members, through their idealism, enthusiasm and can-do spirit, have multiplied the impact of organizations like Big Brothers Big Sisters and Habitat, and hundreds of other organizations large and small.