HONORING THE LATE DR. ALICE SMOTHERS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a daughter of Texas, Dr. Alice Smothers. She passed away on Saturday, October 14, 2000, at the age of 104.

The state of Texas, the nation and the world have lost not only a good friend for those in need, but also an outstanding educator and leader. Dr. Smothers, a well-known pioneer to many, provided a place in this world for orphaned Black children. Alongside her husband, the late J.W. Smothers, she founded St. Paul Industrial Training School. Like Dr. Smothers, the school served countless young Texans in providing training in the agricultural, industrial and technical arts for over 60 years throughout the Henderson County community. Dr. Smothers' vision and leadership allowed the St. Paul Industrial Training School to become an entity that awarded educational scholarships to needy college-bound students. To this day, the scholarship program of the St. Paul Industrial Training School has assisted over 530 students to help them realize their dreams of pursuing a college education.

I am deeply saddened that Texas, the nation and the world have lost such an exceptional and tireless trailblazer of the educational community like Dr. Smothers. I ask the House to join me in remembrance of Dr. Alice Smothers—a true champion for men, women and children everywhere.

FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT AND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM CENTENNIAL ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 2000

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I supported this bill when the House first considered it, but I did have some concerns about it.

Now, as it comes back to us from the Senate, it is considerably improved and I will support it without the same reservations.

The bill was prompted by the Resources Committee's oversight of the implementation of several important programs under which the federal government assists the state wildlife agencies.

As a result of our committee's review, it became clear that we should revisit the underlying statutes. At the same time, though, it's clear that some of the charges about the actions of the current Administration were exaggerated and that some of the people making those charges failed to point out similar actions that occurred during prior Administrations.

The programs of assistance to state wildlife agencies addressed by this bill are very valuable for Colorado and many other states. And I certainly agree with the bill's sponsors that it would be good to tighten the current law that allows the Interior Department an unusually large degree of discretion in the administration of these programs. However, as originally passed by the House, I was concerned that the bill went overboard in responding to the ways the Interior Department has used that discretion.

I certainly understand the purpose of limiting the amount of money that can be spent on administration, because obviously what's spent that way won't be available for the substantive purposes of the programs. But we need to recognize that administration is necessary, and adequate administration is essential to avoid the risk of misuse of taxpayer funds, either by the Department of the Interior or by other parties.

The Senate amendments would authorize more realistic funding levels for administration, and would allow some additional flexibility for unexpected administrative costs. I think those are definite improvements, and so are some other changes that reduce the extent to which the bill imposes micro-management requirements. Accountability is essential, but excessive paperwork for its own sake can eat up resources that could be put to more productive purposes.

Also, as it comes before us today the bill includes a reauthorization for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, so that it can continue its very important work in support of conservation and sound management. And it also includes legislation to commemorate the centennial of the National Wildlife Refuge System that is similar to H.R. 4442, a bill that I cosponsored and that the House passed earlier this year.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to concur in the Senate amendments and send the bill to the President for signing into law.

SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NEED FOR WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL ON THE MALL

SPEECH OF

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 2000

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for this legislation, S. Con. Res. 145, that expresses the sense of Congress that the construction of the National World War II Memorial should be constructed expeditiously and that the appropriate site for the Memorial is on our National Mall at the Rainbow Pool. I want to thank Senator WARNER, Chairman STUMP, and all the other Members of Congress who worked to bring this legislation before us today.

As we enter the new century, it is appropriate that we reflect on the turning point of the past century. The World War II Memorial will commemorate that period between 1939 and 1945 that so profoundly reconfigured the modern world. So long as there is an America, this hallowed ground will pay homage to the superlative devotion that elevated duty, honor, and country to sacred proportion.

The location of the World War II memorial between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial is not only appropriate, but also historically coherent. Those two memorials commemorate the defining national events of the 18th and 19th centuries: our Nation's founding in the Revolutionary War and our unification during the Civil War. It is only fitting that the event that reshaped the modern world in the 20th century and marked our Nation's emergence from the chrysalis of isolationism as the leader of the free world be commemorated on this site.

As we all know, the site and the form of the memorial have been the subject of ongoing qualification and even some controversy. This is how public dialogue should ensue in our country. I believe that the site and respectful style of the memorial are most appropriate. The refined design is a beautiful tribute to a generation of Americans who sacrificed their lives in service to our country with unparalleled valor and distinction. This design enhances the Mall's representation of American history. It retains open vistas—north and south as well as east and west. And it adds trees, plantings, and waterfalls while also capturing for visitors and all Americans the significance of this most historic event of the 20th Century.

More importantly, we must acknowledge that the open, expansive process by which decisions have been made about this site and this design. The democratic process these brave Americans fought to defend has been pursued. The congressional deliberations—extensive hearings, floor action, and two separate bills—that led to the authorization of the memorial were long, frustratingly long, but they were thorough. As one sage commented, ''It has taken longer to build the memorial than it did to fight the war.'' I can now say it has taken us twice as long to build the Memorial as to fight the war—over 13 years.

Our first bill authorizing the memorial was filed in 1987, and the final bill was passed in 1993. The Administrations of two presidents, five Congresses, and a decade of administrative reviews have elapsed.

After authorization, the procedures of the American Battle Monuments Commission and the other bodies responsible for approving the memorial have been open and fair. There have been 17 open, public meetings held on the proposed Memorial since 1993. Questions have been raised and suggestions offered by Members of Congress, the general public, and interest groups about the site and style of the memorial. With that deliberative process, the concept has been refined and become more elegant and appropriate for this hallowed site.

The concept of a World War II Memorial in Washington sprang from a dogged Army veteran, my constituent, Roger Durbin of Berkey, Ohio, who fought with the 101st Armored Division in the Battle of the Bulge. It was Roger's question to me about why there was no memorial to World War II in Washington to which he could take his grandchildren that inspired the historic project that is before us today.

The thought of Roger reminds me of that auspicious day, Veterans Day, 1995, when the memorial site was consecrated with soil from American battlefield cemeteries around the world. Roger Durbin participated in that dedication, accompanied by his wife Marian. He wrote about it as follows:

> I stood on the site of the Memorial, November 10, 1995, watching the activity thereon. Touch football, stickball, Frisbee, picnicking, etc. as people enjoyed a sunny day as they would have in an ordinary public park. The next day I stood with President Clinton at the end of the glorious site dedication ceremony and scattered sacred soil