One physician told the Hirschfeld's that Jake had no better than a one in ten chance of living outside of institutional care. Jake's mother, Nancy, recalls that ''one preschool initially turned away our son because of their fear of autism, but once they began to see Jake as a person who had unique gifts as well as challenges they accepted him.''

Thankfully, the Hirschfeld family persevered and sought services to help their son. Their search led them to engage an intensive early intervention therapy called Applied Behavior Analysis, or ABA. This therapy has been available for over twenty years, and was recently featured on NBC Nightly News and ABC's Primetime Live. It is one of the treatments that can significantly reduce the symptoms of autism. Because the cause or causes of autism have yet to be identified, early intervention is the best course available for parents today.

Unfortunately, these services are not universally supported by public or private insurance, so families like the Hirschfeld's pay up to $60,000 per year to help their children. In the State of Nebraska, there are now organizations who offer these services, including the Families for Effective Autism Treatment, or FEAT. Although FEAT now serves over 20 families in Eastern Nebraska, countless other families nationwide cannot access this treatment because of its prohibitive cost.

But the tremendous investment can pay great dividends. Jacob Hirschfeld could once barely speak, but he was recently one of the stars in an Easter musical at his school. He was once scared of most people, but is now regularly seen riding his bike around the neighborhood, greeting neighbors and playing with friends. And yes, he plays a pretty decent game of baseball. Jake has come a long way, but he will continue to need services to help him along his journey, just as many autistic children in America need support and care.

Early intervention has also made a difference in the lives of Patrick and Jean McDermott, and their son, Grant, who was diagnosed with autism when he was 22 months old.

Grant's mother Jean said ''it was devastating to hear the words 'diagnosis of autism' as parents of this beautiful child. My husband and I wondered what his future would hold. After the initial shock, we started researching what we could do to give him a brighter future.''

The McDermott's also chose the ADA early intervention therapy. Therapists worked with Grant about 35 hours a week, teaching him basic and then more advanced skills. Grant is now in regular school with no aides, and will be going to kindergarten this Fall. His future is looking bright and the McDermott's believe he will live a full life, but it will always be a challenge having an autistic son until a cure can be found.

Autism now affects 1 out of every 166 children in the United States. Boys are four times more likely to have autism than girls. This developmental disorder robs individuals of their ability to communicate and interact with others. Some autistic children seem barely able to distinguish their parents from strangers.

The costs of caring for autistic individuals is high financially as well as emotionally. Nationwide, an estimated $90 billion is spent every year. Specialized treatment in developmental centers costs about $80,000 per child, and special education programs cost about $30,000 per autistic child. Services are needed to help reduce these burdens on families and society.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great need for increased public awareness about autism, and more aggressive research into this disorder to help American families like the Hirschfeld's and the McDermott's. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H. Res. 605, and urge my colleagues to join me in wholeheartedly voting for its passage today.

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR INCREASED EDUCATION AND AWARENESS ABOUT HEPATITIS C

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 2004

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, May has been designated as Hepatitis Awareness month. In light of that, I rise today to highlight one type of Hepatitis that is an important health issue facing our country—the Hepatitis C virus. Hepatitis C is now the most common bloodborne infection in the United States infecting an estimated 2.7 million Americans and more than 32,000 in my home State of New Mexico alone. Further exacerbating the situation is the fact that it is estimated that less than 5 percent of individuals with Hepatitis C are receiving treatment. These statistics alone underscore the critical need to increase education and awareness about this virus. Today I am introducing a resolution that calls for exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the figures I mentioned above, it is also worth noting that approximately 80 percent of those infected with Hepatitis C develop chronic liver disease with an increased risk for development of cirrhosis and liver cancer. In fact, in the United States Hepatitis C is estimated to be the cause of 40 percent to 60 percent of cases of chronic liver disease and 8,000 to 10,000 deaths annually.

One population in our society for whom Hepatitis C is a particular concern is our veterans. A study released in July 2003 measured the prevalence of Hepatitis C in a sample of veterans treated in a homeless veterans program in Massachusetts over a five-year period. The study found an overall prevalence rate of HCV infection of 44 percent, a rate more than 10 times higher than the national rate for men age 20–59. According to the study, adjusting for age, significant risk factors in the sample included a history of substance abuse and service during the Vietnam era. However, this is by no means the only at-risk population.

Native Americans are another segment of our population who are experiencing the destructive effects of the Hepatitis C virus. Although Native Americans experience infection rates on average with other populations, because of other obstacles to accessing care and accessing quality care, they are experiencing much higher death rates and years of life lost as a result of chronic liver disease.

Mr. Speaker, these are but two examples of specific demographic groups dealing with the realities of the Hepatitis C virus. But as indicated by the number of Americans infected with this virus it is clearly a much more widespread concern. As a nation we must begin confronting the rising human and economic costs of this virus. And we in Congress must begin confronting the policy choices we need to make to stem these costs. Passing this resolution will be an important step in this process.

EXPRESSING CONCERN OF CONGRESS OVER IRAN'S DEVELOPMENT OF MEANS TO PRODUCE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 2004

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I abhor nuclear weapons and would like nothing better than to see the world free of these weapons. I believe that Iran is a nation that we cannot trust. I also believe the House Concurrent Resolution rushed through Congress by the Republicans with little debate and even less clarity in intent is wrong, and I cannot support it.

The wording of the Iran Resolution reminds me of the blank check the President got for Iraq. Here's what I mean. The relevant portion of Section 2 of the Iran Resolution says: ''. . . to use all appropriate means to deter, dissuade and prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. . . .'' We must not make the same mistake twice. We need to deal with Iran. We need to deal with nuclear weapons programs, but this is not the way to do it.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DAVE OBEY

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 2004

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit the humble, humorous and insightful remarks of my dear friend and Dean of the Wisconsin Congressional Delegation, the Honorable DAVE OBEY. The gentleman was the honored guest recently at the University of Wisconsin-Madison's Department of Political Science as it celebrated its Centennial. I was given a copy of his remarks and was captivated. Written with his characteristic no nonsense Wisconsin affect, this wonderful speech is a treasure to be shared. To that end, I submit it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I came to Madison in 1958—after two years at the UW-Marathon County Center in Wausau—to get a poly-sci degree.

Arthur Henderson, my high school history teacher, who had worked with the great William Hesseltine, told me that I should seek out Ralph Huitt as my faculty advisor and take as many courses from him as possible if I wanted to understand how government and politics really worked. That's exactly what I did.

I had many other fabulous professors: Leon Epstein, Bernie Cohen, Fred von der Mehden, David Fellman, John Armstrong, Henry Hart, to name a few.

And in the history and econ departments, people like: Selig Perlman, Michael Petrovich, George Mosse, David Granick.

It's amazing to me how much of what they taught me has had direct relevance in my later life. I treasure what I learned here—in and out of class—and I treasure the memories.

I attended here at the same time as Bill Steiger, who later was my Republican opposite image in Congress and one of the finest politicians I have ever known. Bill was elected to the State Assembly in 1960; I followed him in 1962. He was elected to Congress in 1966; I followed 27 months later. But in the late 1950s, we were both still here and had two classes together.

One was Constitutional law with Dave Fellman. For those of you who do not know Fellman, his style was much like the law professor played by John Housman in the TV series ''Paper Chase''—dry and acerbic.

Steiger was ''Big Man on Campus.'' His father, Carl Steiger, was President of the Board of Regents, and Bill was well known and active in everything. On the first day of class, Steiger walked into Fellman's class about 5 minutes late. Chagrined, he walked gingerly to his seat. Fellman paused, peered at Steiger over his glasses, and said icily, ''Please pardon me, Mr. Steiger. Ordinarily we would have an usher escort you to your seat. Unfortunately, our carnations have not yet arrived.'' Bill turned blood red. No one in that class was late after that.

I remember in 1960 the first time I met Jack Kennedy. Kennedy and Hubert Humphrey were running against each other in the Wisconsin presidential primary. I was running Humphrey's campaign on campus.

One evening I was chairing a meeting in the student union. We knew Jackie Kennedy was upstairs at a fashion show, but we didn't know that Jack was with her. Halfway through our meeting, the door to our room opened and Kennedy poked his head in. ''I understand this is a meeting of the Young Democrats he said.'' ''Not quite,'' I responded, ''this is a meeting of the Humphrey for President club.'' ''Well, do you mind if I come in and say hello?'' he asked. ''Of course not,'' I responded. Kennedy came in, shook hands around the table, wished us luck but not too much, and moved on.

That same year I met Jackie Robinson and wound up wanting to strangle him. Gaylord Nelson, the new Governor, called me one afternoon. Nelson was officially neutral, but personally favored Humphrey over Kennedy. When he called me, he said, ''Dave, Jackie Robinson is coming to town to endorse Hubert. Get a room at the union, build a crowd, and you can introduce us.''

We had a huge crowd for him. I emceed the meeting and introduced Gaylord, who introduced Robinson. Robinson gave a ringing endorsement of Humphrey and then opened up to questions. The first question from the press was, ''Mr. Robinson, you have endorsed Senator Humphrey, but what if he loses to Senator Kennedy in the primary?'' Robinson said, ''Why then I'll endorse Nixon.'' The crowd gasped and the press ran for the phones to call their papers. What was supposed to be a good day for Humphrey turned into an even better one for Nixon.

As you know, Kennedy did win the nomination and squared off against Nixon. The last week of the election it was announced that Nixon's plane would touch down for an early Saturday morning rally at Truax field on the way to California. Bill Whitford, Tom Eckerle, and I decided we wanted to crash the rally. We went down to GOP headquarters and wheedled a bunch of Nixon Lodge signs (Nixon's running mate that year was Henry Cabot Lodge). We cut Lodge's name off the bottom of the sign, moved it to the top, added the letters ''D-1-S'' in front of Lodge's name so the signs read ''Dislodge Nixon'' and sounded a small dissent at the rally the next morning.

After the election we needed the help of the faculty to get one of our friends out of trouble. In 1961 the Republican Leadership in the Legislature called upon Governor Nelson to fire his Secretary, Esther Kaplan, after she had circulated a petition calling for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Republican Leadership introduced a resolution praising HUAC and held a Nelson bashing hearing on it in the State Assembly Chambers. My friend, Dave Sheridan, was so angered by the resolution that he put on his ROTC uniform, walked down to the Capitol, and testified against the resolution.

''I know that you are claiming that anyone opposed to HUAC is either a traitor or a communist dupe,'' Sheridan said. ''I'm wearing this uniform to demonstrate that while I may be a dupe, I'm certainly no traitor.'' The Republican Leadership was enraged and moved to have Sheridan thrown out of the ROTC program because he had worn his uniform to testify—in violation of Army rules.

A number of Dave's friends on the faculty went to Ralph Huitt and several others to get some advice on how to save Sheridan's hide. Huitt (or someone else on the faculty) called Carlisle Runge a UW law professor who had been named a high Pentagon post by Kennedy, and got Sheridan off with a reprimand. Years later it was to be my great pleasure to cast a vote that disbanded HUAC.

And there were some other pleasures. In his course on legislation, Huitt scheduled a Mock Senate, role playing exercise one weekend in the State Assembly Chambers at the Capitol. Each student was assigned to play an individual, real life U.S. Senator. Fittingly, Bill Steiger was assigned to play Everett Dirksen, the Republican Floor Leader. I was assigned to play Senator William Fullbright. It was my task to try to push a foreign aid bill through the Senate. I had no idea that 25 years later I would Chair the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, which had the responsibility to handle all foreign aid appropriations.

And there were so many other links in the chain.

A large part of that Foreign Operations Committee responsibility would be to shape development aid to the Third World, the region that was the focus of Fred von der Mehden's and Henry Hart's courses on Third World politics.

Another strong focus for the committee was the Middle East. Next to the Soviet Union, my main regional interest in Congress has been the Middle East. That interest was first triggered by series of debates that two faculty members at the UW-Marathon County Center, Dr. Sam Weiner and Dr. Bob Najem, had conducted after the 1956 Mid-East war.

Of course, I knew nothing of those future linkages then. Certainly, in graduate school under John Armstrong where I focused on Russian area studies and expected to wind up teaching Russian government somewhere, I had no idea that 30 years later I would be partnering with Indiana Congressman Lee Hamilton to shepherd through Congress aid packages for Russia and Eastern Europe after Gorbachev allowed the Soviet block to crumble, virtually without a shot.

I'm grateful for all those memories and for the substantive grounding the University gave me to prepare me for my congressional responsibilities. But the grounding I received from the University was not just because of the courses I took. It was also because of the spirit, the philosophy, the progressive mindset that defined the University and set it off as something special in the American experience.

You simply cannot live in Wisconsin and go to the University of Wisconsin without recognizing the centrality of the La Follette progressive tradition that is at the heart of Wisconsin history, and the linkage the University has with that tradition.

The greatest public servant Wisconsin ever produced was Robert La Follette. Before La Follette led his Progressive revolution, Wisconsin's politics was owned lock, stock, and barrel by the railroads, the mining companies, and the timber interests. Government was geared to promote the welfare of those engaged in the production of wealth. The interest of the working class was an after thought. La Follette changed all that—aided and abetted by the University. La Follette changed the focus of Wisconsin government from enriching the few at the expense of the many to enriching the few by enriching the many. In short, he was Hubert Humphrey before Hubert Humphrey.

The original Wisconsin practitioner of the art of ''Percolate Up'' rather than ''Trickle Down'' economics, La Follette's mission and passion was to keep the big boys honest in order to include everybody in the circle of prosperity and progress. He was the Andrew Jackson of his time and place.

He understood that America is a capitalist economy, but it is also more than just an economy; it is democracy. And as a democracy, it is supposed to stand for the greatest good for the greatest number, even as it respects the rights of the individual.

He understood that capitalism works through market forces that cannot be repealed, but that democracy is not just ''Of, By, and For the Markets.'' It is designed to be ''Of, By and For the People!'' He believed that Darwin's law of the survival of the fittest might be good enough for the animal world, but not good enough for the world of man. He wanted balanced capitalism, not a new feudalism in disguise. And he intended to use the tools of government to achieve it. And he used the resources of the University to help him in his task.

Helped by scholars, such as Frederick Jackson Turner, Richard Ely, and John R. Commons, he began the process by writing legislation to loosen the stranglehold of the railroads on Wisconsin's farmers and economy. What La Follette began, before he moved to the U.S. Senate, reached its zenith under Governor Francis McGovern.

The legendary Charles McCarthy, a University product, created Wisconsin's pioneering Legislative Reference Bureau. He and more than 40 other University figures were at the center of pioneering progressive achievements—

Achievements like: The nation's first workers' compensation program, workers' safety legislation, a State Industrial Commission, limits on the hours of work for women and children, forest protection legislation, the nation's first progressive income tax, and so many others.

In his autobiography La Follette explained his passion for economic justice and the role the University played in nurturing and furthering it. In that autobiography, a Follette wrote the following. ''I shall never forget the speech I heard the old Chief Justice of Wisconsin, Edward G. Ryan, make to the graduating class at Madison in June of 1883 just before I entered the University,'' La Follette said:

''There is looming up a new and dark power . . . the enterprises of the country are aggregating vast corporate combinations of unexampled capital, boldly marching not for economic conquest only, but for political power. For the first time really in our politics money is taking the field as an organized power . . . The question will arise in

your day . . . which shall rule—wealth or man; which shall lead—money or intellect; who shall fill public stations—education and patriotic free men or the feudal serfs of corporate capital?''

La Follette then goes on to say that that speech kindled in him the spirit he carried throughout his public service. As La Follette described it, ''It grew out of the intellectual awakening . . . the very center and inspiration point of which in Wisconsin was then, and has been ever since, the University at Madison. It is difficult indeed to overestimate the part which the University has played in the Wisconsin revolution,'' La Follette said. ''For myself,'' he said, ''I owe what I am and what I have done largely to the inspiration I received while there. It was not so much the actual courses of study which I pursued; it was rather the spirit of the institution—a high spirit of earnest endeavor, a spirit of fresh interest in new things, and beyond all else, a sense that somehow the state and the University were intimately related and that they should be of mutual service.''

La Follette's attachment to the University was understandable and fitting. He was the first graduate of the University to become Governor. The legendary Charles Van Hise was a member of that same graduating class—the first person to obtain a PhD from the University, he was later effectively appointed University President by La Follette.

And I must say that it was that same sense of the spirit of the institution, so intimately connected to Wisconsin's progressive traditions, which sparked my passion for public service.

What I learned here that inspired me is that while La Follette and other Progressive Reformers like George Norris and Theodore Roosevelt were regarded as secular men, they really were at the moral core of a movement that had deep roots in the Jewish Prophetic Tradition and the Christian Social Gospel, which implied that there were certain norms of decency that must be the objectives of political choices in a democracy.

That tradition was rooted in the belief that politics must be more than merely transactional. It must be more principled than ''who gets what.'' That it could and should be, as Bill Moyers has said, transformational—that it must try to ''even the starting gate so that people who are equal in humanity but not in resources have a reasonable opportunity to pursue a full and decent life.''

The Wisconsin tradition dictates that political leadership must challenge people to see beyond their own self-interests and prerogatives. That is why whenever anyone comes into my office asking me to do something, I first ask them to read aloud a sign hanging on the wall which asks, ''What do you want me to do for someone besides yourself that is more important than whatever it is you want me to do for you?'' If you cannot answer that question you are failing the ultimate test of good citizenship in a democracy.

For the past 40 years, in the Legislature and the Congress, I have tried to pursue that special Wisconsin vision of the role of government in shaping a more just society. Wisconsin has so often in its history been informed by a special sense of commonwealth—of using our common wealth to invest in efforts to spread the blessings of society more broadly.

I wish I could say that we are still following that special calling today, but we have drifted away in so many ways. Over much of the last three decades we have seen the country retreat from those ideals. Anna Quindlen has written that ''America is a country that now sits atop the precarious latticework of myth. It is the myth that work provides sufficient rewards, that working people can support their families. It's a myth that has become so divorced from reality that it might as well begin with the words ''Once upon a time.'' Why does Quindlen say that? Because one out of every four American workers makes less than $8.70 an hour—poverty level for a family of four.

La Follette and the past greats of the University would be stunned to see that in one generation America has gone from being the industrial society with the smallest gap between rich and poor to the one with the largest.

They would be astounded to see that the safety net, which they fought so hard to construct, has not been nearly strong enough for large portions of our population.

They would be appalled that the number of Americans without health insurance has grown by 4 million people in less than a decade.

They would see shame in the fact that the most well off 1 percent of America's families enjoy control over 33 percent of the nation's wealth while the bottom 50 percent struggle to maintain 2.8 percent of the nation's wealth.

They would be dismayed to see how little heed has been paid to the warning of Adam Smith, the founding high priest of capitalism, that without fair rules of the game to keep markets honest that capitalism could be misaligned into a system that provided insufficient protection for the legitimate interests of workers and consumers alike.

They would find it unbelievable that the percentage of American workers who belong to unions has contracted rather than expanded over the last half century.

They would be outraged that the ownership of news outlets is much more heavily concentrated today than it was in their era.

They would not be surprised, but they would be repelled by a tax system that provides greater rewards for accumulated wealth than it does for work.

And most of all, La Follette himself would be disheartened by the growing financial barriers to opportunity that are encountered by the children of so many working families who seek to attend this very University.

La Follette himself is Wisconsin's most distinguished example of how crucial it can be to eliminate financial barriers to higher education. In his autobiography, La Follette made the following observation:

''My single term at the University law school had been rendered possible only through the consideration of the faculty in making an extraordinary exception in my case and permitting me to enter without paying the usual matriculation fee. I had no money . . .''

How little we have learned, despite all the blather uttered by both political parties about how much we have expanded opportunity for higher education. UW Chancellor John Wiley observed in a speech last November that the median family income in Wisconsin is a little over $45,000, but the median family income for this year's new freshman at Madison is $90,000.'' Think about that for a moment. As Wiley pointed out, ''The distribution of brains, talent, ambition, and creativity is independent of family income. We will ignore that fact and freeze out the children of average and low income families at our peril.''

Now tie that to another fact. Pell Grants, the principal student aid program for low income students, now pay for only one-half of the cost of instruction that they paid for in 1976. I feel acutely about this because I'm the Ranking Democrat on the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee that funds all education programs. Next, add in another fact. More than half of all college graduates graduate with debts above $15,000.

If La Follette were planning to go to law school today, he couldn't afford it. How many La Follettes or Gaylord Nelsons or Bill Steigers are we today passing over?

What would he and the University greats of old say about a government which, when struggling with a $500 billion deficit, a huge Social Security deficit, record long-term unemployment, and 44 million people without health insurance, decides that the number one priority in the budget next year is to provide a $155,000 tax cut to someone making a million dollars while we short fund elementary and secondary education by $9 billion and continue to tolerate a two-tier system for access to higher education or quality health care.

We all love this country. In spite of all its short comings, this is a great country. But shame on us for allowing such an outcome. We must do better.

I thank the University—and you should, too—for its tradition of producing graduates and citizens who are never satisfied, for it's tradition of saying ''We can do better!'' For the sake of the kind of country we want America to be, let's all do our part to live up to that tradition.

Now, I'm sure that some of you may strongly disagree with the thrust of what I have said today. That's o.k. As Will Rogers observed, ''If two people agree on everything, one of them is unnecessary.'' That difference would probably be rooted in the fact that we follow different philosophers. Some of you may follow Plato or Aristotle or even Ayn Rand, God Forbid. But my favorite philosopher is Arch the Cockroach.

Archy was a character invented by a writer by the name of Don Marquis in the 1920s. He was supposedly a poet who had died and had come back to life in a body of a cockroach. He lived in a newspaperman's office and every night would crawl out of the woodwork, climb onto the typewriter, dive head first on the keys, and leave little messages which would appear in the newspaper the next day. He had a thought for every occasion. One of the things he said was this:

''did you ever
notice that when
a politician
does get an idea
he usually
gets it all wrong''

But my favorite was this:

''im too small
to feel great pride
and as the pompous world
goes by
i see things from
the under side''

Like Archy, I try to see life from the underside. I make no apology. I learned it here!

PAYING TRIBUTE TO COL. LORRIS WILLIAM MOOMAW

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to the life and memory of Colonel Lorris ''Bill'' Moomaw who recently passed away. Bill was a true American hero and patriot, and a beloved friend and colleague to many in his community. In his years spent in the armed forces, Bill embodied the ideals of integrity