

resulting in immediate and massive bleeding and the threat of shock or even death to the mother.

None of this risk is ever necessary for any reason. We and many other doctors across the U.S. regularly treat women whose unborn children suffer the same conditions as those cited by the women who appeared at Mr. Clinton's veto ceremony. Never is the partial-birth procedure necessary. Not for hydrocephaly (excessive cerebrospinal fluid in the head), not for polyhydramnios (an excess of amniotic fluid collecting in the women) and not for trisomy (genetic abnormalities characterized by an extra chromosome). Sometimes, as in the case of hydrocephaly, it is first necessary to drain some of the fluid from the baby's head. And in some cases, when vaginal delivery is not possible, a doctor performs a Caesarean section. But in no case is it necessary to partially deliver an infant through the vagina and then kill the infant.

How telling it is that although Mr. Clinton met with women who claimed to have needed partial-birth abortions on account of these conditions, he has flat-out refused to meet with women who delivered babies with these same conditions, with no damage whatsoever to their health or future fertility.

Former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop was recently asked whether he'd ever operated on children who had any of the disabilities described in this debate. Indeed he had. In fact, one of his patients—"with a huge omphalocele [a sac containing the baby's organs] much bigger than her head"—went on to become the head nurse in his intensive care unit many years later.

Mr. Koop's reaction to the president's veto? "I believe that Mr. Clinton was misled by his medical advisers on what is fact and what is fiction" on the matter, he said. Such a procedure, he added, cannot truthfully be called medically necessary for either the mother or—he scarcely need point out—for the baby.

Considering these medical realities, one can only conclude that the women who thought they underwent partial-birth-abortions for "medical" reasons were tragically misled. And those who purport to speak for women don't seem to care.

So whom are you going to believe? The activist-extremists who refuse to allow a little truth to get in the way of their agenda? The politicians who benefit from the activists' political action committees? Or doctors who have the facts?

THE COMPUTER SOFTWARE DEPRECIATION CORRECTION

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1996

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to change current tax law to allow computer software acquired in the purchase of a business to be subject to the same tax depreciation rules as most other computer software available to the general public. My bill also shortens the depreciable life of computer software to 2 years, to better reflect its true value to a small business or a corporation.

Current law considers software acquired in the purchase of a business to be an "intangible asset," under Internal Revenue Code section 197. As such, it is subject to a punitive 15-year depreciation rule. My bill first places all computer software, regardless of its origin,

composition, or means of acquisition, on equal footing with typical off-the-shelf software technology currently available to most consumers.

My bill then lowers the current 36-month "useful life" standard for computer software deduction down to 2 years. This shorter period is a much more fair concept of "useful life." The 2-year deduction is weighted in the first year to allow a 70-percent deduction, followed by a second-year 30-percent deduction. This also reflects the value of the software to a business in a much more fair way.

Shortening the depreciable life of computer software—and especially subjecting the most technical and sophisticated programs to the same treatment as commercially available software—will have substantial economic impact. It will lower the cost of operation for thousands of small businesses which may currently purchase hundreds of programs a year. It will also restore a measure of equity for small businesses vis-a-vis larger corporations which can afford to write their own software and expense the costs that year as a research and development expenditure.

While on the vanguard of our technology sector, computer software has an increasingly short product life cycle, often about 1 to 2 years, depreciating much more rapidly than most products. My bill will help spur further innovation in this growing sector of our economy. And as many new companies involved in emerging technology markets must acquire new technologies in order to grow, my bill will enhance the competitiveness of U.S. firms with foreign firms that may enjoy much more favorable tax treatment of acquired assets like software.

An in-depth economic analysis will have to be made on my bill's impact, a preliminary examination of the legislation indicates its cost will be minimal, compared to its benefit to the technology sector. I encourage my colleagues to join me in this effort by cosponsoring this important bill.

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS TRAVIS AMVETS POST 14 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1996

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Louis Travis Amvets Post 14 as they celebrate the 50th anniversary of their post charter on Saturday, October 26, 1996.

After the end of World War II, thousands of veterans throughout our country had the need for an organization which would bring them together under a common bond. In Bay View, a World War II veteran by the name of Edward Cialdini understood this need and sought to find such an organization. Ed came into contact with an organizer for the American Veterans of World War II, also known as AMVETS, and on March 27, 1946 they met with 14 other Bay View veterans to create an AMVET post.

Once the new post was created, the founders decided it should be named in the memory of a local veteran, Louis Travis of Bay View. He was the sixth child of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Travis, born in January 20, 1925. In 1943 Louis joined the Navy and participated in many Pacific campaigns aboard the U.S.S.

Minneapolis and U.S.S. Pensacola where he saw combat in the Iwo Jima operation. During this bombardment, his ship was struck by enemy shells and he was killed on February 17, 1945. He was posthumously awarded the Purple Heart, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one silver and three bronze stars, and the World War II Victory Medal. The organizers were proud to name their new post after this true American hero.

For several years, the Travis Post held its meetings at the local club where it was formed. However, as the organization grew, so did the need for their own clubhouse. After the war ended, the Travis Post purchased a messhall from the German prisoner-of-war stockade built at Mitchell Field. After many years of hard labor by its members and several local community volunteers, and financial troubles, the post was finally completed and operational by 1952. That building served Bay View area veterans for 43 years. In 1995, the building was sold, and Travis Post meetings are now being held at the same club where it was formed.

Over the past 50 years, the Travis Post has met the needs of all Bay View veterans. The Louis Travis AMVET Post has a history filled with sacrifice, hard labor, and ultimately success. I applaud all of the veterans who helped to organize, build, and sustain the Travis Post over these past 50 years.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

HON. CALVIN M. DOOLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1996

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, recently the House passed the conference report to accompany H.R. 3816, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1997. This legislation includes a long-sought solution to resolve the issues concerning costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program. This language directs the Secretary of Interior to collect repayment of the cost of the Kesterson drain as described in the report entitled "Repayment Report, Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, February 1995".

While all parties involved in the Kesterson cleanup issue are pleased with the solution of the repayment situation, there are several landowners who are involved in a lawsuit—Sumner Peck Ranch—that stems from the closing of the drain. The closing of the drain has led to the degradation of land in the area. In some cases this land has become incapable of being farmed. The basis of the lawsuit is that the landowners believe that the Federal Government should provide them with monetary compensation for the loss of the productive use of their land because the Federal Government is not operating a drain as promised in past contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation.

The case has not been resolved, and mandatory settlement discussions before the Ninth Circuit's chief mediator are ongoing. I want to make clear that the language contained in the fiscal year 1997 energy and water development appropriations bill in no way was intended to affect the outcome of the Sumner

Peck Ranch litigation. The only purpose of the language was to resolve the long-standing dispute regarding the allocation of the repayment responsibilities.

OPPOSITION TO THE FISCAL YEAR
1997 VA/HUD CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1996

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I joined 24 of my colleagues in opposing the fiscal year 1997 VA/HUD conference report. I want to be very clear that I strongly support our veterans. I voted for this legislation when the House passed its version earlier this year. But I could not, in good conscience vote for the conference report.

I voted against this bill for one reason and one reason only—this bill hurt some of the accounts most critical to our Nation's veterans. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee worked long and hard to produce a budget that maintained or increased almost every major VA account. Unfortunately, the final conference product cuts the House request of two of the most critical veterans programs while increasing funds for nonveterans programs.

The VA medical care account was cut by \$55 million over the House-passed version. As the VA struggles to offer consistent quality medical care to veterans, I am angry that these dollars are being spent by Americorps—a paid volunteer program which received \$400 million more than the House originally intended. Our veterans heeded the call of our country and risked their lives and their health in true service to the United States. They should not be asked to take a back seat to a program that has been criticized for mismanagement and waste.

The VA medical research account was cut \$15 million from the House passed legislation. Mr. Speaker, in addition VA's premier research efforts in areas such as spinal cord injury and blind rehabilitation, this cut hurts some of our newest and sickest veterans—those who have returned from Operation Desert Storm with bizarre service-connected illnesses ranging from chronic fatigue syndrome to cancer. On the heels of a long-overdue Pentagon admission that some of our troops were exposed to chemical weapons, we are trimming the very dollars that may have been used to improve treatment methods or quality of life for these soldiers.

I am an original cosponsor of a bill introduced by my colleague, the Honorable GLEN BROWDER creating an independent commission to study the use of chemical weapons in the gulf war. We must take the lessons of our sick veterans to ensure that future generations of soldiers are given the best opportunity to perform in an age of chemical warfare and still come home with their health.

The priorities of this conference report are skewed. While I understand that overall VA funding is increased over fiscal year 1996 dollars, I am disappointed that VA's medical mission has been slighted in the process. The wishes of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee should have been given more, not less, consideration.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE
SCHOOL OF NURSING, UNIVER-
SITY OF MARYLAND AT BALTI-
MORE, AND DR. BARBARA R.
HELLER

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1996

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the School of Nursing, University of Maryland at Baltimore and Dr. Barbara R. Heller, Dean of the School, as it breaks ground on a new building and marks an important milestone in the history of the institution, nursing education and the nursing profession.

The School of Nursing, ranked in the top 10 nationally and one of the largest institutions of nursing education in the country, is in the forefront of nursing education, research and clinical service. Students are provided with the knowledge and skills they need to practice in a dynamically changing, global health care marketplace.

The school targets critical local, State and national problems through research in such areas as the health of mothers and infants, drug abuse, oncology, geriatrics, school/child health, trauma/critical care, community health and AIDS prevention.

Through growing clinical practice initiatives, the school offers vital primary and preventive services throughout Maryland. While enriching the academic experience for many students, these affordable, accessible nurse-managed, community-based health centers served as models of health care delivery to underserved and uninsured populations.

I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting the efforts of the School of Nursing to refocus, redefine and reengineer nursing education. I also congratulate the faculty, students and staff as they break ground on a new facility, building the future of our Nation's health care delivery system through education.

LEGISLATION TO EXPAND CONDI-
TIONS FOR VETERANS PRE-
SUMED TO BE SERVICE CON-
NECTED DUE TO EXPOSURE TO
IONIZING RADIATION

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1996

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to address an injustice that should be corrected at our earliest possible opportunity—the poor treatment of our Nation's atomic veterans.

There can be no question that atomic veterans were not adequately informed of the dangers of ionizing radiation and were injured as a result. Many of these men and women have paid for their dedication and bravery with their health and some with their lives. We owe it to them to see that they are not forgotten and that they receive the compensation for all of the illnesses that were incurred because of their service to our Nation. My legislation is but another step in ensuring that we fulfill our duty to them.

Recent developments have made a clear case for providing relief to these vets. The final report of the President's Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experimentation more or less concluded that our Government has failed these brave men and women. The recommendations of the committee mirrored many of the concerns that the atomic veterans groups have had for years: that the list of presumptive diseases contained in law is inadequate, that the standard of proof to meet administrative claims is often impossible to meet, and that these statutes are limited and inequitable in their coverage.

I believe that Congress must provide the necessary leadership to ensure that these veterans' needs are met. My legislation is based on the precedent set by the Marshall Islands Nuclear Claims Tribunal Act, which provides relief for a number of presumptive diseases. Currently, Marshall Islanders receive compensation if they exhibit one or more of the 27 illnesses presumed radiogenic in nature. My legislation would ensure that all of the radiogenic illnesses that Marshall Islanders are compensated for are also on the presumptive list for our Nation's vets. Specifically, it would add bone cancer, cancer of the colon, nonmalignant thyroid nodular disease, parathyroid cancer, ovarian cancer, brain and central nervous system tumors, unexplained bone marrow failure and meningioma to the presumptive list.

This legislation will ensure that atomic veterans are treated properly, not as second-class citizens. It will also ensure that our Nation's policy on addressing the damage done by our Nation's nuclear weapons program is consistent. The least we can do is to make sure that veterans receive compensation for illnesses already determined by our Government to be linked to exposure to ionizing radiation. I urge my colleagues to sponsor this long-overdue legislation.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3666,
DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS
AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1996

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3666, the conference report on VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations for fiscal year 1997. I support this bill for many reasons but especially because it includes a provision that requires health insurance companies to cover 48 hours of hospital care for a woman after she gives birth.

Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mrs. Maureen Drumm is a perfect example of why this practice of drive-through deliveries must be stopped.

On August 31, 1992, Maureen gave birth to her first daughter, Bridget Theresa. Bridget's first twenty-four hours of life were that of a normal, beautiful, healthy baby. However, approximately twenty-hours after Bridget was born, Maureen began to experience severe physical distress. Maureen had developed a