

[From the Daily Racing Form, June 7, 1997]
CAPTAIN BODGIT GAVE THIS OWNER THRILL OF
A LIFETIME

(By Thomas B. Evans Jr.)

"My Old Kentucky Home," so symbolic of all that the Kentucky Derby represents, was a song I had always loved to sing on many trips to Louisville the first Saturday in May. This year it was even more special, but I could only finish the first few lines. I'm sure it was in part because it's so unlikely that I would ever again have the chance to sing it as an owner, albeit only a small percentage one, of a wonderful horse like Captain Bodgit.

The shared excitement and joy felt by the many owners of Captain Bodgit was contagious and added to his increasing popularity and to the excitement of the moment. As I glanced at the tote board indicating the odds, the Captain was clearly the favorite of the majority at Churchill Downs as well. I was aware of the crowd, and through tears, also of the many people offering encouragement and good luck. However, my thoughts were of the sacrifice, the discipline and hard work that it took to get to the Kentucky Derby.

I thought of the young trainer, Gary Capuano, I was standing behind, and Captain Bodgit's grooms, and exercise rider, Sammy Davis, all of whom cared so much about Captain Bodgit. I thought of the passion with which the Captain approached his races and his workouts and the marvelous example that sets for everyone.

Years of going to the races and enjoying many great times at Derbys past could never prepare you for this incredible moment played out in two electrifying minutes in arguably the greatest classic in American sports. From my own perspective, the anxiety that accompanies political campaigning cannot compare with the anxiety you feel in the days, hours and minutes leading up to the Kentucky Derby.

I thought of so much in those few minutes before the race, including the marvelous support of racing fans, friends and family, and some of my former colleagues in Congress—all of whom I knew were rooting for Captain Bodgit. I thought of my mother and father and the many fun times we had at Delaware Park. As the starting gate opened, the exhilaration and rush of adrenalin I felt were almost beyond comparison.

The stirring stretch drives of the Captain and the courage he displayed along with Free House and Silver Charm will forever be etched in my mind. Taking nothing away from any of the other horses, and especially Silver Charm and Free House, I will always believe in my heart that our horse could have won both races with any degree of racing luck.

Being forced to change leads in the stretch robbed him of his momentum in the Derby, and still, he lost by only a head. Drawing a post position in the Preakness next to a very nervous and fractious horse did not help his start in that race. Starting from 13 lengths behind at Pimlico is difficult to make up, especially on a track that was not kind to closers.

All day long, the track favored speed; therefore Captain Bodgit's sensational close at the end to lose by only a neck was all the more remarkable. The courage he displayed in the last 70 yards of the Preakness was truly unbelievable, and without detracting from the superb talents of Silver Charm, Free House or Touch Gold, I believe the Belmont at a mile and a half was Captain Bodgit's race.

Sadly and unfortunately, we will never know. Our dreams were shattered when word came of Captain Bodgit's injury, which was

probably caused by his all-out desire to win in Baltimore. Although the news was bad, I believe most all of us feel that we are indeed fortunate to have had such a marvelous experience.

Although I had dreamed of owning a horse in Kentucky Derby, I never thought it would happen. I will always be thankful of the thrill of owning even a small part of such a wonderful horse.

These great 3-year-olds produced sensational racing and thrilled millions on television. In the process, they have done a lot of thoroughbred racing, which adds so much to so many communities in the United States. From a purely practical standpoint, thoroughbred racing accounts for hundreds of thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions in revenue, not to mention the great enjoyment it brings to so many.

It is sad about Captain Bodgit's injury, but a friend and avid racegoer put it in perspective for me when he said, "Just think, Captain Bodgit will have a new girlfriend every day." I only hope that his offspring will be bred here in America. That way we can look forward to seeing young Captain Bodgit giving us some of the same thrills and displaying the same stamina and courage and the great Captain did for all too short a time.

FAMILY FARM AND SMALL BUSINESS ESTATE TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1997

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to help preserve and protect our Nation's most valuable assets: Families and Family-Owned Businesses.

Family-owned farms and small businesses are the backbone of my State and our Nation. They employ our people, generate economic growth and strengthen our communities. However, Uncle Sam has socked it to family-owned businesses over the years with increasing regulations and taxes. Families are finding it harder and harder to continue operating the family business.

One of the largest obstacles to staying in business for families is Federal estate taxes or death taxes. Before a family has even had the opportunity to properly mourn the passing of a loved one they must begin to face the task of settling the estate. Often a family must endure two deaths; the death of a loved one followed by the death of a business. With tax rates as high as 55 percent on assets in excess of \$600,000, death taxes can sap the lifeblood out of a family-owned business and in many cases force the sale of the entire business to settle up with the IRS. Family farms and small businesses are frequently cash poor but rich in assets such as land and equipment. The current \$600,000 exemption can often be eaten up in the increased value of land which often has no correlation to the income generating value of the business.

Small businesses and family farm make up 98 percent of all businesses in North Carolina and employ over 50 percent of all workers in North Carolina. The \$600,000 exemption is too low and places a burden on some family-owned businesses so severe they cannot survive. People labor too long and hard through-

out their lives to see the fruits of their work disappear into Uncle Sam's pockets.

That is why today I am introducing the Family Farm and Small Business Estate Tax Relief Act of 1997. This bill will raise the current exemption for family-owned farms and small businesses from \$600,000 to \$1.5 million. It will also index the exemption to inflation, something that should have been done a long time ago.

The current estate tax is an unfair double tax on assets generated through income that has already been taxed. It is a disincentive to saving, hard work and entrepreneurship. Current policy undermines everything that is great about America: family, ingenuity, hard work, and providing for the economic security of our children.

There are thousands of Americans across this country that play by the rules and work hard only to be faced with the prospect that their very success will saddle their children with a burden so great that it will force them to abandon the only livelihoods they have ever known.

According to the Congressional Research Service 70 percent of family owned businesses do not survive to the second generation and 87 percent do not survive to the third. This is wrong and it must stop. The Family Farm and Small Business Estate Tax Relief Act is good for our economy, is good for families and is good for America.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB) and the North Carolina Farm Bureau for their support of my legislation. NFIB and the NC Farm Bureau understand the importance of preserving family-owned businesses.

With the right policies we can strengthen and preserve the family owned business in America. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation initiative.

ARMY BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE

HON. JOHN M. MCHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the birthday of the United States Army. June 14, 1997 marks the Army's 222 years of service to the United States of America.

For 222 years, our Army's purpose has been to fight and win our nation's wars. America's Army exists to give the nation decisive victory on the battlefield and wherever else the nation needs them. Decisive victory today means more than simply destroying the army of an opponent. It can take many forms: saving lives by producing and delivering clean water to Rwandan refugees, restoring democracy in Haiti, or keeping the peace in Bosnia. Whatever the mission, the nation turns to the Army for help during crises, and the Army delivers success.

The key to the Army's success has been its willingness to change, to meet the world as it is, while remaining constant in its selfless service and its dedication to duty, honor and country. These are not mere words; they are codes by which the Army lives. General Douglas MacArthur, in 1961, summed it up best

when he said, "Yours is the profession of arms, the will to win, the sure knowledge that in war there is no substitute for victory—and that if we fail, the nation will be destroyed."

But the world has changed, and it continues to change. For the Army, the 21st century began in 1989. Think about it. From 1950 to 1989, almost 40 years, the United States of America used its military 10 times. Since 1989, we have used our military 25 times, a 15-fold increase. Let's quickly review some of the major recent actions in which the U.S. Army played a critical role: in 1991, Operation Desert Storm in Southwest Asia and Provide Comfort in Turkey and Iraq; in 1992, relief efforts after Hurricane Andrew; in 1993, Restore Hope in Somalia; in 1994, fighting fires in the Western United States, Uphold Democracy in Haiti, and Support Hope in Rwanda; and in 1995 and 1996, Joint, Joint Endeavor and Joint Guard in Bosnia. Yes, during the past 7 years, the Army has done 70 to 80 percent of the heavy lifting, and they have done it for less than 24 percent of the budget given to the Department of Defense. The U.S. Army is indeed a cost-effective force.

The cold war may have been more dangerous, but today's geopolitical environment is more complex. We must deal with the crumbling of an empire—the breaking up of nation-states around the world. We must deal with the possibility of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction—a sure knowledge that any nation with resources can buy instant terror. We must deal with uncertainty throughout the world—what's next, where are we headed? We must deal with the explosive release of religious and racial tensions that have lain dormant in the global village for more than 50 years. We must deal with difficult, emotional issues that have been covered up since World War II.

Television and the other electronic news media have taken us back to the future. How our soldiers deal with those tensions is played out for us at breakfast tables and in our living rooms almost instantaneously—24 hours a day, up close and personal.

It is the responsibility of our generation to sustain and pass on an Army that is as good as, or better than, the one we inherited. Today's Army has evolved into a full-spectrum force. It has shed the label describing it as a strictly threat-based force. We have evolved beyond that. We can reassure our friends and allies, and we can provide support to civilian authorities in times of domestic crisis. If necessary, we can compel and deter potential adversaries.

We've moved out on this exciting journey, and we have come a long way. We are bending metal and we are moving electrons across the battlefield. The term includes Army civilians, soldiers and members of industry working together to secure the future.

We are learning the tremendous potential of situational awareness and information dominance. It is very reassuring to know where all our friendly forces are 100 percent of the time, and to know where our enemy is as well. With that kind of intelligence, the Army can do things they've never done before on the battlefield. This will clearly allow the Army to maintain the edge. It clearly will allow this force to be the world's best Army.

We are in the execution mode of Army 21—the Army of the early 21st century—and changing in a fundamentally different way than ever before. We have information dominance.

The Army's Chief of Staff, General Dennis J. Reimer, has said "Army 21 is critical, but it is only an intermediate stop along our journey. The focus of our intellectual efforts has shifted to the 'Army After Next.' The Army After Next is our effort to look as deep as possible into the future, to look at what happens to the world in the 2025 time frame, to evaluate the geopolitics, the technologies, the human resources and war-fighting capabilities that will be available at that time. Army After Next is a totally different force, but we know a lot about it. We know we want to have greater lethality."

"Army After Next is the objective force," General Reimer said, "but the road to Army After Next goes through Army 21. We must insure that we develop the total force design—that we have the training package right, that we have the force structure right, that we validate the doctrine, and that we insure the technology is there so we can leverage the tremendous potential of this great informational dominance."

General Reimer caution us against the notion that new technology will automatically result in large-scale reductions to the size of the Army. Already since 1989, the active force in all the services has been cut by 700,000 people—about a third. The Army has taken its share of the cuts, but there is a limit to the downsizing we can sustain without losing mission readiness. It takes soldiers with the capability for long term commitment to separate warring parties . . . to reassure fearful civilians . . . to restore public order . . . to keep criminals from taking advantage of the vacuum in civil order . . . to deliver humanitarian assistance . . . to prevent and win the nation's wars. Such capabilities require boots on the ground. We must never forget that soldiers are the essence of the Army—always have been and always will be.

The Army is changing to meet the challenges of today, tomorrow and the 21st century. They must change if they are to remain relevant to the needs of the Nation. They must work smarter, and must be willing to take risks. Not to take risks is the greatest risk of all, because they will miss the window of opportunity to tap the tremendous potential that is there. Despite the ambiguity of future warfare and the many forms it may assume, the battlefield will always be a lonely, frightening and dangerous place. Only soldiers of character and courage, trained to a razor's edge—ably led, superbly equipped and in sufficient numbers—will survive there and win tomorrow as they have in the past.

Yes, the Army is changing to meet the challenges of today, tomorrow and the 21st century. This past year, the soldiers bore out that fact very well:

They concluded operations in Haiti, giving that country an opportunity for democracy.

After years of devastation in Bosnia, we finally deployed our soldiers there. To a war-torn country, those soldiers brought hope and more than a year without war. They also showed the world that the United States means business when it places its soldiers on the ground.

Time and time again, the spirit of our soldiers came through in so many ways. One shining example is the bridge we built across the Sava River. Not only was it the longest pontoon bridge since World War II—620 meters long—but they also put it in under the most difficult conditions. They had sleet. They

had rain. They had snow. They had freezing cold. They had mud up to their ankles and they had a hundred-year high-water mark. But our soldiers wouldn't be beaten. They put in the bridge. They put it in on schedule so our forces could successfully enter Bosnia. A tremendous accomplishment and a tremendous tribute. It was not only a tribute to technology but, more important, to our soldiers and their indomitable spirit.

The evacuation of Liberia, Operation Assured Response, involved 300 soldiers—special forces, infantry and signal units. They were called upon to assist with the evacuation of American citizens from Monrovia. Most of those soldiers had just returned from Bosnia. They hadn't even turned in their cold-weather gear when we deployed them into the heat of Liberia to evacuate American citizens. They had no time to prepare, but they performed magnificently. They secured all the American citizens and brought them back safe. They did it without casualties—a flawless mission.

The Military Observer Mission Ecuador and Peru takes place on the border between Ecuador and Peru—a contested border area. Fewer than 60 of our soldiers stand guard down there. They're holding together that critical point of the world and they're doing a magnificent job—just a handful of American soldiers.

Probably the world's most visible event took place in Atlanta at the Summer Olympics of 1996. Again, American soldiers—primarily Army National Guard soldiers assisted by U.S. Army Reserve and active-component soldiers—provided security to the events. They insured that the athletes got to the right place. They insured that officials got to the right place. They earned the accolades of a grateful world.

Task Force Vanguard consisted of active- and reserve-component soldiers sent to fight forest fires in the Northwest United States. It's a tough mission, but they are good at it, and their civilian counterparts admired them for their organization ability, their discipline, and the physical ability and endurance they brought to the task.

Last year, we carried out Operation Desert Strike. Smart weapons from airplanes and ships could not deter Saddam Hussein, so—in the short span of 96 hours—the U.S. Army deployed over 3,500 soldiers—a brigade from the 1st Cavalry Division, two Patriot missile batteries, and other soldiers—to Kuwait. Saddam Hussein got the message, and the world found out what it meant when we talk about "power projection". Yes, we clearly showed last year that we are a full-spectrum force—a force of decision—a force based on capabilities. We're building and maintain the right force for the times, and we'll keep it honed to a razor's edge. We can't help feeling at least a tinge of regret that the colors of so many proud Army units had to be furled and cased. Fortunately, size by itself is not the most important thing, and America can still take pride in having the world's best army. What they lack in quantity, the more than make up in quality. Know this, they accept the sacrifices that make them better able to fulfill the motto on the Army seal: "This We'll Defend."

The building of a force better able to defend American freedom is an Army birthday present all of us deserve and should be delighted to receive. This we'll defend—this land, this Nation, this flag that must never be furled and cased.

In closing, let us all reflect for a moment that June 14, 1997, is Flag Day as well as the Army's birthday. Like our Army, the American flag grew out of revolution. And like our Army, the design of our flag—Old Glory—has evolved over the years since 1777. The liberty it stands for, however, remains constant. So does the Army's vigil to protect that liberty, because, in the words of General Eisenhower, "A soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

Since 1775, more than 42 million Americans, in times of crisis as well as times of peace, have raised their right hands to take an oath, making America's Army what it is: the premier fighting force in the world and a values-based institution closely bound to the Nation and the Nation's people. They have taken that oath not to a king, and not to a flag alone, but to the ideals our flag represents.

Yesterday the Army was ready, from Lexington and Concord to Gettysburg, and from Normandy to Bosnia. Today they are ready to fight and win the Nation's wars, and to keep the peace or provide humanitarian relief around the globe. Tomorrow, too, they will be ready. Wherever the time, wherever the mission, whatever the challenge, American can count on its Army.

A TRIBUTE TO HELEN WHISTLER

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. SHERMAN Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor excellence in service to the Girl Scouts of America and recognize Helen Whistler as the San Fernando Valley Girl Scout Council Woman of the Year.

Girl Scouting is very important throughout our community and our Nation. The Girl Scout's basic promise "To serve God and my country, To help people at all times" is no simple task. But each day women like Helen Whistler go out into the community and spread the Girl Scout promise.

The San Fernando Valley Girl Scout Council Woman of the Year Award is given to honor outstanding efforts in providing Girl Scouting throughout the San Fernando Valley. Their mission "to serve girls in a diverse environment by inspiring them to reach their full potential" can only be realized if someone makes an effort to attract and organize these young women.

Fortunately, there are women like Helen Whistler who excel in promoting the Girl Scout mission. Helen has worked tirelessly to bring Girl Scouting to every girl of our community. She has gathered and analyzed enormous amounts of data that have enabled the council to develop plans which would better serve our women of tomorrow. Helen's research is pivotal to the success of the San Fernando Valley Girl Scout Council.

In addition to providing an extraordinary amount of time to this research, Helen serves as the 3d vice president and secretary of the Board of Directors and on the Executive Committee. Her dedication to the Girl Scout community is greatly appreciated.

I join Helen's family, friends, the San Fernando Girl Scout Council and the women in our community in honoring Helen Whistler as Woman of the Year.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to be among 150 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives who have joined to introduce the Employment Non-Discrimination Act [ENDA] of 1997. This legislation will extend to gay and lesbian Americans the same employment protections guaranteed to all other Americans without creating special rights or quotas.

It is intolerable that in 39 States hard working women and men can be fired or turned down for a job just because of their sexual orientation. No woman should have to worry about receiving a pink slip because she is gay. No man should be denied a position or a promotion simply because he is gay.

America is blessed with a diverse people and America works best when everyone is allowed to contribute to his or her fullest potential. As a nation, we take pride in our sense of fairness, and in fairness to all Americans it is time to put an end to all forms of employment discrimination. The time has come for the Congress of the United States to provide assurance to every American that his or her opportunity to get a job and to keep a job will be based on their abilities, not on their sexual orientation. Almost 70 percent of American voters believe that is the right thing to do and Congress should act accordingly.

Last year, ENDA supporters were heartened by the near passage of the bill in the Senate. That the Senate vote on ENDA was 49-50, coupled with the fact that today there are 150 original ENDA cosponsors in the House—compared to 139 cosponsors in the last Congress—is proof that progress is indeed being made.

Increasing support for and ultimately enacting ENDA will build upon our Nation's legacy of ensuring fairness in the workplace. We have outlawed employment discrimination based on race, gender, age, religion, or disability. Let us now take the next important step. I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this legislation so we can make it law in the 105th Congress.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE SOUTHERN EYE BANK

HON. JOHN COOKSEY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Southern Eye Bank of New Orleans, LA, and to congratulate this eye-bank on its continued commitment to excellence.

The Southern Eye Bank was incorporated on June 7, 1947 and opened its doors on July 30, 1947. It was founded under the auspices of the Eye Bank For Sight Restoration in New York City, which was the first eye bank in the United States being founded in 1944 by Dr. Townley Paton. Subsequently other eye banks were located in Boston and Chicago. The Southern Eye Bank was the first in the South.

The initial executive committee included Mr. Charles E. Fenner, as chairman of the board of trustees; Mr. John Reilly, as treasurer; Mr. John Sims, as secretary; Drs. George M. Haik and William B. Clark, as chairmen of the Medical Advisory Committee, and Mrs. Orville Ewing, as the volunteer executive director.

In the ensuing middle years Mr. Robert Simpson served as chairman of the board of trustees. He and Dr. Clark are credited with being the driving force that guided the Southern Eye Bank during its formative period.

This first office was located in the Hutchinson Memorial Building of the Tulane Medical School at 1430 Tulane Avenue. Eventually, in 1948 it moved to the Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat Hospital. The Southern Eye Bank functioned with the cooperation of LSU School of Medicine; the Tulane Medical Center, and various local hospitals—Charity, Hotel, Dieu, Flint Goodrich, Baptist and Lakeshore.

The original purposes of Southern Eye Bank were twofold: to secure corneas for transplant, and to establish a laboratory in which young eye surgeons could be trained to perform corneal grafts. Within the first four months of its opening, the Southern Eye Bank had a list of 3,000 donors. The public was instructed on how to become a donor as follows: Sign the donor card and return it to the Eye Bank Office; the signature must be witnessed, but need not be notarized; the family of the donor must be notified of these intentions; the gift should not be part of a will, since the eye must be used immediately before a will can be probated.

The first corneal transplant, performed under its auspices, was at the Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat Hospital. The patient was a 69-year-old female who had been blind for 7 years. The procedure was deemed a success, that is permanent vision was restored.

Today, the Southern Eye Bank provides approximately 800 corneas for transplantation a year.

Today, over 95 percent of corneal transplants are successful. This success rate reflects significant advances in the way donor corneas are processed.

In 1947 the eye had to be removed within 3 hours of time of death; the transplant had to be performed within 24 hours of recovery; only 50 percent of surgeries were deemed successful.

In 1997 the eye can be removed within 8 hours of the time of death; the transplant can be performed up to 14 days after recovery; about 95 percent of surgeries are successful.

One of the reasons for the increased rate of success was the ability to store corneal tissue in a liquid media so that it could be later used under optimal conditions. In the early days of corneal transplantation (i.e., in 1947), the patient had to wait (sometimes for a long time), for a telephone call to come to the hospital when tissue had become available. Then the transplantation was done as an emergency at a time when conditions in the operating room might not be optimal. A major breakthrough was the development of the M-K media by Drs. Bernard E. McCarey, Ph.D. and Herbert E. Kaufman, MD in 1974. Thereafter, corneal tissue could be stored for up to 3 days and still be viable. This meant that surgery could be done under ideal conditions. Beyond that, it was now possible for individual eye banks to be clearinghouses for distributing tissue to other eye banks throughout the country. This