

Degree in Social Sciences. In 1949, she was conferred an M.A. Degree in Social Sciences from the Colorado State College in Greeley, Colorado.

Betty went on to become active in Guam's political, civic, and community affairs. Having married an island-resident, Joe Castro Guerrero, Betty moved to Guam in the 1950's. From 1951 to 1960, she worked as a teacher in the Guam public school system. Between 1954 and 1957, she also worked as a part-time instructor at the University of Guam. In 1960, prior to being hired as a budget and management analyst for the Government of Guam's Bureau of Budget and Management, she made a move from teaching to school administration. In 1968, she was named director of the Head Start program for the University of Guam and, in 1969, she became the assistant to the President of the University.

From 1969 to 1976, Betty administered the Comprehensive Health Planning Program while, at the same time, serving as Executive Director to the Territorial Planning Council. She worked as a consultant for the Guam Legislature's Committee on Territorial-Federal Affairs from 1977 until 1979, when she was named Director of the Bureau of Planning. She served under this capacity until 1983. In 1984, she resumed work with the Department of Education as an opportunity room teacher. She worked for this program designed to help troubled students until 1987.

Although she might have taken it slow after her Department of Education job, Betty never really retired. She kept herself occupied with a wide range of activities. She was always willing to impart and share her expertise, enthusiasm, and energies to deserving activities and projects. We have been blessed to have her choose to be part of our community. The legacy she leaves behind includes almost five decades of government and community service. She will be greatly missed by all of us on Guam.

On behalf of the people of Guam, I join her children, Leonard, Clarice, and Stephen, who, together with her grandchildren, Nicole, Ashley, Kathleen, Mason, and Stephen II, in celebrating her life and mourning the loss of a mother, a grandmother, and fellow educator. Adios, Betty.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
AUTHORIZING CONGRESS TO
PROHIBIT THE PHYSICAL DESE-
CRATION OF THE FLAG OF THE
UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1999

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 33, the proposed constitutional amendment to prohibit the physical desecration of our flag. And, in this respect, I take no pleasure in doing so: Like the vast majority of Americans, I too condemn those malcontents who would desecrate our flag—a universal symbol for democracy, freedom and liberty—to grab attention for themselves and inflame the passions of patriotic Americans.

Further, I fully appreciate and respect the motivations of those who offer and support

this amendment, particularly the patriotic men and women who so faithfully served this Nation in our armed services and in other capacities. Their strong feelings on this issue should neither be questioned nor underestimated. They deserve our respect.

However, I respectfully disagree with them and will oppose this amendment for the reasons so eloquently articulated by Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky. In opposing a similar amendment a few years ago, Senator McConnell stated that it "rips the fabric of our Constitution at its very center: the First Amendment." He added, "Our respect and reverence for the flag should not provoke us to damage our Constitution, even in the name of patriotism."

Those of us who oppose this amendment do so not to countenance the actions of a few misfits, but because we believe the question before us today is how we—the United States of America—are to deal with individuals who dishonor our Nation in this manner.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a constitutional amendment is neither the appropriate nor best method for dealing with these malcontents. As the late Justice Brennan wrote for the Supreme Court in *Texas v. Johnson*: "The way to preserve the flag's special role is not to punish those who feel differently about these matters. It is to persuade them that they are wrong. . . . We can imagine no more appropriate response to burning a flag than waving one's own."

Furthermore, it troubles me that this amendment, if approved, would ensconce the vile actions of a few provocateurs into the very document that guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom to petition the government. That document, of course, is our Constitution.

In more than 200 years, our Constitution has been amended only 27 times, and nearly all of those amendments guarantee or expand rights, liberties and freedoms. Only one amendment—prohibition—constricted freedoms and soon was repealed.

I simply do not believe that our traditions, our values, our democratic principles—all embodied in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights—should be overridden to prohibit this particular manner of speech, even though I completely disagree with it.

Free speech is often a double-edged sword. However, if we value the freedoms that define us as Americans, we should refrain from amending the Constitution to limit those same freedoms to avoid being offended.

Finally, while even one act of flag burning is one too many, I do not believe that flag desecration is rampant in our Nation or so harms the Republic that nothing short of a constitutional amendment is needed.

I remind my colleagues that if we approve this amendment, we put our great Nation in the company of the oppressive regimes in China, Iran, and Cuba—all of whom have similar laws protecting their flags. Needless to say, when it comes to free speech, the United States of America is the world's leader. It does not follow China, Iran or Cuba.

Our flag is far more than a piece of cloth, a few stripes, 50 stars. Our flag is a universal symbol for freedom, liberty, human rights and decency that is recognized throughout the world. The inflammatory actions of a few misfits cannot extinguish those ideals. We can

only do that ourselves. And I submit that a constitutional amendment to restrict speech—even speech such as this—is the surest way to stoke the embers of those who will push for even more restrictions.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VILLAGE OF CASEYVILLE

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 150th Anniversary of the Village of Caseyville.

The Village of Caseyville first began to be settled in the 1840's. While today the area is well known for its small town charm, it was recognized in the 19th century as a coal-mining community.

Coal was not only a source of fuel and economic prosperity, but it influenced the further development of the community as well as regional transportation. Indeed, one of the first railroads in St. Clair County began in Caseyville, sponsored by the Illinois Coal Company.

Caseyville has also long been recognized as a quiet force in Illinois politics. The namesake of the town, Zadok Casey, served in the Illinois State Assembly as both a State Representative, State Senator, and Lieutenant Governor. He eventually served in the U.S. Congress before returning to the Illinois Assembly to serve in the State House and State Senate again.

Today, I am proud to represent Caseyville, a close community of churches, civic groups, and businesses. This weekend as the Nation celebrates the anniversary of our country's independence, Caseyville residents will also proudly remember their own place in American History.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Village of Caseyville in commemoration of its 150th Anniversary.

THE GENETIC NONDISCRIMINATION IN HEALTH INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT ACT

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to announce the introduction of the Genetic Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance Employment Act, a bill that will protect all Americans against the misuse of their genetic information.

Genetic information is among the most powerful, personal, and private information we can have about ourselves. Increasingly, genetics can give us insights into the fundamental characteristics that make us individuals—into what makes our eyes blue, our skin freckled, our bones more prone to breaking, our family members unusually long-lived. Yet while genetic information can offer insights, it rarely extends guarantees. Few genes carry an absolute assurance of developing a given condition or disease. Rather, the vast majority of

genes increase or decrease our health risks, interacting with a complex web of environmental and other factors to produce an actual health outcome.

Our understanding of genetics and the interplay between genes and outside influences is still in its infancy, but it is growing every day. The Human Genome Project, coordinated by the National Human Genome Research Institute, now predicts that we will have a "working draft" of the entire human genome by early in the year 2000. A complete, highly accurate transcript will be completed only perhaps two to three years later. In the meantime, science will continue racing ahead to identify genes associated with specific traits and diseases. Before long, new gene-based therapies will likely be available to treat genetic diseases, ushering in a new era in human medicine.

The promise of genetic research and technology seems almost limitless. Unfortunately, the potential for abuse of genetic information is also considerable. Many health insurers and employers have already expressed a keen interest in the potential to use genetic information. In some cases, this genetic information would not be used to pursue the best interests of the individuals involved. Health insurers may wish to use genetic data to determine which consumers are likely to be the most or least healthy, setting insurance premiums accordingly or denying coverage altogether. Employers could use genetic information in hiring or promotion decisions, or as a tool to keep their company's insurance premiums low. In either situation, such actions would effectively punish individuals for being born with certain genes.

Americans are deeply concerned about the possibility of genetic discrimination. In a recent poll of Better Homes & Gardens readers, fully 90 percent of respondents said they were extremely, very, or somewhat concerned when asked, "How concerned are you that [genetic] tests will be used to deny health insurance or even jobs?" Even more worrisome, evidence is emerging that many people are deciding not to participate in clinical trials or genetic research because they fear their genetic information might not remain private. Clearly, we must protect the privacy of genetic information and prevent abuse of this data if we are to avoid damaging the prospects of genetic research for curing human ills.

The Genetic Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance and Employment Act would provide all Americans with the necessary guarantees that their genetic information will not be used against them. This bill would prevent insurers from raising insurance premiums or denying coverage based on predictive genetic information. It would also prohibit insurance companies from requiring disclosure of this sensitive information or revealing it to third parties without consent. These provisions are backed up with meaningful penalties and remedies.

In addition, this bill contains crucial provisions banning genetic discrimination in employment. Under this legislation, employers would be barred from failing to hire, firing, or discriminating against workers with respect to the compensation, terms or privileges of employment based on genetic information. Employers would be prohibited from collecting genetic information except in connection with a program to monitor biological effects of toxic substances in the workplace. Finally, the privacy of genetic information would be protected

by preventing employers from disclosing this information to outside parties.

I am pleased to note that companion legislation is being introduced today by Senators TOM DASCHLE, EDWARD KENNEDY, TOM HARKIN, and CHRISTOPHER DODD. Our bill is supported by a broad range of organizations active on health care issues. I look forward to building a bipartisan coalition in support of this bill, which responds effectively to the concerns of the American people with regard to genetics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House leadership to schedule hearings immediately on the Genetic Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance and Employment Act. With completion of the human genome mapping imminent, we cannot afford to waste any more time in addressing these critical issues. Congress must act quickly to protect all Americans against genetic discrimination and secure the future of genetic research.

HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, people from my district in San Francisco come to visit my office wanting to talk about their personal battle against disease. They include parents of children with juvenile diabetes, women fighting a breast cancer diagnosis, families of people with Parkinson's, and people struggling with HIV disease and AIDS.

They come to talk about different problems, but speak with one resounding voice about how they want Congress to respond. Their message to me, and to all of us, is that funding for the National Institutes of Health must be doubled over five years.

My colleagues, we must heed their message and continue to increase NIH funding to achieve this goal. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HHS-Education, I strongly supported last year's \$2 billion, or 15%, increase in the research budget at the NIH, bringing total funding to \$15.6 billion. And this year, I am an original cosponsor of H. Res. 89, legislation that expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that NIH funding should be increased by another \$2 billion in fiscal year 2000.

I support these increases because I believe we are on the verge of making great leaps ahead in our ability to treat and prevent a wide range of diseases. Dr. Harold Varmus, Director of NIH, has testified before the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee that, "discoveries are occurring at an unprecedented pace in biology and medicine, presaging revolutionary changes in medical practice during the next decade." We have a responsibility to take advantage of this enormous opportunity to advance science, fight disease, and save and prolong life.

There are many success stories to point to at NIH and many challenges that lie ahead, including eliminating health disparities, reinvigorating clinical research, finding cures and vaccines for hundreds of diseases including malaria, cancer and HIV, and mapping the

human genome and making it accessible to scientists across the world.

As Dr. Varmus testified this year, "Throughout the world, the NIH is considered the leading force in mankind's continuing war against disease." Our wise investment in NIH is paying off. We must enter the new millennium investing in science that can unlock secrets of human disease and human health, and change our world for the better. I urge my colleagues to support a doubling in NIH funding over five years.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2413, THE COMPUTER SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1999

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce, H.R. 2413, the Computer Security Enhancement Act of 1999, a bipartisan bill to address our government's computer security needs. Joining me as cosponsors of this important legislation is Mr. Bart Gordon of Tennessee and Mrs. Connie Morella of Maryland, the Chairwoman of the Science Committee's Technology Subcommittee.

The bill amends and updates the Computer Security Act of 1987 which gave the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) the lead responsibility for developing security standards and technical guidelines for civilian government agencies' computer security. Specifically, the bill:

1. Reduces the cost and improves the availability of computer security technologies for Federal agencies by requiring NIST to promote the Federal use of off-the-shelf products for meeting civilian agency computer security needs.

2. Enhances the role of the independent Computer System Security and Privacy Advisory Board in NIST's decision-making process. The board, which is made up of representatives from industry, federal agencies and other outside experts, should assist NIST in its development of standards and guidelines for Federal systems.

3. Requires NIST to develop standardized tests and procedures to evaluate the strength of foreign encryption products. Through such tests and procedures, NIST, with assistance from the private sector, will be able to judge the relative strength of foreign encryption, thereby defusing some of the concerns associated with the export of domestic encryption products.

4. Clarifies that NIST standards and guidelines are to be used for the acquisition of security technologies for the Federal Government and are not intended as restrictions on the production or use of encryption by the private sector.

5. Addresses the shortage of university students studying computer security. Of the 5,500 PhDs in Computer science awarded over the last five years in Canada and the U.S., only 16 were in fields related to computer security. To help address such shortfalls, the bill establishes a new computer science fellowship program for graduate and undergraduate students studying computer security; and