to the unifying culture being promoted by the administration. It will finally bring the United States into compliance with its own law and fulfill the weighty moral obligations imposed by the sacred principles of democracy and freedom to our faithful ally which has been ignored for too long.

PROVIDING MEDICARE COVERAGE FOR FILIPINO WORLD WAR II VETS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill that would allow Filipino WWII Veterans to enroll in Medicare even if they do not meet the eligibility requirements.

The time is long overdue that we provide justice to the Filipino Veterans who fought side by side with the United States Army during World War II.

On July 26, 1941, the Philippine military was called on to join forces with the United States under an Executive Order by President Roosevelt. Their efforts were instrumental in the United States' successful final assault in the Pacific.

Despite their outstanding contributions, in 1946 Congress enacted the Rescission Act, which stripped members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army of being recognized as veterans of the United States. As a result, they were excluded from receiving full veterans benefits.

Last Congress, we provided disabled Filipino veterans living in the United States with the same payments for service-related disability compensation as other veterans receive.

Let's go one step further this year.

Under my bill, qualified WWII Filipino Veterans living in the United States would be entitled to Medicare Part A benefits and the option to enroll in Part B.

It is time to recognize the service of our friends and neighbors who fought so valiantly for freedom and democracy.

SECOND AMT BILL INTRODUCED

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a week ago I introduced legislation to allow nonrefundable personal credits, like the child credit and education credits, to be used against the alternative minimum tax. I have introduced this legislation in the past two Congresses, and it has been enacted into law twice on a temporary basis.

The legislation I introduce today corrects an additional critical problem with the AMT. In this case, the mere fact that a family has a large number of children forces them to become alternative minimum tax taxpayers, and they lose some of the benefit of their personal exemptions.

For example, my office has been in touch with a family in North Carolina for over a year. This military family has ten children, are home schoolers, and began to pay the alternative minimum tax in 1998. An extension of the temporary law regarding nonrefundable personal credits will not help this family, and neither will President Bush's tax proposal help them out of the AMT or give them a rate reduction. While it may be true that this family will be ''no worse off'' than they are now, they will not be any better off either in terms of their current situation. I do not believe relief for this family from the alternative minimum tax should wait until it is more convenient, or until after this year is over.

Mr. Speaker, I think all the members of this body would agree that this family is not the type of family we meant to pay the minimum tax. They do not have large tax preferences with which they are sheltering income. Yet they are paying the minimum tax. Mr. Speaker, I hope all members will not just agree that we should provide families like this one relief, I hope they will act to provide that relief on the first tax bill on which Congress works.

INTRODUCTION OF FY2001 DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce an emergency supplemental appropriations bill for the Department of Defense and to ask my colleagues here in the House to pass it expeditiously.

This legislation will provide $6.7 billion in emergency funding for critical readiness needs of the armed forces, and it will cover the cost of shortfalls in the Defense Health Program as identified by the Chiefs of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

This amount is only what is required to cover unexpected cost increases for the most basic needs of our service members through the end of this fiscal year. This is an appropriate and an expected response to the kinds of unavoidable expenses—fuel, power increases, housing and other operations costs—that were not provided for in the regular appropriations bill for the Department of Defense. This is a routine and prudent exercise, Mr. Speaker, we must act expeditiously in order to avoid the cuts in each of the services that would be triggered soon—with nearly half the fiscal year over—if we were not to pass this bill.

There are many causes for this action that is now required. The basic cost of living for our armed forces is substantially higher than DOD's projections from last year. Congress approved the FY 2001 Defense Appropriations bill more than six months ago, and the budget Congress approved had been assembled well over a year ago. In the interim, energy costs have skyrocketed, housing costs have increased substantially because we've been making a conscious effort to improve the living conditions for our military personnel and their families. And Congress and President Bill Clinton have committed the nation to provide higher pay and a more complete

Let me also address the issue of why it is neither necessary nor prudent to wait until the new Defense Secretary completes his Strategic Review. It is clear to me that none of these costs will be affected in the slightest way by a strategic review of Pentagon systems. In most cases, these bills have already been incurred, and the money is already spent. The need for a supplemental appropriations bill to cover these costs is simply indisputable.

I believe that the current resistance to such a bill by the Bush Administration has more to do with the size and timing of tax cuts than it has to do with military strategy. Not paying these bills now forces the Department of Defense to reduce and delay training and maintenance. And it thus affects the readiness of our armed forces. It is simply too high a price to pay for the questionable goal of quick and massive tax cuts. I can understand why the political strategists may want to conduct a debate over large tax cuts without the annoyance of mentioning the costs of necessary budget increases for the Defense Department. I just do not believe it is responsible to do so, and I am therefore asking my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to approve this urgent supplemental defense spending bill as soon as possible.

Of the $6.7 billion in this bill, a total of one billion dollars will go toward pay and housing allowances; $4.3 billion will be for operations and maintenance costs such as training, force protection, aircraft and ship maintenance, base operations, and fuel cost increases. One billion dollars will be allocated for unanticipated health care costs; $270 million to procure spare parts and force protection equipment, and $110 million will be provided to offset the impact of energy price increases on military family housing.

I am proud to join with my original cosponsors, Representatives IKE SKELTON, NORM SISISKY, MARTIN FROST, CHET EDWARDS and ELLEN TAUSCHER in introducing this bill. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will move quickly to review and pass this bill. And I hope that President Bush will agree to sign it.

TRIBUTE TO THE VICTIMS OF THE ORANGEBURG MASSACRE

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the men and women who were victimized in the little known civil rights battle which has become known as the Orangeburg Massacre. And to thank South Carolina's Governor Jim Hodges for the remarks he made during last week's thirty-third anniversary of this catastrophic event which took place on February 8, 1968. The Governor's remarks are inserted below.

The Orangeburn Massacre's place in history has been overlooked, and is considered one of the most violent such events in South Carolina's struggle for civil rights. While many people believe the Kent State shootings were the first such event in our nation's history, the Kent State event occurred two years after the unrest at my alma mater, S.C. State. Henry Smith, 20, Samuel Hammond, 19, and Delano Middleton, 17, lost their lives during the bloody clash. Another twenty-seven people were also

injured by the bullets from state law enforcement officers on that ill-fated evening.

Some three hundred students gathered on the campus of South Carolina State after three days of sit-ins and protests at All-Star Bowling Lane. The students were continuing their demonstration against the segregation of Orangeburg's only bowling alley. Four years after passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the establishment remained segregated, despite numerous efforts to persuade the owners to integrate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me today in honoring Henry Smith, Samuel Hammond and Delano Middleton, the twenty seven students who survived their wounds. Governor James Hovis Hodges along with the hundreds of other students, teachers, administrators and parents who helped and are still helping to bring equality to this nation.

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR JIM HODGES—SOUTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY, ORANGEBURG, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2001

I am truly honored and humbled to be here with you today.

Nearly 170 years ago, when our country was still newly-formed a Frenchman named Alexis de Tocqueville came to our shores to explore this fledgling experiment in democracy. He recorded his thoughts in a landmark treatise called Democracy in America. He told his readers that he ''sought the image of democracy itself, with its inclinations, its character, its prejudices, and its passions, in order to learn what we have to fear or hope from its progress.''

Had Tocqueville visited America in 1968, he would have seen our fears and not our hopes. We were a country in turmoil. Thousands of American soldiers died in Vietnam. Assassins struck down Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King. Neighbors feared and distrusted one another. We were a state and a nation deeply divided by race, age and politics.

This was especially evident on our college campuses. On these campuses, the passions of the time spawned protests and confrontation. Some of these protests are known to all Americans. One of the most famous images of the era is that of a young girl weeping over her fallen friend at Kent State in Ohio.

But when we look in the pages of history, the Orangeburg Massacre is often missing. Most Americans know about the four students killed at Kent State in 1970, but not the three students killed at S.C. State two years before. What happened here thirty-three years ago was the first tragedy of its kind on an American college campus. Yet few Americans have ever heard the names of Samuel Hammond, Delano Middleton and Henry Smith. Most Americans do not know them as we know them.

Henry Smith was a sophomore from Marion. His mother was secretary of his high school PTA. Henry's mother taught him the importance of a good education. She told her children, ''I always figured if I couldn't get it, I was going to have it for my kids. Get them to college and get them what they needed.'' Henry kept his promise to his mother. And he wrote her every week to let her know how he was doing in school.

Delano Middleton was a student at Wilkinson High School here in Orangeburg. He would often lead his teammates in prayer after football practice. His mother worked at the college, and Delano often spent time on the campus making friends with the other students.

Samuel Hammond was born in Barnwell, and grew up in Florida. He returned to his home state with dreams of becoming a teacher. On a college questionnaire, Samuel was asked ''What was the one big thing he wanted in life?'' Samuel responded that the thing he wanted most was an education.

Henry Smith, Samuel Hammond and Delano Middleton each wanted to enjoy the unlimited potential offered in America . . . in a time and place where skin color provided limited opportunity. It was that effort to claim equal rights and equal opportunity, that pursuit of human dignity . . . that led students to protest segregation at a local bowling alley.

And after three days of fear and uncertainty . . . these three young men were killed . . . and twenty-seven others wounded . . . on the grounds of this campus.

We deeply regret what happened here on the night of February 8, 1968. The Orangeburg Massacre was a great tragedy for our state. Even today, the State of South Carolina bows its head, bends its knee and begins the search for reconciliation.

The families of Samuel Hammond, Henry Smith and Delano Middleton are gathered here today. We thank you for coming. As a parent, I can only imagine the sorrow you must have felt to lose a loved one. We wish we had the opportunity to know them as you did. We regret that they were taken from us at such a young age.

Many of the survivors of that night have gathered here. We thank you for coming, and we welcome you back to Orangeburg today. We take comfort from the fact that Orangeburg is a better place, South Carolina is a better place, and America is a better place than it was thirty-three years ago.

I also want to thank the students of S.C. State for being here today. If these three young men were alive today, their sons and daughters would be college students just like you. They were here because their parents believed in the power of education. And you are here because of the sacrifices they made. These sacrifices must never be forgotten, and these opportunities must never be taken for granted.

Thirty-three years ago, a group of students gathered around a bonfire on this campus after being denied their basic right to patronize a local business. And on that cold February night, that bonfire was extinguished, along with the lives of three brave young men.

But that bonfire still glows brightly today. Because we—the living—are now the keepers of that flame.

We must carry the flame with understanding . . . and compassion . . . and education. Opportunity comes from education. Ignorance and prejudice are turned back by education.

The flame of education illuminates the dark corners of our past. The flame of education warms our hearts with reconciliation. And the flame of education can guide us into a future of boundless hope and opportunity.

In America, we still seek the image of democracy itself. And we still must contend with our passions and our prejudices.

But if Alexis de Tocqueville . . . or Samuel Hammond . . . or Henry Smith . . . or Delano Middleton were here today, they would see a city, and a state, and a nation where fear has waned and hope abides. They would witness the progress of our democracy, nod their heads and recognize that there is still much to be done.

And most importantly, they would urge us to continue down the path of reconciliation.

Thank you for granting me the honor of standing here today.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE NATIVE HAWAIIAN HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT TO REVISE AND EXTEND SUCH ACT

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, Representative Patsy Mink, to introduce a bill to reauthorize the Native Hawaiian Health Care Improvement Act. The purpose of this legislation is to improve the health status of Native Hawaiians through the continuation of comprehensive health promotion and disease prevention. IT is intended to provide health education in Native Hawaiian communities and primary care health care services using traditional Native Hawaiian healers and health care providers trained in Western medicine. In areas where there is an underutilization of existing health care delivery systems that can provide culturally relevant health care services, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to contract with Native Hawaiian health care systems to provide care referral services to Native Hawaiian patients. This reauthorization is intended to assure the continuity of health care programs for Native Hawaiians under the authority of Public Law 100–579.

As enacted in 1988, the Native Hawaiian Health Care Improvement Act is premised upon the findings and recommendations of the Native Hawaiian Health Research Consortium report of December 1985 to the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. The report clearly indicates that the underutilization of existing health care services by Native Hawaiian can be traced to the absence of culturally-relevant services. Additionally, the report reveals a general perception in the Native Hawaiian community that health care services based on concepts of Western medicine will not cure diseases afflicting Native Hawaiian people.

The bill contains extensive findings on the current health status of Native Hawaiians including the incidence and mortality rates associated with various forms of cancer, diabetes, asthma, circulatory diseases, infectious disease and illness, and injuries. It also includes statistics on life expectancy, maternal and child health, births, teen pregnancies, fetal mortality, mental health, and education and training in the health professions.

The Native Hawaiian population living in Hawaii consists of two groups: Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians, which are distinct in both age distributions and mortality rates. Hawaiians comprise less than 5 percent of the total Native Hawaiian population and are much older than the growing part-Hawaiian population.

Overall, the Native Hawaiian death rate is 34 percent higher than the death rate for all races in the United States, but this composite masks great differences that exist between Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians. Hawaiians have a death rate 146 percent higher than the U.S. all-races rate. Part-Hawaiians also have a higher death rate, but only 17 percent greater than the U.S. as a whole. A comparison of age-adjusted death rates for Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians reveals that Hawaiians die at a