TRIBUTE TO MR. DONALD J. KRAPOHL

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 2004

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to pay tribute to an outstanding individual, Mr. Donald J. Krapohl. On May 23, 2004, family and friends will gather to honor Donald, as he celebrates his 75th birthday.

Donald is a longtime resident and tireless advocate of Genesee County. He held the election positions of Mt. Morris Township Trustee and Supervisor. In addition, Don served his community in many other capacities, including but not limited to the Beecher Board of Education, Genesee County Economic Development Corp., Genesee County Parks Commission, Genesee County Bicentennial coordinator, Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Commission, Mt. Morris Twp. Housing Commission, Department of Outdoor Recreation advisory committee, National Association of Counties Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement committee, Forward Development Corporation, Genesee County water and waste division advisory committee, and Chairman of the Mt. Morris Twp. Senior Citizen Board of Directors.

During his career, Don has received numerous recognitions for his outstanding community leadership. He was named an honorary Fireman by the Mt. Morris Central and Beecher Fire departments. The Mt. Morris Township Senior Citizen Center was named in his honor. To know Don is to appreciate him. He is a hard working and unselfish leader. He is an inspiration to others who are serving their community. Aside from his duties in public service, he is the coach for the Beecher Schools little league football program.

Don and his lovely wife Barbara have four wonderful children, eight grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, as the Member of Congress representing Genesee County, Michigan, I ask my colleagues in the 108th Congress to please join me in not only recognizing my good friend Mr. Donald Krapohl for his outstanding citizenship and concern for the people of Genesee County, but to wish him a very happy 75th birthday, and many more to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 2004

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family I missed several votes last week. Had I been present:

Rollcall No. 162 (on motion to recommit H.R. 4279), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 163 (on passage of H.R. 4279), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 164 (on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 352), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 165 (on motion to recommit H.R. 4280), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 166 (on passage of H.R. 4280), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 167 (on motion to suspend the rules and agree, as amended to H. Con. Res. 378), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 168 (on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 409), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 169 (on agreeing to the Tanner amendment to H.R. 4275), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 170 (on passage of H.R. 4275), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 171 (on motion to instruct conferees on S. Con. Res. 95), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 172 (on agreeing to the Kind amendment to H.R. 4281), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 173 (on motion to recommit with instructions H.R. 4281), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 174 (on passage of H.R. 4281), I would have voted ''nay''.

Rollcall No. 175 (on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.J. Res. 91), I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall No. 176 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Con. Res. 414), I would have voted ''yea''.

MAY IS ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 2004

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, May is Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, and I would like to commemorate the substantial achievements of Asian Pacific Americans to our nation's history. My district, comprised of Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Benito Counties in California owes a particularly large debt to the Asian Pacific community. California has benefited greatly from the contributions of Asian Pacific immigrants throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. Chinese immigrants were instrumental in building the transcontinental railroad which helped open California to settlement and brought rapid economic growth to the West and along with immigrants from Japan, helped start Monterey's commercial fishing industry.

The Central Coast of California was and still is, highly dependent on agriculture. Starting in the late 1890s, Chinese, Japanese and Filipino farm laborers were the engine behind the growth and development of the agricultural industry. Farm labor work on strawberry and peach farms was often back-breaking work; laborers rose at dawn and worked until dusk, and were generally paid very poorly. Additionally, Asian Pacific immigrants were often treated horribly and harshly discriminated against. Filipino farm workers formed the first organized group in the early history of the United Farm Workers Union. Despite these conditions and obstacles, over the last hundred years, the Asian Pacific American community has grown into a vibrant community that has made substantial contributions to California and our nation as a whole. I am proud to represent a large Filipino population in my district who are active citizens of the community.

This year's theme of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month is ''Freedom for All—A Nation We Call Our Own,'' and exemplifies one of the best aspects of the America; that all citizens can take ownership in our society and country and work towards building a better nation. Mabuhay.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. J. D. HAYWORTH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 2004

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 2004, I missed a series of rollcall votes in the House of Representatives because of a family obligation that required my presence in Arizona. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall votes 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, and 199. I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall vote 197.

CLARIFICATION OF ANTITRUST REMEDIES IN TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 2004

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 2004

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, the application of the antitrust laws in the telecommunications sector has produced enormous competitive benefits. Market competition has fostered innovative technologies, greatly enhanced product and service choices, and reduced prices for millions of American telecommunications consumers. The threat of treble damages for antitrust violations has provided a powerful deterrent against anticompetitive misconduct in this marketplace.

Indeed, the primary catalyst for the structural changes that have produced the enormous competitive gains and expanded consumer choice in the telecommunications fields was the principled application of the antitrust laws. The legal basis for the elimination of Ma Bell's national telephone monopoly was rooted in the antitrust laws. While the former AT&T had operated in a highly intensive Federal and State regulatory regime for decades, the government relied on the antitrust laws to provide the robust procompetitive remedy that regulation could not, did not, and will not provide alone.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the ''Telecom Act''), was enacted ''to promote competition and reduce regulation in order to secure lower prices and higher quality services for American telecommunications consumers . . . by opening all telecommunications markets to competition.'' In passing the Telecom Act, Congress did not create an ''antitrust free zone'' in which the regulatory provisions of the Telecom Act limited the historic application of the antitrust laws in deterring and punishing monopolistic misconduct in the telecommunications field.

Rather, to reaffirm the centrality of the antitrust laws in the overall regulatory scheme created by the Telecom Act, Congress included an explicit antitrust saving clause in the legislation. In clear and forceful legislative guidance, Congress said:

''. . . Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to