

Yet many in our midst will recite the mantra according to which "a lot of time has passed since the Founding . . ." "They didn't even have electric light, knew nothing about moon shots—how could they have foreseen the world for which they were providing guidance . . ." "We must treat the Constitution as a living-breathing document and change it as needed . . ."

But the miracle of the American Founding was precisely that they knew. Without electricity, without computers and space flights, they knew. They wrote provisions so one person could not dictate. They made certain America's future would not depend on whether "the hand" was decent or not. They had seen how quickly rulers become corrupted.

They knew the mortal danger of the evil pen.

Apparently, we don't.

#### A TRIBUTE TO OFFICER JAMES DRESS

### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 31, 2000*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, during our recent recess, a constituent of mine performed an heroic act which saved the life of a fellow law enforcement officer and earning him a place as one of the genuine heroes of our Hudson Valley region.

James Dress of Tappan, NY, is a rookie officer of the 49th Precinct in New York City, and is also chief of the South Orangetown Ambulance Corps in my Congressional District. Two days before New Year's Day, Officer Dress arrived at the scene of a shooting in which an undercover detective was seriously wounded. Utilizing his experience as an EMT, Officer Dress realized that the wound was too serious to await an ambulance. He and a fellow officer performed emergency procedures on the undercover policeman and rushed him themselves to Jacobi Medical Center, where he was admitted in critical condition with extensive internal injuries.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Officer Dress and I am pleased to insert into the RECORD at this point a profile on Officer James Dress, which appeared in the "Our Town" newspaper soon after his act of heroism:

[From Our Town, Jan. 5, 2000]

A "HERO" LABEL 12 YEARS IN THE MAKING

(By Arthur R. Aldrich)

Not every NYC rookie cop gets the "hero" label pinned on him after only a few months on the job. Some complete their careers quietly doing their jobs with little public recognition. But when the moment came for action, James Dress of Tappan was prepared. He had been preparing since 1987.

Dress is chief of the S. Orangetown Ambulance Corps, elected to his third term as head of the unit. He joined the corps in 1987 while still at Tappan Zee High School, learning first aid riding the rigs as a youth corps member. While still at TZ, Dress took and passed the 120-hour EMT certification course to qualify as a full-fledged corps member.

Even while he completed his college work at SUNY Oneonta, Dress returned to Tappan

and rode the rigs as often as he could. At Oneonta, he was among the founders of the student Medical Response Team, usually first on the scene at campus emergencies, and trained to administer first aid.

"I was looking at corporate law for a career," Dress concedes. But at Oneonta he switched his major from political science to business economics and marketing.

But under all his other career ambitions was lurking a desire for law enforcement. "I took the tests in Rockland for police officer," Dress says, "and came in as a finalist for appointment in Orangetown." All the while he continued to volunteer as an EMT and answer calls with the S. Orangetown Corps.

But Orangetown never appointed Dress; instead, he took the New York City Police exams, qualified, and was graduated from the Police Academy in April, 1999.

Instead of landing in a corporate law office, Dress found himself on the streets of the Bronx, a rookie assigned to the 4-9 Precinct in Baychester. His unit concentrates on quality of life crimes; but of course, performs all other police duties as well.

Assigned to the 5:30 p.m. to 2:05 a.m. patrol, Dress was riding with his sergeant, Ed Warren, in a patrol car at 12:35 a.m. on Wednesday, December 29, when he responded to a call of a shooting. Pulling up at E. Gun Hill Road and Sexton Place, the officers discovered a man lying on the sidewalk and a small crowd.

According to Dress, he determined the man on the sidewalk had been shot in the stomach. Others in the crowd had also been injured by gun shots, but less seriously.

"I put in a rush call for an ambulance," Dress says, "and began first aid." But when Dress realized how serious the injury was, he made the decision to put the wounded man in the patrol car and take him to Jacobi Medical Center, a few minutes away.

"We could have waited for the ambulance," Dress says, "but we didn't know how long it would take, and where it would have to come from."

Dress' evaluation of the situation and prompt administration of appropriate first aid is credited for saving the man's life.

Only later did Dress and the other officers learn that the wounded man was an undercover NYC police officer. The investigation into the shooting is continuing.

As an EMT, Dress' first obligation is always to treat the patient. As a police officer, Dress also had to obligation to try to get information from the shooting victim while he was treating him.

"He was trying to give me a name," Dress says, "but he was in a lot of pain." At Jacobi, doctors determined that the bullet had pierced the undercover officer's heart and had lodged near his spine.

On Saturday, Dress and other officers visited the wounded man, still in intensive care, whose name is not being released because he is an undercover policeman.

"He seemed to be improving; he shook hands with me. His wife and children were there, too. His two year-old son also hugged me and thanked me." The wounded officer is now reported to have regained some feeling in his legs, leading to hope for a more complete recovery.

Dress is the first to disclaim the hero label. "I did what I was trained to do. Any police officer would have done the same thing; we're all trained in first aid. I think was EMT experience made the difference in evaluating the situation."

Dress is back on duty, having been given New Year's Eve off at the discretion of his

unit commander. And he still spends his days off working at the S. Orangetown ambulance headquarters, and riding the rig when needed.

His hope for the new year? That the man whose life he helped save makes a full and complete recovery.

#### NATIONAL BIOTECHNOLOGY MONTH

### HON. CALVIN M. DOOLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 31, 2000*

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of myself and Mr. GREENWOOD of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Ms. DUNN of Washington, and Mr. TANNER of Tennessee to recognize January 2000 as National Biotechnology Month.

It is fitting that in the first month of this new year, at the start of a new century, we look to biotechnology as our greatest hope for the future.

Mapping the human genome, for example, is ahead of schedule and nearly complete. That achievement, begun 10 years ago, will rank as one of the most significant advances in health care by accelerating the biotechnology industry's discovery of new therapies and cures for our most life-threatening diseases.

Biotechnology not only is using genetic research to create new medicines, but also to improve agriculture, industrial manufacturing and environmental management.

The United States leads the world in biotechnology innovation. There are approximately 1,300 biotech companies in the United States, employing more than 150,000 people. The industry spent nearly \$10 billion on research and development in 1998. Although revenues totaled \$18.4 billion, the industry recorded a net loss of \$5 billion because of the expensive nature of drug development.

In 1999, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved more than 20 biotechnology drugs, vaccines and new indications for existing medicines, pushing the number of marketed biotech drugs and vaccines to more than 90. Total FDA biotech approvals from 1982 through 1999 reach more than 140 when adding clearances for new indications of existing medicines. The vast majority of new biotech drugs were approved in the second half of the 1990s, demonstrating the biotechnology industry's surging proficiency at finding new medicines to treat our most life-threatening illnesses.

Biotechnology is revolutionizing every facet of medicine from diagnosis to treatment of all diseases. It is detailing life at the molecular level and someday will take much of the guesswork out of disease management and treatment. The implications for health care are as great as any milestone in medical history. We expect to see great strides early in this century.

A devastating disease that has stolen many of our loved ones, neighbors and friends is cancer. Biotechnology already has made significant strides in battling certain cancers. This is only the beginning.

The first biotechnology cancer medicines have been used with surgery, chemotherapy and radiation to enhance their effectiveness, lessen adverse effects and reduce chances of cancer recurrence.

Newer biotech cancer drugs target the underlying molecular causes of the disease. Biotech cancer treatments under development, such as vaccines that prevent abnormal cell growth, may make traditional treatments obsolete. In addition, gene therapy is being studied as a way to battle cancer by starving tumor cells to death.

Many biotech drugs are designed to treat our most devastating and intractable illnesses. In many cases these medicines are the first ever therapies for those diseases. For example, advancements in research have yielded first-of-a-kind drugs to treat multiple sclerosis and rheumatoid arthritis as well as cancer.

Other medicines in clinical trials block the start of the molecular cascade that triggers inflammation's tissue damaging effects in numerous disease states. In diseases, such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and Huntington's, clinical trials are under way to test a variety of cell therapies that generate healthy neurons to replace deteriorated ones. Recent breakthroughs in stem cell research have prompted experts to predict cures within 10 years for some diseases, such as Type I (Juvenile) Diabetes and Parkinson's.

With more than 350 biotechnology medicines in late-stage clinical trials for illnesses, such as heart ailments, cancer, neurological diseases and infections, biotechnology innovation will be the foundation not only for improving our health and quality of life, but also lowering health care costs.

In the past two years Congress has increased funding for the National Institutes of Health's basic research programs by 15 percent per year. We are 40 percent of the way toward doubling the NIH budget. Health-care research, however, is not one-sided. The public funds we provide are for basic research. The private sector takes this basic science and then spends many times more than what the government has contributed to create new drugs and get them to patients. In today's world, biotechnology companies are among the greatest innovators and risk takers.

Biotechnology also is being used to improve agriculture, industrial manufacturing and environmental management. In manufacturing, the emphasis has shifted from the removal of toxic chemicals in production waste streams to replacement of those pollutants with biological processes that prevent the environment from being fouled. And because these biological processes are derived from renewable sources they also conserve traditional energy resources. Industrial biotechnology companies are the innovators commercializing clean technologies and their progress is accelerating at an astonishing rate.

In agricultural biotechnology, crops on the market have been modified to protect them from insect damage thus reducing pesticide use. Biotech crops that are herbicide tolerant enable farmers to control weeds without damaging the crops. This allows farmers flexibility in weed management and promotes conservation tillage. Other biotech crops are protected against viral diseases with the plant equivalent

of a vaccine. Biotech fruits and vegetables are tastier and firmer and remain fresher longer.

The number of acres worldwide planted with biotech crops soared from 4.3 million in 1996 to 100 million in 1999, of which 81 million acres were planted in the United States and Canada. Acceptance of these crops by farmers is one indication of the benefits they have for reducing farming costs and use of pesticides while increasing crop yields.

Biotech crops in development include foods that will offer increased levels of nutrients and vitamins. Benefits range from helping developing nations meet basic dietary requirements to creating disease-fighting and health-promoting foods.

Biotechnology is improving the lives of those in the U.S. and abroad. The designation of January 2000 as National Biotechnology Month is an indication to our constituents and their children that Congress recognizes the value and the promise of this technology. Biotechnology is a big word that means hope.

#### HONORING LARRY LEDERHAUSE

#### HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 31, 2000*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to pause and remember the life of Larry Lederhouse who passed away on December 11, 1999. Many relatives and close friends will miss this remarkable person.

Larry Lederhouse was born on January 30, 1963. He attended Eagle Valley Junior/Senior High School in Gypsum, Colorado. He was very involved in 4-H and Future Farmers of America projects. He served as a volunteer with the Gypsum Fire Department. Larry attended college in Oregon at Western Baptist College.

Larry returned to Colorado and worked for the Garfield County Airport. He then owned and operated L&L Sanitation Service.

Larry loved animals, especially his dog, Happy. Larry also sang with the "Sagebrush Singers" of the Battlement Mesa and liked to go hunting, hiking, swimming and flying.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remember Mr. Larry Lederhouse, a great American who was loved and cherished by many.

#### THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION STATEMENT IN REFERENCE TO CERTAIN TYPES OF RELIGIOUS BROADCASTING

#### HON. CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 31, 2000*

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, in December of last year, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) overstepped its bounds and authority by issuing statements that if enforced, would restrict certain types of religious broadcasting.

I am happy to report that the FCC reversed its decision on Friday. I applaud the decision

of the FCC but am troubled that such a decision was ever made.

While issuing a ruling on a routine license transfer, the FCC editorialize about new, strict standards for educational programming that could have affected many non-commercial, educational television broadcasters. The FCC stated that "religious exhortation, proselytizing, or statements of personally-held religious views and beliefs generally would not qualify as 'general education' programming. Thus, church services generally will not qualify as 'general education' under our rules."

It is arrogance of the highest form for the FCC to attempt to determine what is—and what is not educational. The FCC's statements amount to an unconstitutional restriction on religious speech. This type of content regulation and suppression of religious expression is not acceptable. The FCC is neither qualified nor does it have any legal authority to engage in this sort of line drawing.

The FCC was established by the Communications Act of 1934 and is charged with regulating interstate and international communications by radio, television, wire, satellite and cable. The FCC's jurisdiction covers the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and U.S. possessions. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is an independent United States government agency, directly responsible to Congress.

Shortly after reading the FCC's anti-religious statements, Reps. MIKE OXLEY, STEVE LARGENT, CLIFF STEARNS and I wrote the Chairman of the FCC to remind him that the FCC is still directly responsible to Congress and that he should reverse the anti-religious statements or he could stand by and see it overturned by Congressional action.

Last week, we introduced H.R. 3525—The Religious Broadcasting Freedom Act to overturn the ruling issued by the FCC and did so with over 60 cosponsors. The FCC is accountable to the Congress and I believe we have demonstrated that we will take decisive action when the FCC or any other federal agency exceeds its authority—and especially when such actions threaten our religious freedoms.

The FCC's action was an unprecedented action by a government agency in an attempt to decide what is acceptable religious programming and content. The fact is, it is not the place of any government agency to determine what is acceptable religious speech because religious freedom and freedom of speech are both protected by the Constitution.

I have heard from many religious broadcasters in Mississippi and across the country who expressed outrage at the FCC and their actions. I am pleased to tell them that we have stopped this un-Constitutional decision in its tracks. Yet, I urge my colleagues to remain vigilant. I assure you that if the FCC takes any actions that suggest they may attempt to pursue this action in any other format, I will fight it once again.