

month-old. He had his whole life ahead of him, until yesterday. This decorated New York City police officer was killed while he was doing his job protecting the people of New York City and specifically the people of Staten Island.

He is the third police officer to die in the last 3 years in Staten Island alone, adding to the list of hundreds of others who have given their life for their country and for the community.

So now a 2-year-old and a 9-month-old grow up without a father. Patricia, with our prayers, along with her family, will live on.

John's mother, Margaret, as well as his brothers Michael, Robert and Patrick, hopefully will find some comfort and solace from the other people of our community knowing that Officer John Kelly, a decorated officer with four commendations during his career, who went above and beyond the call of duty for the people he loved so much, the community he loved so much, as well as for the job he took so much pride in performing day in and day out. His partners and everyone who worked with him on Staten Island have nothing but praise for him.

I just thought it was appropriate that from time to time while others, like cats on mice, jump to disparage what good police officers do throughout our Nation, that we understand and pause for just a moment to remember that people like John Kelly, just 31 years old, gave his life for the very reason that he took the oath to be a New York City police officer.

So if anything comes out of this, I just would hope that the people of this Nation remember the Kelly family in their prayers. We wish, on behalf of the people of Staten Island, that they find some comfort in knowing that John Kelly died a hero.

NUCLEAR FUEL RELIABILITY ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to inform the House that I am introducing a major piece of legislation which would make it possible for this Government to once again assume the ownership of the nuclear fuel production industry in this country. The act is entitled the Nuclear Fuel Reliability Act of 2000.

Why is this legislation necessary? I think it is important for this House to understand that approximately 2 years ago actions were taken that for the first time privatized the industry which is responsible for enriching uranium in this country.

What that means, in practical terms, is that the industry that is responsible for producing approximately 20 percent of all of the electricity that is gen-

erated in this country has been placed in private hands.

Now, that may not be so bad if the company that became the owner of this industry had acted responsibly and had kept faith with this Government once privatization had occurred.

One of the obligations placed upon the private company was to operate the two enrichment plants which exist in this country today, one in Paducah, Kentucky, and one in Piketon, Ohio, to operate those plants through the year 2004. Recently, the company has made the decision to close the Piketon, Ohio, plant in June of next year.

Who has benefited from privatization, Mr. Speaker? I think the only ones who have benefited from privatization are those select few individuals who oversaw the privatization process and have enriched themselves. And I am speaking specifically of the CEO of that private corporation, Mr. Nick Timbers.

As I have said before, as a Government employee, his salary was approximately \$350,000, which is a respectable income. He was given permission to oversee privatization, to make recommendations, to advocate; and he did those things and he did so in a way that enriched himself.

As the CEO of the now private corporation, his salary is somewhere in the vicinity of \$2.48 million; and he has a golden parachute of \$3.6 million.

What has been the result? Who has benefited other than Mr. Timbers and a select few of Wall Streeters? Well, I will tell my colleagues who has not benefited. Have the investors benefited? Absolutely not.

At the point of privatization, the stock of the company was worth approximately \$14.50 a share. It is now hovering around \$4 a share. So the investors have not benefited.

Has the Government benefited? Absolutely not. We find ourselves, as a government, facing a situation where we may become dependent on foreign sources for up to 23 percent of all of the electricity that is generated in this country.

Have the communities where these plants are located benefited? Absolutely not. My community is being absolutely annihilated as workers who have spent 25 and 30 years of their lives working in the service of this country are being summarily discharged and dismissed.

I am terribly troubled by the actions of this corporation. I am terribly troubled as a result of the process that led to privatization. I think it was a process that was corrupted, it was a process that enabled individuals to benefit themselves, to enrich themselves personally at great expense to the well-being of this Nation and to our local communities and to the investors.

□ 1845

That is why I have asked for an investigation of these matters. That is

why I look forward this fall to the Commerce Committee's hearings into these matters, because I think they will bring many things to light that the American people need and deserve to know.

And so as I introduce my bill this evening, it is my hope that multiple Members of this House will see fit to join me in supporting this legislation. It is the right thing to do for our country.

VICTIM OF "DRIVE-BY" POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was talking to a gentleman from Common Cause. I had called him in regard to a statement that they sent out asking all Congressmen to sign the statement. One of the points on the statement that they were asking us to sign on to was a commitment to vote for any ban on soft money, banning all soft money going to political organizations coming from corporations, coming from unions, coming from wealthy individuals.

We got to talking about this. I had called them and asked them to give me their thoughts on this because, of course, this kind of thing happens often, the kind of thing that they are trying to deal with; and they explained that for a long time there had been a relatively effective ban on the kind of money coming into politics that has a corrupting influence. They use the words "corrupting influence." It started with the Teddy Roosevelt era. But that interestingly in 1992, the Clinton campaign found a way around it and found a way that they could use soft money in the creation of ads attacking their opponents but doing so sort of in a way that separated them from the ad itself. They could set up these dummy little organizations and run ads that were not part of the campaign, and they could use soft money to fund it. So all of a sudden they found this loophole. Now everybody is doing it, essentially. Once they found out how to do it, both parties use it and certainly many, many organizations use it.

Members know the kind of ad that I am talking about. Many people have seen these ads run, where the group comes on, they usually have some name you have never heard of and they will say something like, gee whiz, isn't it horrible that certain Congressmen would do X, Y or Z. Why don't you call them and ask them why they did such a terrible thing.

Now, Common Cause says that this kind of thing has a corrupting influence on the system, and that is why they would like to try to stop it. They want to try to stop these thinly veiled