

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF FRED BITTERMAN

## HON. SCOTT MCINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 24, 2000*

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise at this time to recognize the remarkable life and significant achievements of a distinguished public servant and friend of mine, Captain Fred Bitterman. Tragically, Fred passed away Tuesday night in an accident at Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. Captain Bitterman, a dedicated law enforcement officer, father, grandfather and friend, will be deeply missed.

For over twenty five years Captain Bitterman served the people of the State of Colorado first as a State Patrolman, and later as a Troop Commander and Captain in the Colorado State Patrol. Captain Bitterman supervised a region that included the cities of Parachute, Vail, Eagle, New Castle, Carbondale, and of course our hometown of Glenwood Springs. As a law enforcement officer, his professionalism elevated him into a position of leadership. Captain Bitterman commanded a deep sense of admiration and respect from those officers who had the privilege of working alongside him, and also from those whom he worked so diligently to protect.

Captain Bitterman also put forth an immense effort to serving the public in his professional life. Captain Bitterman distinguished himself with his service to the Colorado State Patrol. Captain Bitterman enjoyed a well-deserved reputation of integrity not only within the ranks of the state patrol, but within the community as well.

Captain Bitterman was a strong family man, who took great pride in the family that he shared with his wife Cathy. In addition to Cathy, Captain Bitterman is survived by his six children, and many grandchildren. Captain Bitterman's passing is a severe loss not only to his family, but to our community as well.

Captain Bitterman was a very, very good man.

CONDEMNING 1994 ATTACK ON AMIA JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER IN BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

SPEECH OF

## HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 17, 2000*

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 531, condemning the 1994 attack of the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Six years have passed since this senseless, but very tragic act of violence.

The Jewish people of Argentina make up the largest Jewish community in Latin America. On July 18, 1994, the AMIA Jewish Community Center was bombed in Buenos Aires. As a result 86 people lost their lives and 300 were injured.

This resolution calls upon President Fernando de la Rúa to continue the investigation of the bombing, an investigation in which no person primarily responsible for this crime has been brought to justice. Argentine officials have acknowledged that this investigation was filled with negligence, and led to the arrest of just a few people tied to the incident, but who were only charged with providing a stolen vehicle used in the attack.

Investigators for the South American government have stated that the evidence indicates the bombing was carried out by the Iranian sponsored terrorist group Hezbollah. They have also found that the bombing could not have been carried out absent the assistance of local Argentine security forces, which have been reported to be compassionate to anti-Semitic rhetoric.

The democratic leaders of the Western Hemisphere have denounced terrorism in all its forms and have pledged to jointly combat terrorist acts anywhere in the Americas. The United States is not immune to acts of terrorism and this resolution serves to reiterate the long-standing policy of our country to stand firm against terrorist attacks wherever and whenever they occur and to work with its allies to ensure that justice is given to the victims and that the perpetrators of such violence are prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

In order to fully live up to this policy we must lend our support to the government of Argentina. As I said previously, the evidence indicates that insiders played a major role in executing this violence. What security is available to the people of Argentina when the officers who pledged to uphold the law commit crimes against the people they are supposed to protect?

Terrorism effectively destroys the peaceful and civilized coexistence of all people. The United States cannot turn its back on such acts no matter where they take place. Failure to punish terrorists would be to reward them and to encourage the spread of violence in our homeland and abroad. This is not the impression the United States Government wants to give to the American people, nor to anyone around the world.

Terrorists ignore existing rules of law and endanger the stability of democratically elected constitutional governments. Terrorism is a serious form of organized and systematic violence, intended to generate chaos and fear among the people and results in death and destruction. Terrorist acts are acts of hate carried out on individuals because of the difference of their religion, the color of their skin or their political beliefs. When we ignore the acts of people that wreak havoc on others be-

cause of their differences, it is a negative reflection of the values of America as a whole. Terrorist acts are immoral and should never be condoned by the United States or any other government.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to urge the Argentina government to fulfill its international obligations and its promise to the Argentine people by vigorously pursuing all persons involved in the bombing of the AMIA Jewish Community Center.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

## HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 24, 2000*

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 2000, due to a scheduling conflict, I was unable to be present on the House floor during the vote on H.R. 4871 and its amendments. Had I been here I would have voted in the following manner:

"No" on rollcall 428; "aye" on rollcall 427; "no" on rollcall 426; "no" on rollcall 425; "no" on rollcall 424; "aye" on rollcall 423; "no" on rollcall 422; and "aye" on rollcall 421.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4810, MARRIAGE TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

## HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 20, 2000*

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, as a father of young, working children, with working spouses, I am concerned that our tax system is penalizing them, and over 42,000 other working couples in my district, for making the sacrifices necessary to support their families.

Our tax system create penalties for being married in different ways. The tax laws do not allow married couples to earn twice as much taxable income as single taxpayers before higher tax rates take effect. The higher rates mean that spouses earn less after taxed than if they were single. The standard deduction for a single taxpayer is currently \$4,300. But for married couple the standard deduction is not doubled to \$8,600—it is only \$7,200. Millions of middle class working families who don't itemize deductions wind up paying a penalty because they are married.

Whatever form it takes, the "marriage penalty" is a tax bias against the working spouse with lower earnings. This means it is disproportionately a tax bias against working women taxpayers. Is this tax fairness? Married working women see a higher tax bite than

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

their single counterparts because our tax laws fail to tax them on the same footing as single taxpayers. It's time to stop punishing working Americans. We encourage Americans to work, and we encourage single mothers and fathers to marry to benefit their children, and now we are fixing the tax system so that it makes marriage affordable. I urge you to pass this legislation.

---

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. SCOTT McINNIS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 24, 2000*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, due to business in Colorado, I was unable to vote on the Hostettler amendment to H.R. 4871, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001 (Roll No. 427). Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "yea."

---

INTERNET GAMBLING  
PROHIBITION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 24, 2000*

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a topic that surrounds the dynamic questions raised by the extensive growth and reach of the internet. The information superhighway and the entire technological revolution have forced the Congress and industry officials to reexamine the regulation of internet gambling.

Under current federal law, it is unclear that using Internet to operate a gambling business is illegal. Gambling over the Internet only represents nefarious activity that we must only carefully examine, but such gambling also perpetuates the addictive nature of gambling.

It is well known that many gamblers are compulsive gamblers. In other words, they feel compelled to gamble, just as many smokers feel compelled to smoke cigarettes. Access fuels such additions, and by providing gambling sites over the Internet, illegal entities create access to anyone who owns a computer with a modem.

On-Line casino operators have created "virtual strip"—where gamblers who are tired of one casino can simply "walk" down the virtual Internet boardwalk into a different casino. Internet gambling sites offer everything from sports betting to blackjack. Many of these are operated from offshore locations. It is significant to note that H.R. 3125 would impose a mandate on Internet service providers by requiring them to offer their residential customers filtering software that would block access by children to gambling Internet sites. It is crucial that we protect our children from such activity.

Given the fact that the majority of our citizens have access to computers and the Inter-

net, we must ensure that the Internet is used for the right reasons such as education and communication. We cannot forget that people utilize the Internet in a global marketplace of ideas.

This measure prohibits a person from knowingly using the Internet or any other interactive service to place, receive, or otherwise make a bet or wager with any other person. H.R. 3125, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act of 2000, would prohibit persons engaged in a gambling business from using the Internet or any other interactive computer service place, receive, or otherwise make a bet or wager, or send, receive, or invite information assisting in the placing of a bet or wager.

More importantly, the bill addresses not only individual gamblers, but also gambling businesses. For those gambling businesses that choose to participate in Internet gambling, they face fines up to \$20,000 or imprisonment (up to 4 years).

This bill would also require common carriers and Internet services to assist federal, state, and local enforcement agencies in shutting down illegal betting or wagering sites.

We must toe the line when we enforce this measure. We do not want to trample upon the privacy rights of individuals. However, as long as the enforcement of a "gambling business" defined the legislation is not expanded by law enforcement authorities, it will help protect many parties from destructive and illegal conduct.

We must adopt a model of enforcement that provides uniformity and specificity so that the Internet carriers and telephone companies can easily and efficiently remove gambling sites from the Internet. It is my expectation that this legislation, after reconciliation with S. 692, the Senate-version of this bill, will make a positive contribution to the regulation of gambling businesses.

---

INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICARE  
EARLY ACCESS AND TAX CREDIT  
ACT

**HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 24, 2000*

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, more and more people in this country are losing access to health insurance. A new study by the Urban Institutes that the percentage of people under 65 without health insurance in 1998 grew to a stunning 18.4 percent. And, as the study's authors highlight, the strong national economy is masking what would otherwise be an even greater problem.

There are many approaches to solutions for decreasing the number of uninsured. As most of my colleagues are aware, I support the creation of a universal health care system in which each and every American would have health insurance coverage. That is the most fair, affordable, and sustainable solution to our national health care needs.

However, that won't be accomplished overnight. In the meantime, there are steps that Congress can and should be taking to develop immediate, if smaller, solutions to providing

people affordable health insurance coverage options.

One such is to pass legislation that would provide certain groups of individuals the option of buying into Medicare. For two sessions of Congress, we have sponsored a bill endorsed by the President called the Medicare Early Access Act. The goal of this legislation is to expand access to Medicare's purchasing power to certain individuals below age 65.

The Medicare Early Access Act is self-financed, through enrollees' premiums; it is not a publicly financed program. It simply would enable eligible individuals to harness Medicare's clout in the marketplace to get much more affordable health coverage than they are able to purchase in the private sector market that currently exists.

The bill would provide a very vulnerable population (age 55–64) with three new options to obtain health insurance:

Individuals 62–65 years old with no access to health insurance could buy into Medicare by paying a base premium (about \$326 a month) during those pre-Medicare eligibility years and a deferred premium during their post-65 Medicare enrollment (about \$4 per month in 2005 for an individual who participated in the full 3 years of the new program). The deferred premium is designed to reimburse Medicare for the extra costs due to the fact that sicker than average people are likely to enroll in the program. The deferred premium would be payable out of the enrollee's Social Security check between the ages of 65–85.

Individuals 55–62 years old who have been laid off and have no access to health insurance, as well as their spouse, could buy into Medicare by paying a monthly premium (about \$460 a month). There would be no deferred premium. Certain eligibility requirements would apply.

Retirees aged 55 or older whose employer-sponsored coverage is terminated could buy into their employee's health insurance for active workers at 125 percent of the group rate. This would be a COBRA expansion, with no relationship to Medicare.

Today, we are here to introduce a new, improved version of this legislation. As we are all aware, there are new projections of vast budget surpluses in our Nation's future. We want to take a small portion of those monies and finance a new component of the Medicare Early Access Act. Our new bill, the Medicare Early Access and Tax Credit Act of 2000 supplements our previous proposal by incorporating a new 25 percent tax credit that would be attached to each of the three programs. Thus, the actual cost to taxpayers would be 25 percent less than the cost under the proposals in the existing bill. I join today with more than 50 of my colleagues to reintroduce this new version of the legislation.

Affordability is a key component of expanding health insurance coverage. Adding a tax credit to the programs increases their affordability so that more people age 55 and older can take advantage of the program. The latest analysis from the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, indicate that more than 500,000 currently uninsured people would gain health insurance coverage by enactment of the Medicare Early Access and Tax Credit Act.