

July 27, 2000

on the election law, so that it will meet international standards. I hope my colleagues will join me, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PITTS and Mr. CARDIN in this effort, and we welcome their support.

COMMUNITY RENEWAL AND NEW
MARKETS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 2000

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong and enthusiastic support of the Community Renewal and New Markets Act of 2000.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ARCHER and Ranking Member RANGEL of the Ways and Means Committee for their support in this legislation being on the floor today and I want to thank the Speaker for scheduling. Secondly, I want to thank President Clinton and Speaker HASTERT for their leadership to commitments to try and help the most distressed, disadvantaged and poverty stricken areas of the country, in both urban and rural America. Thirdly, I want to commend and congratulate my colleagues and principal originators and cosponsors of this legislation, Chairman JIM TALENT; chairman of the Small Business Committee and Representative J.C. WATTS for their relentless efforts to make this legislation a reality. And Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of those who have indicated support for a small, but seriously important step forward, in reality a giant step as we move to uplift downtrodden communities and put hope back into the hearts of our people.

This legislation is designed to do what none of our efforts have effectively done, which is seriously attract business and redevelopment efforts to the poorest communities in our nation. This legislation is no hollow sounding rhetoric, it is no flash and dash, it is no pig in a poke. It is economically sound, socially relevant and based upon the principles of free enterprise. It takes forty Renewal communities and provides tax incentives, lifts restrictions and barriers, provides for capital gains tax for five years, investment programs, wage incentives, environmental clean-ups, CRA credits, Commercial Revitalization, Tax Credit Opportunities to rehabilitate dilapidated housing, venture capital to start businesses and the promotion of Faith-Based Drug Counseling initiatives.

I know that some of my colleagues have concerns about this provision, suggest that it infringes upon the separation of church and State and even go so far as to suggest that it is unconstitutional. This is absolutely untrue!

In the charitable choice arena, this bill breaks no new ground! First of all, H.R. 4, the current Welfare Law, allows States to contract out their social services to both religious or non-religious providers. In addition, H.R. 4271, the Community Services Authorization Act of 1998, Senate Bill S. 2206 and H.R. 1776, the American Home Ownership and Economic Opportunity Act all have some charitable choice provisions. Even under the establishment of the Religion Clause of the First

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

16903

Amendment, (1) Religious organizations are generally eligible to participate as grantees or contractors in such programs. But the clause has generally been interpreted to bar government from providing direct assistance to organizations that are pervasively sectarian.

As a consequence, government funding agencies have often required social service providers, as conditions of receiving public funds, to be incorporated separately from their sponsoring religious institutions. They are to refrain from religious activities and proselytizing in the publicly funded programs and to remove any religious symbols from the premises in which the services are provided. The establishment clause, in short, has been construed to require religious organizations to secularize their services as a condition of obtaining public funding. ACRA's drug treatment provision is the same. It voucherizes the Substance Abuse Block Grant and other treatment Block Grants and allows the patient to decide where to use the voucher.

The courts have found that our government can provide assistance directly to enterprises operated by religious concerns as long as it is not pervasively sectarian and that grantees devise ways of involving other organizations including religious ones, in the delivery of such services.

In the Aguilar vs. Felton case, the Supreme Court ruled that it was constitutionally permissible for public school teachers to provide remedial and enrichment educational services to sectarian school children on the premises of the schools they attend. Thus, the Court has ruled that as long as the client has a choice among providers both religious and non-religious and the participant makes the decision, then the choice is constitutional.

And so, Mr. Speaker, even though I understand the concerns expressed by some of my colleagues, the law is the law. The constitution is the constitution and the legislation is in compliance with both. Therefore, I urge a "yes" vote to help the people renew their hope and rebuild their communities. I am reminded of the scripture, they rebuild the walls because the people had a mind to work. This legislation will work to help restore and rebuild faith in America.

REMEMBERING JOHN ELLIOTT

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 2000

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to recognize and pay tribute to the memory of fine young man, Ensign John R. Elliott, 22 of Egg Harbor Township who passed away on Saturday, July 22, 2000.

I would like to offer my deepest sympathy to John's family and friends for their loss of a son, a brother, a grandson, a nephew, a cousin, and a friend. I am truly saddened by John's death and hope that his family and friends may experience peace and comfort in this time of sorrow.

I met John in the fall of 1995 when he participated in the application process for admis-

sion to one of our nation's four academies. John expressed his desire to serve in the United States Navy. I had the privilege of nominating him to the United States Naval Academy. In the spring of 1996, he was appointed and accepted by the United States Naval Academy as a member of the Class of 2000.

While at the Academy, John was designated to participate in the United States Navy Honors program, nothing new to a young man who was among the top five graduates in the 1996 Egg Harbor Township High School graduating class, a National Merit Scholar and class president. John was recognized for his exceptional achievement in the fields of math and science and graduated with a Bachelors in Science Degree with merit in systems engineering. Upon graduation, he received his commission as an ensign in the Navy and was to attend flight school in Pensacola, Florida.

As his father has said, he was filled with hopes and dreams for his future. John's hopes and dreams can still be realized in the memory of John's accomplishments. John was an intelligent, hard-working and popular young man, respected and liked by his peers, a successful student and fine young man who had a bright future with the United States Navy. John was one of our best and brightest. He epitomized all that makes the United States of America the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

My thoughts and prayers are with John's parents, Bill and Muriel Elliott of Egg Harbor Township, his sister Jennifer, his grandmother Audrey Moyer, his aunts and uncles Pamela and Randall Johns, Robert and Deborah Elliott, and Artis and Stephen Hoffman, and the rest of his family and friends during this time of grief.

CARL ELLIOTT FEDERAL
BUILDING

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 2000

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman from Alabama's resolution. It is both fitting and appropriate to recognize my former colleague, Carl Elliott, by naming a public building in his honor. Because not only was Carl Elliott a good and decent man, but a dedicated and capable public servant who gave much to Alabama and his country.

It was just last week that we debated federal aid to libraries. I would remind my colleagues that it was Carl Elliott who began the crusade for library funding, and it is he who is responsible for the Library Services Act.

Carl Elliott was a man of principle and foresight. He was a tireless advocate on behalf of education, working to secure federal assistance for low income, poverty-stricken school districts and students across Alabama and the United States. In doing so, he helped give poor students access to higher education and job opportunities based on their ability and merit rather than economic background.

But his thoughtfulness and humanity on racial issues is noteworthy. At a time of great tumult in the South and Alabama over racial