

Also, as it comes before us today the bill includes a reauthorization for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, so that it can continue its very important work in support of conservation and sound management. And it also includes legislation to commemorate the centennial of the National Wildlife Refuge System that is similar to H.R. 4442, a bill that I co-sponsored and that the House passed earlier this year.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to concur in the Senate amendments and send the bill to the President for signing into law.

SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NEED
FOR WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL
ON THE MALL

SPEECH OF

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 2000

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for this legislation, S. Con. Res. 145, that expresses the sense of Congress that the construction of the National World War II Memorial should be constructed expeditiously and that the appropriate site for the Memorial is on our National Mall at the Rainbow Pool. I want to thank Senator WARNER, Chairman STUMP, and all the other Members of Congress who worked to bring this legislation before us today.

As we enter the new century, it is appropriate that we reflect on the turning point of the past century. The World War II Memorial will commemorate that period between 1939 and 1945 that so profoundly reconfigured the modern world. So long as there is an America, this hallowed ground will pay homage to the superlative devotion that elevated duty, honor, and country to sacred proportion.

The location of the World War II memorial between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial is not only appropriate, but also historically coherent. Those two memorials commemorate the defining national events of the 18th and 19th centuries: our Nation's founding in the Revolutionary War and our unification during the Civil War. It is only fitting that the event that reshaped the modern world in the 20th century and marked our Nation's emergence from the chrysalis of isolationism as the leader of the free world be commemorated on this site.

As we all know, the site and the form of the memorial have been the subject of ongoing qualification and even some controversy. This is how public dialogue should ensue in our country. I believe that the site and respectful style of the memorial are most appropriate. The refined design is a beautiful tribute to a generation of Americans who sacrificed their lives in service to our country with unparalleled valor and distinction. This design enhances the Mall's representation of American history. It retains open vistas—north and south as well as east and west. And it adds trees, plantings, and waterfalls while also capturing for visitors and all Americans the significance of this most historic event of the 20th Century.

More importantly, we must acknowledge that the open, expansive process by which de-

isions have been made about this site and this design. The democratic process these brave Americans fought to defend has been pursued. The congressional deliberations—extensive hearings, floor action, and two separate bills—that led to the authorization of the memorial were long, frustratingly long, but they were thorough. As one sage commented, "It has taken longer to build the memorial than it did to fight the war." I can now say it has taken us twice as long to build the Memorial as to fight the war—over 13 years.

Our first bill authorizing the memorial was filed in 1987, and the final bill was passed in 1993. The Administrations of two presidents, five Congresses, and a decade of administrative reviews have elapsed.

After authorization, the procedures of the American Battle Monuments Commission and the other bodies responsible for approving the memorial have been open and fair. There have been 17 open, public meetings held on the proposed Memorial since 1993. Questions have been raised and suggestions offered by Members of Congress, the general public, and interest groups about the site and style of the memorial. With that deliberative process, the concept has been refined and become more elegant and appropriate for this hallowed site.

The concept of a World War II Memorial in Washington sprang from a dogged Army veteran, my constituent, Roger Durbin of Berkey, Ohio, who fought with the 101st Armored Division in the Battle of the Bulge. It was Roger's question to me about why there was no memorial to World War II in Washington to which he could take his grandchildren that inspired the historic project that is before us today.

The thought of Roger reminds me of that auspicious day, Veterans Day, 1995, when the memorial site was consecrated with soil from American battlefield cemeteries around the world. Roger Durbin participated in that dedication, accompanied by his wife Marian. He wrote about it as follows:

I stood on the site of the Memorial, November 10, 1995, watching the activity thereon. Touch football, stickball, Frisbee, picnicking, etc. as people enjoyed a sunny day as they would have in an ordinary public park. The next day I stood with President Clinton at the end of the glorious site dedication ceremony and scattered sacred soil gathered from 16 military cemeteries from around the world and Arlington upon the sparse and worn grass. That is when it became the most sacred, revered, beautiful spot in America.

Sadly, Roger passed away earlier this year. Roger was deeply wounded that he would not be able to see his idea come to fruition. The architectural rendition of the Memorial was framed above his fireplace, and he has assembled a copious note and scrapbook about the legislation and administrative proceedings for the record.

For thousands of other veterans, the same is true. Since the site dedication in 1995, perhaps a third of the World War II veterans then living have left us. There are fewer than 6 million World War II veterans living today, and we are losing them at a rate of 1,000 a day! I feel a great urgency to complete this project on schedule. As many as possible of the brave Americans who served during that conflict, abroad and on the home front, should bear

witness to this memorial in its final form. Is this too much to ask?

Of course, all veterans' organizations and students of history recognize what this generation achieved in the triumph of freedom over tyranny. As Americans in future generations visit our Nation's Capital, they will have an opportunity to stop along the Mall to reflect on a time when America went to war to defend our fundamental political values. Millions of visitors every year traverse this site already as they wend their way between the various memorials, parks, roads, and special events that give our National Mall its public character. They will be able to reflect on the level of commitment that engaged millions of Americans and our allies in combat during World War II.

The World War II memorial will thus serve as a symbol of our legacy to the future centuries: a determination to defend democracy at any cost. The world's political landscape was reshaped for all time as a result of the Allied victory. I urge the Commission to approve the architectural and landscape design as presented today. Let us move expeditiously toward the groundbreaking this coming Veterans Day in the first year of a new century and the advent of the new millennium.

Again, Madam Speaker, I fully support S. Con. Res. 145 and urge its passage.

IN RECOGNITION OF PALADIN
DATA SYSTEMS

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to publicly praise a tremendous high-tech company in my district, Paladin Data Systems. Paladin, based in Poulsbo, Washington, was recently ranked number 59 among the 500 fastest growing private companies in the nation by Inc. Magazine.

Paladin specializes in implementing both Oracle and Microsoft based solutions, Oracle database development, consulting and remote administration, technology training. Founded in 1994, Paladin was voted one of the "Best Places to Work" by Washington CEO Magazine in 1998, 1999, and 2000. The Puget Sound Business Journal placed Paladin at number 69 on their list of the 100 fastest growing private companies in Washington. It is clear that Paladin, now with over 70 employees, is indeed fueling the engine of our new economy.

Paladin also recognizes that the students of today must receive a comprehensive high-tech education so that they are able to secure jobs in the high-tech corridors of Puget Sound. To that end, Paladin has partnered with the Bremerton, Central Kitsap, North Kitsap, South Kitsap, North Mason, and Peninsula School Districts to form the West Sound School-to-Career consortium to train faculty members to teach the most recent information technology to our young people. Moreover, Paladin received a \$100,000 Information Technology Education Grant from Washington State and contributed \$50,000 of its own funds for this exciting partnership.

Paladin is just one of the many high-tech, bio-tech, and information technology businesses that are stimulating economic growth and creating new jobs in our country. Like many other Members of Congress, I value the contributions of our dynamic high-tech industry and want to make sure that the government continues to take appropriate action to help stimulate and develop this industry. I invite other Members of Congress to join me in congratulating Paladin Data Systems for their amazing success and wishing them nothing but the best in years to come.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS J. SWEENEY

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a patriotic American and a distinguished leader in the labor movement, Thomas J. Sweeney.

A native and lifelong resident of Oakland, California, Tom Sweeney was the devoted husband of Ann-Marie Sweeney for 51 years, the father of Susan Eldridge and the proud grandfather of four, including Teo and Michelle Eldridge. He served ably as Local 595's Business Manager, as an officer of IBEW's International Executive Council, as a Commissioner of the Port of Oakland and as President of the Building Trades Council.

When Tom Sweeney's life ended on August 11, 2000, at the age of 78, he had raised his family, served his community, succeeded at providing countless opportunities for generations of working Americans and made his beloved nation a much better place.

It is an honor for me to pay tribute to this good man and I ask Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues join me in offering our condolences to the family of Tom Sweeney and pay tribute to a life lived so well.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE RONALD V. DELLUMS FEDERAL BUILDING, OAKLAND, CA

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that my colleague, Ms. LEE and I rise in recognition of one of our greatest statesmen, Congressman Ronald V. Dellums, and in celebration of the dedication of the Ronald V. Dellums Federal Building in Oakland, California.

The Dellums Federal Building is considered the "Gateway to the East Bay" and has enhanced the Oakland city skyline. The distinct twin towers of this \$200 million project has played a pivotal role in the revitalization of the downtown area. Additionally, this building was built by a local and diverse workforce.

Mr. Dellums was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1970, serving until his retirement in 1998. Mr. Dellums was a distinguished and respected leader in the Congress and throughout the world and remains a tireless leader on behalf of peace and justice.

His diverse accomplishments include his leadership and vision as the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Chair of the House Armed Services and District of Columbia Committees; his challenge against the Vietnam War; his belief and advocacy of "Coalition Politics" as a way to truly evoke change in the political arena; his leadership and vision laid to the foundation for base conversion and ultimately the job creation and business development of these former military installations; his legislation to expand the Port of Oakland and estuary dredging; his tireless commitment to youth; and his National Health Service Act, which has long been considered the most comprehensive and progressive health care proposal since it was first introduced in 1977.

The true leadership of Mr. Dellums, and quite possibly the most rewarding moment in his career, was his vision to have the U.S. end its support of the racist apartheid regime of South Africa. Mr. Dellums was among the first in Congress to lead the international Anti-Apartheid movement. For years, until Nelson Mandela was released from prison, he faithfully introduced a bill and lobbied his colleagues for support of having Congress impose sanctions against the South African government.

Since his retirement from Congress, Mr. Dellums has served as the President of Healthcare International Management Company focusing on global health issues, most notably the AIDS pandemic. He serves as the Chair of President Clinton's Advisory Committee on HIV/AIDS. He has also recently written his memoirs, "Lying Down with the Lions: A Public Life from the Streets of Oakland to the Halls of Power."

It is with great pride that we offer recognition of some of the monumental contributions made by Ron Dellums to better our community, country and world. There is no other leader more deserving of having a Federal building named in his or her honor. Thank you Ron.

RECOGNIZING THAT GREATER SPENDING DOES NOT GUARANTEE QUALITY HEALTH CARE

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in these waning days of the 106th Congress, we are considering a bill that will give back nearly \$30 billion to managed care organizations, hospitals, and health care providers. These groups argue that without spending increases, quality of health care will suffer. The assumption: more money means better care. Of course adequate funding is necessary to effectively run hospitals, health plans, and clinics—but is that all it takes to ensure quality?

In fact, greater spending does not always guarantee better quality.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a recent report published in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) entitled, "Quality of Medical Care Delivered to Medicare Beneficiaries: A Profile at State and National Levels." This report, compiled by researchers at the Health Care Financing Administration, ranks states according to percentage of Medicare Free-for-Service beneficiaries receiving appropriate care. The researchers looked at a range of health problems, including strokes, heart failure, diabetes, pneumonia, heart attacks, and breast cancer. There is remarkable consensus in the medical community about what constitute appropriate care for these conditions. For example, health professionals agree that conducting mammograms at least every 2 years can save countless lives in the fight against breast cancer. They also agree that heart attack victims should be given aspirin within 24 hours of being admitted to a hospital.

If the claims of the managed care, hospital, and provider groups are accurate, states receiving the most Medicare spending should implement more of these scientifically validated practices. So I compared state performance rankings with Medicare payment estimates (per beneficiary). The results do not support this view. In fact, the 10 best performing states received 17 percent less in Medicare payments per enrollee than the 10 worst performers. Clearly, more money does not automatically translate into better health care nor does less money mean poor health care.

Furthermore, according to this JAMA report, all states could do a better job of implementing quality care. On average, only 69 percent of patients received appropriate care in the typical state. This figure dropped as low as 11 percent for certain practices, such as immunization screenings for pneumonia patients prior to discharge. A clear trend also emerged—less populous states and those in the Northeast performed better than more populous states and those in the Southeast.

What accounts for these differences in performance? JAMA authors suggested that, "system changes are more effective than either provider or patient education in improving provision of services." Perhaps this is why states that have instituted health care reform, such as Vermont and Oregon, demonstrated relatively high levels of performance at lower cost.

Authors of the JAMA article further suggested that it is necessary to hold all stakeholders accountable, not just health care providers and health plans. This includes, "purchasers, whether Medicare or Medicaid, . . . because they are making continual and important decisions that potentially balance quality against expenditures."

I call upon my colleagues to recognize that we too are accountable. Medical experts agree on best practices. So we must do more than just authorize spending, we must recognize what constitutes quality care and expect providers, hospitals, and health plans to deliver. Medicare beneficiaries across the United States deserve the best care available and this cannot be achieved through greater