

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me today in honoring Mrs. Maranda Phillips Holmes for the incredible service she has provided for the citizens of her community. The world is a better place because of her years of distinguished service, and she has certainly earned the honor this notable award recognizes. The citizens of Charleston County and I congratulate Mrs. Holmes on her outstanding accomplishments and wish her the best in all of her future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 2001

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on July 23 I was necessarily absent and was not able to vote on three recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

H.R. 2137—Criminal Law Technical Amendments Act of 2001—Yes; H.R. 1892—Family Sponsor Immigration Act of 2001—Yes; S. 468—James Corman Federal Buildings Designation—Yes.

ON THE ANOINTMENT OF REVEREND DR. HUBERT BANKS AS BISHOP

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 2001

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Reverend Dr. Hubert Banks on his elevation to the Office of Bishop in the Pentecostal Deliverance Tabernacle Worship Center in Ridgewood, New Jersey. On July 29, 2001, Reverend Dr. Banks will be consecrated as Bishop, one of the highest levels in his faith, at the Gilmore Memorial Tabernacle in Paterson, New Jersey. Reverend Dr. Banks has devoted his life to his faith, community, his family, and to ministering throughout the world. He is truly an exemplary man of faith and we are fortunate to have him serve our northern New Jersey community.

Reverend Dr. Banks has faithfully ministered since 1985, however his involvement with the Church began when he was twelve years old. A graduate of Ridgewood High School, he has served as Director of various youth, senior, and state choirs and worked actively with youth faith groups. His outstanding leadership and devotion brought him to the position of deacon while continuing his work with a men's chorus. At this point, Reverend Dr. Banks was also named Board Chairman of the Allene Gilmore Day Care Center.

In 1980, Reverend Dr. Banks was licensed into ministry as an Evangelist by the United Christian Church and Ministerial Association. One year later, he was ordained and went on to found the Pentecostal Deliverance Ministry. Reverend Dr. Banks then brought his spiritual leadership overseas as he spent time ministering in Israel. Since that experience, he has

spent extensive time doing evangelistic work throughout Africa in Venda, Malawi, and Johannesburg. In 1990, Reverend Dr. Banks was promoted to District Elder in the Northern New Jersey region and received his Doctorate Honoris Causa from the Shiloh Theological Seminary shortly thereafter. In 1998, Reverend Dr. Banks was named Bishop-Elect under the Faith Tabernacle Outreach Ministries and now, three years later, he will be appointed to the respected position of Bishop in a traditional ceremony, rich with his faith's symbols. With his elevation to the title of Bishop, Reverend Dr. Banks will serve a larger congregation, bringing his dedication to new churches in the area. These churches are fortunate to have such an outstanding man both leading and serving their communities.

Reverend Dr. Banks' life as a minister includes his wife and two daughters, three stepsons and five grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Reverend Dr. Banks for his elevation to the position of Bishop and for the outstanding example he sets for all of us.

HONORING ANDREW A. ATHENS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 2001

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding American, a humanitarian and a dedicated health provider, Andrew A. Athens.

Mr. Athens has dedicated his life not only to serving his family, his faith, and his nation, but is trying to improve the quality of life for millions of patients in need of health care throughout the world. With the same dedication and work ethic, Andy Athens and his wife, Louise, have raised their children and grandchildren in the best traditions of philanthropy, respect, and good will.

Andy was born in Chicago, IL, the son of Greek-American immigrants. He went on to serve as a captain in the U.S. Army during World War II where he distinguished himself in the European and African campaigns for which he was decorated with the Bronze Star. Following the war, he helped rebuild the infrastructure of war-ravaged Europe, which service earned him a citation from the Hungarian Government. Subsequent to his return to America, Andy cofound Metron Steel Corporation, in which he served as its president for 41 years and during which time it became a major steel service center in the Midwest.

A life-long activist in the Greek Orthodox Faith, Andy Athens has held leadership roles on the local, Diocesan and national levels. While President of the Archdiocesan Council of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America from 1974–1995, the highest position a layman can hold in the Church's national administration, Andy helped to establish the charitable arms of the Greek Orthodox Church in America, the International Orthodox Christian Charities, and Leadership 100. For his outstanding humanitarian service, Andy received numerous awards, including the highly

regarded Religious Heritage of America Award, the Athenagoran Human Rights Award, the Medal of Saint Paul, and other honors. Furthermore, Andy's service to the National Church has earned him the international recognition of the leader of World Orthodoxy, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, who has elevated Andy to the rank of Archon of the Order of Saint Andrew.

Responding to the need for political action, Andy mobilized the Greek American community to petition elected officials and to express their views for global action. In 1974, he founded the United Hellenic American Congress (UHAC), and continues to serve as its' chairman. UHAC has helped to bridge the gap between the Greek American communities who govern nationally and globally. It is a voice for human rights violations in the Mediterranean and the Balkans and the need for religious freedom in Turkey. Continuing his international humanitarian service, in 1995, Mr. Athens was elected to serve as the 1st President of the World Council of Hellenes Abroad (SAE).

Andy's greatest political and humanitarian achievements have been in his service with the SAE, which represents 7 million Hellenes living outside of Greece. Under Andy's leadership, the SAE instituted an historic program bringing primary health care and job opportunities to Hellenes and their neighbors living in the countries of the former Soviet Union. The SAE Medical Relief Program has established three health care centers in Georgia, a clinic and visiting nurses program in Ukraine, and a health care clinic in Armenia. Soon, they will begin a full program in Albania. They have managed to help more than 34,000 patient's per month throughout these clinics.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join in honoring Andrew A. Athens, a "Greek-American global advocate of all the values that have made our nation so strong." Mr. Athens has lived the American dream based on honor, duty, faith and respect. He has truly been saintly as a philanthropic global advocate for the values we all embody as Americans.

EUROPEAN INTERESTS ARE NOT ALWAYS THOSE OF THE U.S.

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 2001

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member wishes to commend to his colleagues the July 22, 2001, editorial from the Omaha World-Herald entitled "Why America Says No."

Currently, the U.S. is under intense pressure from members of the European Union (EU) to conform to what they deem best for their combined interests. While U.S. economic and security interests often intersect with those of its European allies, such convergence is not always the case. Environmental standards (particularly those outlined in the Kyoto Protocol), agriculture subsidy levels, and the use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are among the issues on which the U.S. and the EU disagree. Participation in the proposed

permanent International Criminal Court (ICC) is yet another issue on which the U.S. national interests and many other countries' national interests diverge.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that choosing not to participate in institutions such as the ICC is not, as some continue to argue, equal to isolationism. Choosing not to engage in conversations with other leaders on difficult issues is isolationism. President Bush, while rightly standing strong against pressure to pursue international agreements and institutions which would be contrary to American interests, has engaged his European counterparts in dialogues on the tough issues and should be commended for doing so.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, July 22, 2001]

WHY AMERICA SAYS NO

One of the irritants in President Bush's current dealings with European nations is his administration's opposition to a permanent International Criminal Court. The 15-member European Union is one of the leading proponents of a United Nations plan to form such a tribunal.

Bush should stand firm. Not because a world court would be a bad thing as a general principle—indeed, in the abstract the idea has appeal. And not even because the trend of recent years toward some kind of world government is a direct affront to American sovereignty, as it surely is.

The U.S. government should continue to be against this proposal because America's potential exposure to the potential misuse of such an entity is greater than that of most other nations.

That's because America is a superpower that is often called upon to be the world's policeman. By tradition and instinct, it has chosen to pursue an active, interventionist foreign policy during many stretches of its history, acting as a force for good in the world. No nation has single-handedly done more to defend down-trodden people against tyranny or to combat the problems of disease, poverty and deprivation.

Accordingly, America has had far-flung military and civilian operations sometimes in circumstances or with outcomes sufficiently ambiguous as to make it a target for prosecution in an international court if the people who ran that court happened not to like Americans.

The purpose of the proposed entity would be to try and sentence war criminals, violators of human rights and perpetrators of genocide. Administration officials fear that the machinery of an international court could, if it fell into the wrong hands, mean trouble for American troops or their leaders—trouble caused by someone who tried to paint an American military intervention (Haiti? Panama?) as a violation of human rights or a foreign policy decision (Henry Kissinger on the bombing of Cambodia in 1970) as a war crime. Not everyone sees things through the same eyes. George Bush, the former president, is either a national liberator or a war criminal, depending on whether you are Kuwaiti or Iraqi.

The spectacle of Americans, based on foreign policy differences, being hauled before a foreign tribunal without the protections of the U.S. Constitution would be an affront to U.S. sovereignty.

Moreover, standards evolve unpredictably. Just a few years ago, the death penalty was widely used around the world. Recently, moralists all across Europe applauded when

Amnesty International labeled the United States a human rights violator for not outlawing capital punishment. Does that make George Bush and Bill Clinton, under whom executions were conducted when they were governors, violators of human rights? Not now, perhaps. But later? The evolution continues.

Thirty-seven nations have ratified the treaty that would form the court. They range from E.U. nations to Senegal, Croatia and Tajikistan. Increasingly, collective operations seem to appeal to the E.U. and parts of the Third World. Americans may just have to recognize—and hope they recognize it, too—that our interests are sometimes different from theirs, and govern ourselves accordingly.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. BRIAN BAIRD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2500) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes:

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague FRANK LUCAS for joining me in offering this important amendment.

The Methamphetamine/Drug Hot Spots Program provides funding for states to pay for the costs associated with fighting meth. This includes identifying and dismantling meth labs and training law enforcement to respond to labs.

Last year, Clark County in my district received funding from this program to hire an additional meth detective for our local drug task force.

As one of the founders of the Meth caucus, I am pleased to offer an amendment to increase the funding for this important program. Forty-two members of our caucus asked appropriators to increase funding for the Meth/Drug Hot Spots from \$48.5 million (FY01) to \$60 million. The bill before us today funds this program at \$48.3, \$11.7 less than requested by our bipartisan caucus.

Our amendment would increase the funding for this program to \$60 million. We are proposing to accomplish this by reducing the increase given to the International Broadcasting Operations by \$11.7 million, which received a \$32 million increase in this bill. Our amendment would still provide for more than a 5% increase for International Broadcasting Operations. This is still more than President Bush's request for no more than a 4% increase in the growth of federal spending.

I want to make clear that this amendment is in no way meant to take away from the important role that International Broadcasting Operations has in spreading the American ideals of freedom and democracy throughout the globe. The amendment is designed to help our law

enforcement officials stop the scourge of methamphetamine abuse here at home.

I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for joining me in offering this amendment and I ask for your support.

THE PATIENT PRIVACY ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 2001

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Patient Privacy Act, which repeals those sections of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 authorizing the establishment of a "standard unique health care identifier" for all Americans, as well as prohibiting the use of federal funds to develop or implement a database containing personal health information.

Establishment of such a medical identifier, especially when combined with HHS's misnamed "federal privacy" regulations, would allow federal bureaucrats to track every citizen's medical history from cradle to grave. Furthermore, it is possible that every medical professional, hospital, and Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) in the country would be able to access an individual citizen's record simply by entering the patient's identifier into a health care database.

When the scheme to assign every American a unique medical identifier became public knowledge in 1998, their was a tremendous outcry from the public. Congress responded to the public outrage by including language forbidding the expenditure of funds to implement or develop a medical identifier in the federal budget for the past three fiscal years. Last year my amendment prohibiting the use of funds to develop or implement a medical ID unanimously passed the House of Representatives.

It should be clear to every member of Congress that the American public does not want a uniform medical identifier. Therefore, rather than continuing to extend the prohibition on funding for another year, Congress should simply repeal the authorization of the national medical ID this year.

As an OB/GYN-with more than 30 years experience in private practice, I know better than most the importance of preserving the sanctity of the physician-patient relationship. Oftentimes, effective treatment depends on a patient's ability to place absolute trust in his or her doctor. What will happen to that trust when patients know that any and all information given their doctor will be placed in a data base accessible by anyone who knows the patient's "unique personal identifier?"

I ask my colleagues, how comfortable would you be confiding any emotional problem, or even an embarrassing physical problem like impotence, to your doctor if you knew that this information could be easily accessed by friend, foe, possible employers, coworkers, HMOs, and government agents?

Many of my colleagues will admit that the American people have good reason to fear a government-mandated health ID card, but they will claim such problems can be "fixed" by additional legislation restricting the use of the