

organization whose sole mission is to end the most exploitative forms of child labor in the United States and around the world. In that same year, through Diane's voluntary efforts, IIECL received three grants working in partnership with AFL-CIO's American Center for International Labor Solidarity, the National Consumers League, and the International Labor Rights Fund.

Throughout her career, Diane has testified on numerous occasions before both the House and Senate, and submitted hundreds of statements and testimony to the executive and legislative branches of the federal government on behalf of farmworkers and farmworker organizations. More recently, she addressed the First International Symposium on Micro-Enterprise in Obregon, Mexico in 1999 addressing child labor and youth employment issues. She returned to Mexico in August 2000 to complete a country survey on child labor in agriculture for the International Labor Rights Fund.

In November, Diane left AFOP to take a new position at Creative Associates working with the United States Agency for International Development. She will oversee the development of innovative basic education programs to prevent child labor around the world. Additionally, she will brief Congress and USAID on international child labor developments, as well as provide training and technical assistance about child labor to U.S. AID global, regional, and mission-level staff in Asia, Latin America, Africa, and Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in expressing our gratitude to Diane for her two decades of service on behalf of our nation's migrant and seasonal farmworkers. We wish her great success in her continuing work to prevent abusive child labor.

HONORING UNSUNG HEROES

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 07, 2001

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to honor three people who have dedicated their professional careers to fighting for better lives for the children and families of our nation's capital. Each week, all of us come to this revered institution to continue the greatest exercise in democracy and freedom the world has ever known. And yet, in the shadow of the Capitol itself are families and children whose lives we cannot imagine. There are children who are not able to contemplate the beauty of democracy and freedom because they are only concerned with surviving another day with enough food, with proper shelter, and without being a victim of abuse.

Luckily, there are many people who are using their formidable talents to provide a better life for these children and their families. On Monday, March 6, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia honored three special individuals as "Unsung Heroes." I would like to take this opportunity to also honor these people.

Alec I. Haniford Deull has been a lawyer in Washington DC for nearly a decade. After graduating from the Washington College of

Law at American University, magna cum laude, Mr. Deull opened his own practice in 1993. For his entire professional career as an attorney, he has represented clients in child abuse and neglect cases. He also represents children in special education court actions. He is widely respected for his passionate advocacy on behalf of his clients. Mr. Deull is also working to train the next generation of children's advocates, often taking on numerous interns from local law schools.

Juliet J. McKenna is now the Executive Director of the District of Columbia chapter of Lawyers for Children America, a wonderful organization. This organization trains lawyers in private practice who are volunteering their time as guardians ad litem in child abuse and neglect cases. Before joining Lawyers for Children America, she spent two years in the District's Office of the Corporation Counsel in the Abuse and Neglect section of the Family Services Division. Ms. McKenna is a bright and enthusiastic young woman who only graduated Yale Law School in 1995, but has already earned a reputation as an outstanding advocate.

Finally, upon graduating from Northwestern University School of Law, Anthony R. Davenport joined the Office of the General Counsel of the District of Columbia Department of Human Services and then the Office of the Corporation Counsel. In all, he spent eight years working for the people, families and children of the District. For the past six years, Mr. Davenport has been a solo practitioner specializing in litigation concerning the rights of children and families. He has spent countless hours working to provide a better future for children and families across this city.

These are three extraordinary people. I ask that all my colleagues join me in recognizing and honoring these people for their contribution to making our nation's capital a better place for children and families.

HONORING PASTOR CLINTON M. MILLER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2001

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Reverend Clinton M. Miller of Brooklyn, New York. This weekend Reverend Miller will be installed as the new pastor of the Brown Memorial Baptist Church in Fort Greene. Reverend Miller has worked towards this goal since the moment he realized that he wanted to dedicate himself to religion and I am pleased to acknowledge his achievement.

Reverend Miller was born and raised in Brooklyn. He received his high school diploma from the Bishop Loughlin Memorial High School and a Bachelor's Degree from Southern Connecticut State University. While in college, at the age of 19, he heard the call to pastor. This led him to Yale University's Divinity School where he received a Master's Degree. After being ordained by the American Baptist Churches and the United Missionary Association of Greater New York, Clinton began what would become an apprenticeship

at the Abyssinian Baptist Church. Rev. Clinton taught in the New York City Public School System until he became a fulltime youth minister at Abyssinian Baptist Church. As a youth minister, Reverend Miller developed a wide array of youth programs, including Sunday evening services, Summer Day Camp, basketball teams and counseling services. In addition, he held a weekly bible reading for seniors.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Miller has had the opportunity of being exposed to the highest quality of spiritual training and guidance under one of the most renowned ministers in the nation, Rev. Dr. Calvin O. Butts; Rev. Miller believes in a fresh approach to teaching the scripture; he believes in utilizing the tools of the congregation; he believes in using the parish to benefit the community; and he was a student of Abyssinian's renovation effort. As such, Rev. Miller is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today, and I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in honoring this truly remarkable man of faith.

CLARIFICATION OF THE HI TAX

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2001

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with Messrs. TIERNEY, FRANK, MCGOVERN, CAPUANO, OLVER and MARKEY, legislation to clarify that the employees of a political subdivision of a State shall not lose their exemption from the hospital insurance tax by reason of the consolidation of the subdivision with the State.

This issue has arisen because in 1997 Massachusetts abolished county government in the State, assumed those few functions which counties had performed, and made certain county officials employees of the State. Specifically, the law provided that the sheriff and all his personnel "shall be transferred to the commonwealth with no impairment of employment rights held immediately before the transfer date, without interruption of service, without impairment of seniority, retirement or other rights of employees, without reduction in compensation or salary grade and without change in union representation."

However, the issue of whether or not these consolidated employees were required to pay the Medicare portion of the FICA tax needed to be clarified. Federal law creates an exemption from this tax for state and local employees who were employed on or before March 31, 1986 and who continue to be employed with that employer. The law is written so it is clear that consolidations between local entities, and consolidations between State agencies, do not in and of themselves negate the grandfather rule. However, the issue of a consolidation between a political subdivision and a State is not directly addressed and I doubt it was thought of during the consideration of the federal law.

The Internal Revenue Service has taken the position that a State, and a political subdivision of a state, are separate employers for purposes of payment of the Medicare tax and

therefore any grandfathered employees merged in a consolidation between a State and a political subdivision lose the benefit of the grandfather rule even if such employees perform substantially the same work.

In a Sixth Circuit Court case, *Board of Education of Muhlenberg Co. v. United States*, the Court ruled on this general issue in terms of a consolidation of boards of education in Kentucky. The plaintiffs in this case argued that the consolidation of school districts did not create a new employer or terminate the employment of any teacher, and the Court agreed that Congress did not intend that exempt employees who have not been separated from previously excluded employment should lose their grandfather and be forced to pay the HI tax. While this case did not go to the issue of the consolidation between a State and a political subdivision, the logic indicates that this issue matters less than the overarching issue of whether the employees continue in the same or essentially the same positions. In Massachusetts this is clearly the case.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to enact this legislation to clarify that local employees do not lose the benefit of the grandfather rule merely because they have been consolidated with a State government.

THE MEANING OF THE ALAMO

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2001

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate one of the defining moments in American history. It was 165 years ago yesterday, that almost 200 Texicans laid down their lives to ensure that Texas achieved her independence. It happened at The Alamo. And the road from Mexico City to the Alamo runs through Laredo, the place where I was born. So, I came into this world only a few steps away from the footprints Santa Anna left on his march north.

And let me tell you, on the night of March 5, 1836, things were going downhill fast for the Alamo's defenders. The Mexican Commander, General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, had the Texicans in the Alamo right where he wanted them. And everything was on the line.

Santa Anna's forces had cut all the roads leading to the village of Bexar in what's now San Antonio, where the Alamo is still standing. He'd turned back a relief column that tried to make its way to help the Alamo's vastly outnumbered defenders. And with each passing hour more of Santa Anna's army arrived.

There's a standard military rule-of-thumb, which advises that an attacker had better have a three-to-one advantage when assaulting a properly defended objective.

Well, there weren't enough Texicans in the Alamo to properly man the walls. As a military fortification, the Alamo left a lot to be desired. Its walls were incomplete and the Texicans had to throw up fences and earthworks to complete their perimeter. In fact, that day one Texican would have to fight off more than ten enemy soldiers. Tall odds.

But the men of the Alamo knew it was time to stand and fight. As a strategic asset, the Alamo was better than nothing. That's because the Texicans had nothing else in place to slow Santa Anna's advance toward the eastern settlements where talk of independence had taken hold.

If Texicans didn't stop him at the Alamo, Santa Anna could very well have carved a path of destruction across the state that effectively deprived its people of the means to resist and the will to continue their struggle for Independence. Had Santa Anna made his way across Texas, there might not have been anything left to fight for.

The upshot is that conquering the Alamo appealed to Santa Anna's ego even though it did little to accomplish his military objective of suppressing the Texas Revolution. He needed to eradicate the passion for independence within every Texican, not simply defeat an army in the field.

Viewed in that light, taking the Alamo was for him an indulgence not a military necessity. He fancied himself as the Napoleon-of-the-west and he dreamed of decisive battles to elevate his standing.

And if Santa Anna had simply swept by the Alamo and pushed on to the settled fertile valleys and ranches further east, he'd have preserved the strength of his force. And if he didn't ultimately succeed in ending the dream of an independent Texas, he'd have extracted a far higher price from the Texicans he fought. So, even though all hands were lost at the Alamo, their sacrifice saved other lives that would have been lost beating back an unwounded Mexican Army of Operation.

Santa Anna himself was a dangerous and daring adversary. He wasn't anyone to be taken lightly. He'd fought his way to the top of the Mexican military through a series of wars, including the fight for independence from Spain. Santa Anna knew a thing or two about fighting. He was a charismatic and compelling leader who issued orders that he knew would be obeyed. His army was disciplined and far better equipped than any comparable units then fighting for Texas.

But we're taught that pride comes before the fall, and Santa Anna's pride was his Achilles'heel. Santa Anna did not begin his campaign with respect for his opponents. He considered the Texicans fighting for Independence as an ill-disciplined rabble that would be defeated by the first whiff of grapeshot that he sent over their heads.

Before he marched north to Texas, Santa Anna even boasted to a group of visiting Frenchmen and Englishmen that defeating Texas was just the first step in his plans for North America. He actually said he'd conquer the U.S., haul down the Stars and Stripes and hoist the Mexican flag over this very building: The Capitol. Well, that's quite a boast, and I know what of Sam Houston must have said when he heard about it:

"That'll be the day. He'll have his hands full right here in Texas." And so he did.

Eventually, Santa Anna did learn to respect Texas, but a lot of men had to die first.

And sitting here today, we ask ourselves: Why did they die? What were they fighting for? And is the country around us today worthy of their sacrifice? Some questions we can answer. Some will be answered for us.

They weren't eager to die. They wanted to live out their years in a free Texas. Time and again, Alamo commander William Travis appealed for reinforcements and only once did 30 men answer the call by riding through the Mexican lines to join their fellow Texicans.

In his famous letter to "the People of Texas and all Americans in the World", that he wrote with the Alamo surrounded and Santa Anna gathering strength, Travis made a last appeal for additional defenders.

This is what he told Texas:

"The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword if the fort is taken. I have answered the demand with a cannon shot and our flag still waves proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender or retreat. I call on you in the name of Liberty, of patriotism and every thing dear to the American character, to come to our aid with all dispatch. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due his own honor and that of his country. Victory or Death."

The men at the Alamo died because they believed that some things are more important than life itself. They knew that faith, family, and freedom were worth fighting for. And they also knew that, if they had to live without true independence, their lives wouldn't be worth living.

They wanted the protections of a legitimate Constitution. They wanted their individual rights to be honored. They believed in the idea of self-government. They insisted that government respect their right to own private property. They chafed under tariffs and demanded free trade. They fought for democracy as the surest path to freedom.

And it's true that the issue of slavery motivated some of the men at the Alamo. We must acknowledge that some of the men at the Alamo owned slaves and they were fighting for the right to keep them. History proved them wrong on that point. And that painful truth should not diminish the greater principles that all of the Texicans at the Alamo fought for. Just as our Founders did great things despite their flaws, so too did the Alamo's defenders ennoble themselves by the way they ended their lives.

The most dramatic moment was still yet to come. It happened when William Travis gathered his command in the courtyard of the Alamo and leveled with his men about the fix they were in. They had three options, he told them.

They could surrender, but they had all seen the red flag Santa Anna had flown. It meant no quarter. They would all be executed.

They could make a break for it and try to fight their way through the Mexican lines. But this option was also doomed to failure because they would be fleeing across open country and Santa Anna's cavalry would butcher them easily.

And they could instead defend the Alamo and, by dying in place, inflict enough casualties on the Mexicans to weaken Santa Anna's army. Travis chose the hard path.

"My own choice is to stay in this fort, and die for my country, fighting as long as breath shall remain in my body. This I will do even if you leave me alone," Travis said. But the choice was up to each of them, he said. Then