

excluded from these programs based solely upon legal health services that they provide with their own, non-U.S. funds. If the services are legal here, and they are legal where the NGO is operating, it would be misguided to deny an NGO the opportunity to carry out its important work.

This new bill will assist women around the world by protecting their fundamental rights and enabling women to access important family planning services from NGO's. As we celebrate Women's History Month, we must continue fighting for fundamental rights for women at home and around the globe.

#### TRIBUTE TO DEWEY FAUGHT

### HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 28, 2000*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who is a dear friend of mine, Dewey Faught.

Dewey Faught has served the state of Arkansas and his country all of his life. He graduated in 1953 from Eudora High School in Eudora, Arkansas and went on to attend Florida State University, Arkansas State University and the University of Central Arkansas where he studied Business Administration. He also received degrees in Liberal Arts and Agriculture.

Dewey is a veteran of the U.S. Air Force having served during the Korean, Vietnam and Cold War. He retired as a Senior Master Sergeant in July of 1974 after 20 years of honorable service. His Squadron was the First Combat Evaluation Group responsible for the administration of the RBS radar sites. His accommodations include the Meritorious Service Award and National Defense Medal. He recently received an accommodation from the Secretary of Defense for his service throughout the Cold War.

Dewey also served as Executive Director, Secretary and Treasurer for the Cabot Chamber of Commerce for 20 years. He also served as the Secretary and Treasurer for the Cabot Lions Club for 19 years, where he presently holds the position of President. He has a perfect attendance record for his 20 years of service to the Cabot Lions Club and is responsible for the recruitment of 40 members. He is a lifetime member of the VFW Post #4548 as well as the Disabled American Veterans. He is also a member of the AARP. In 1990 Dewey received recognition from his church, Cabot United Methodist, for his years of service as Sunday school superintendent. In 1983 Dewey was chosen Cabot Citizen of the Year. He was also chosen for the Cabot Community Leadership Award in 1999. His most recent project has him organizing the Cabot Veterans Monument and Memorial, Inc. He is spearheading the construction of this memorial that will honor Veterans in the North Lonoke County communities of Cabot, Austin, and Ward, Arkansas.

Dewey Faught is a great American and great Arkansan. He is the kind of citizen that made this nation the great place it is today. He has made Cabot a great place to work, live and raise a family. I am proud to call him my friend. Dewey has been married for 43 years to Jane Powell formerly of Gillett, Arkansas.

They have five sons, 17 grandchildren and one great grandchild.

#### HONORING THOMAS R. CAFFREY

### HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 28, 2000*

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Mr. Thomas R. Caffrey of Tuckerton, New Jersey. Mr. Caffrey was a first prize winner in C-SPAN's American Presidents: Life Portraits Viewers' Contest. Mr. Caffrey's poem on President John Adams is worthy of high praise.

President Adams served as our second president from 1797 to 1801. President Adams, as one of our nation's Founding Fathers helped shape a newly formed nation with his intellect and vigor. His personal correspondence with Thomas Jefferson have delighted scholars for years as they provide a personal glimpse of these two very important Presidents. Mr. Caffrey's poem encapsulates the life and times of President Adams.

I would like to enter into the RECORD Mr. Caffrey's poem, "Our Dearest Friend".

OUR DEAREST FRIEND  
(A POEM OF JOHN ADAMS)  
(By Thomas R. Caffrey)

From Puritan seed a seminal birth to Ancient, he was for the ages.

A blend of the heavens and merciless Earth  
To a man needing many assuages  
The genesis of this patriot as Founder will yet be revealed.

Portending rejection of British flat his fate  
about to be sealed.

So stubborn affixing himself to the law in defense of the British who fired.

Yes justice was blind and everyone saw that murder had not transpired.

While sufferings mixed with physical his angst was most profound.

So loving his country, he's practical; can America make it uncrowned?

A man in the midst of Freedom's vortex  
The lover of laws because they protect and make 'That Chair' a rising sun.

Declaring their freedom with principles inspiring Jefferson's pen.

The Wordsmith's text would soon convulse all parties, including them.

Though stunned by the Lion's thundering roar, some cowed by fear of this mother. Undaunted courage he'd force to the show, a rally for most of the others.

Prevailing at Yorktown made him celebrate, Conquest! On his date of birth!

Yet sober he was knowing full well his station, the Treaty would reflect his worth.

In Europe he felt the growing unease of absence from 'Portia'—his 'Friend'.

He often would stir for his quick release, when will this humility end?

The tenuous peace was forged with his mettle, in Paris the year '83.

The subsequent years would provoke much nettles. In Britain he yearned to be free.

Soon after he mixed into dear Quincy's soil, a call came for services, more.

For eight years his self-doubt would burden the toil. 'It's hopeless', he'd like to implore.

Before him the Giant of Mount Vernon, the defied A Priori.

In whose shadow he often fell striving for his own glory.

Leading was harder than Founding, it seemed. Not service but politics he loathed.

Betrayals were bad, from Jefferson worse, impossible when they were betrothed.

A premature move back home was his fate, no destiny to be a two-term.

Oft' ringing his hands and imploring his mate, his worth would she please affirm?

He passed many by on the farm at Peacefield, to dust they went, compost for life.

As his time drew near, posterity sealed, he relented, and thus joined his wife.

Today we think mainly of First and of Third, on Rushmore and our currency.

Remember Our Friend, a man of his word, whose heartsleeve was for you and me.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CAPTAIN ANTHONY R. STARNER

### HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 28, 2000*

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the second year that United States Marine Corps Captain Anthony R. Starner, his wife Ann, and their son Michael were tragically killed in an automobile accident on their way to Michael's baptism. Captain Starner served his country admirably in many places around the world including: Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; Puerto Rico; the Balkans; Estonia; and the United States of America. He was a selfless, well-respected, and caring officer, husband, and father. He and his family are missed by many friends, family members, and loved ones. A flag flew over the Capitol Building yesterday in their honor.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

SPEECH OF

### HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 23, 2000*

The House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (House Concurrent Resolution 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005:

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978 provides for the members of the Joint Economic Committee to come before the House and present their views on the current state of the U.S. economy, to serve as input in the debate we are about to have on the budget resolution before us. I rise today to report that while there are many economic achievements to celebrate, there is also a lot more to do in order for everyone to share in the current prosperity.

For the first time since the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act was passed in 1978, the U.S. economy has met the goals

which Senator Hubert Humphrey and Congressman Gus Hawkins set out in the original bill: 1. The unemployment rate for individuals over 20 is just ½ percentage point above the goal of 3 percent. 2. The unemployment rate for individuals over 16 has met the stated goal of 4 percent. 3. Inflation has remained below the goal of 3 percent since the beginning of the Clinton Administration, 7 years ago. 4. And all of this has been achieved while balancing the federal budget, for the first time in over 40 years.

It is a shame Senator Humphrey and Congressman Hawkins could not witness these achievements.

The great irony is that Senator Humphrey and Congressman Hawkins saw these goals as part of the path toward achieving full employment and balanced economic growth. Today, 20 years later, Alan Greenspan views them as dangerous signs of an overheating economy! I agree with Humphrey and Hawkins—low employment and inflation, and rising wages are always good for an economy.

Currently, unemployment and inflation are low, average wages are rising, and productivity is growing. There is cause to celebrate these achievements, which are due, in large part, to the economic policies of the last 7 years. But the Humphrey-Hawkins bill also called for establishing a national goal to fulfill the RIGHT of all adult Americans who are able, willing and seeking work to find employment at fair compensation. We may have met the numerical targets set out in the bill, we still have a lot to do in order to meet their overarching goal.

Despite the historic economic prosperity we are currently experiencing, the average after-tax income of the wealthiest families continues to grow faster than that for all other Americans, causing the income gap to continue widening. Some of my colleagues like to argue that the tax code should not be used to redistribute income to the poor. Well, I say we should stop using the tax code to redistribute income to the rich, like we have been doing!

Consider the following: Just the richest one percent of Americans—2.7 million people—took home as much after-tax income as the lowest 38 percent—or 100 million people—combined. In 1998, the average income of the wealthiest 20 percent of families was 14 times higher than that of the poorest 20 percent. After adjusting for taxes, the top 20 percent of U.S. households experienced a 43 percent increase in average income from 1977 to 1999, while the average income of the lowest 20 percent experienced a 9 percent decline. In 1999, almost 13 percent of total national after-tax income was concentrated in the top one percent of Americans.

The foundations for this disparity were laid during the 1980s, when average after-tax income for the wealthiest fifth of households increased by 33 percent.

The Republican budget does nothing to narrow the growing gap between the rich and the poor, and in fact would actually make it worse. Tax breaks for multi-millionaires do not help the millions of average Americans or narrow the gap between the rich and the poor.

In addition, the Republican budget would jeopardize the economic prosperity we are currently enjoying.

In 1992, President Clinton inherited budget deficits for “as far as the eye could see.” In

contrast to his predecessors, President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress implemented policies which eliminated the budget deficit. And contrary to what the critics predicted, we balanced the budget while experiencing the longest period of prosperity in U.S. history.

The Republican budget would put all of this in jeopardy. The Republican budget calls for large tax cuts, increases in defense spending, and drastic reductions to non-defense discretionary spending. Where have we heard this before? This precise mix of policies brought us the record budget deficits of the 1980s, which contributed to a decline in living standards for the vast majority of Americans.

My colleagues claim that their budget fixes Social Security and Medicare, creates a prescription drug insurance program, and does all this while keeping the budget in surplus. Well, this sounds like *de ja vu* all over again. To paraphrase this month's testimony of Nobel Laureate Robert Solow before the Joint Economic Committee—if you believe that their budget will do all that, I must be Alice and this must be wonderland.

The Reagan supply-side policies were a complete failure. While a few got rich, the vast majority of American workers and their families suffered as the country was saddled with an enormous debt, which those working families are still paying off.

The nation made the mistake of buying that snake oil once, why should we do it again? I am not about to put the incomes of American families at risk once again, especially as they are just beginning to recover from the last Republican attempt to “save” the economy.

The Republican budget includes a “Bush-lite” tax cut. I must at least give my colleagues some credit for rejecting the full Bush tax cut proposal completely. Their tax cut would only go half as far—which is still way too much. The Republican's current tax cut proposals cost more than the bloated tax cut proposal from last year, which the American people clearly rejected.

There are two fundamental things wrong with their tax proposals. First, they benefit the rich and don't help the vast majority of Americans. Second, these tax cuts, together with the rest of the budget package, are certain to get us back into the mess we were in during the 1980s, which caused real economic hardship on workers and their families.

The Republican budget calls for increasing defense spending by \$17½ billion above the caps, which is even more than the Administration's request. According to the Children's Defense Fund, just this additional spending alone would be enough to: Provide Head Start to 1.7 million additional children; and Provide child care to more than 8 million additional children; and Provide 21st Century After-School programs for close to 35 million additional children.

Just think what we could do for our children if we were willing to forgo just one new major weapon system. In addition to being a budget-buster, excessive defense spending forces us to shift our priorities away from feeding, clothing and educating our children and caring for the sick, the elderly and

The Republican budget has a solution to this problem—cut non-defense discretionary spending by 6 percent or \$114 billion over 5 years. Where is this money going to come

from? I'll tell you. The Republicans want to drop 310,000 low-income women off of WIC, just next year. The Republicans want to deny child care to over 12,000 children of working parents in 2001. The Republicans want to eliminate Head Start services for more than 40,000 children and their families by 2005. The Republicans want to cut off energy assistance to 164,000 low-income families next year, precisely at the same time oil prices are rising. And the list goes on and on.

The Republicans call their budget “senior-friendly.” Well, with friends like them, who needs enemies?

The Republicans set aside \$40 billion for reforming Medicare and establishing a prescription drug program, yet they fail to provide us with the details of how they plan to do so. There are reports that the Republican's prescription drug program would only cover low-income Medicare recipients. Do they actually think that only the poor take prescription drugs? In fact, over half of Medicare beneficiaries who lack prescription drug coverage have incomes above 150 percent of poverty. The cost of prescription drugs is the fastest growing part of health care, and it affects all Americans. We must establish a comprehensive prescription drug plan which covers all seniors, regardless of income, as they are the ones suffering the most from rising drug costs.

The Republicans claim to put aside funds to shore-up Social Security. But in fact, if they do everything they promise, the Republican budget will actually spend the Social Security surplus. We need to protect Social Security, not put it under any more risk. It seems like everyone has learned the clear lessons of the last 7 years except my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Over the last 20 years we have put off addressing some of the major economic problems affecting American workers and their families. Now, during this time of unprecedented prosperity, it is time to begin dealing with these issues. If we can't do it now, then when can we?

Instead of debating tax cuts which favor the rich and will put us back in the fiscal straight-jacket of massive debt, we should be discussing how to provide quality health care for all Americans, while controlling costs.

We should be discussing ways to protect the most vulnerable Americans—the sick and the elderly. We should pass a strong patient's bill of rights, which includes a patient's right to sue for damages, that is not cynically loaded with poison bills—like Medical Savings Accounts, which are nothing more than tax cuts for the rich.

We should raise the minimum wage without having to buy-off the wealthy by providing them close to \$80 billion in estate tax cuts. Working full-time at the current minimum wage is not even enough to keep a family of 3 or 4 out of poverty. Raising the minimum wage is long overdue and should be done with no conditions attached.

For these reasons and others, I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget resolution.