Moreover, the service of Chief Redbone was not limited to his people. He was a veteran, having served the United States in Germany from 1953 to 1955.

Grand Chief Ronald ''Redbone'' Van Dunk was a hero, a gentleman, a soldier, a distinguished leader, and a friend. His passing is not only a loss to his family, but to his tribe and to our Hudson Valley region. His legacy is his hope and dedication for the pride of a people, known as the Ramapoughs.

Our prayers and condolences go out to his family and friends, during their time of mourning.

IN TRIBUTE TO YOSHI HONKAWA

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an extraordinary individual, Yoshi Honkawa, who will be honored on April 17th as the recipient of the Allen and Weta Mathies Award for Vision and Excellence in HealthCare Leadership. This prestigious award is presented by the Partner in Care Foundation, an organization dedicated to creating new methods of dealing with long term health care needs.

This innovative foundation could never have found a more perfect individual to honor for leadership in health care policy. Yoshi's career in this extremely important field—as an advocate, administrator, and mentor—spans decades and has been recognized by most of the leading health care organizations in California and in the nation.

In 1964, Yoshi joined the staff of the Los Angeles County/University of Southern California Medical Center. Many years later, he and his wife, May, endowed a fellowship fund in health policy and management at the University of Southern California. This act is typical of Yoshi's generosity with all of his resources, including his precious time, with young people entering the health care field. As mentor and teacher, there is no greater friend of graduate medical education than Yoshi Honkawa.

He took special note of the need to increase diversity in health care professionals, serving as a founding member of the Board of the Institute for Diversity in Health Care Management. He is also a member of the Board of Directors of the Japanese American Cultural and Community Center, and works with that organization to preserve and promote an appreciation for Japanese and Japanese-American heritage and cultural arts.

Yoshi's expertise in health care policy led to his appointment as a Commissioner on California's Health Policy and Data Advisory Commission. From this post, where he served from 1987 to 1997, he helped shape California's health policy.

It was while he served at Cedars-Sinai that I really came to know Yoshi well and to appreciate his integrity, his knowledge, his ability and his humanity. As the vice-president for government and industry relations, and then as consultant for health care advocacy, I was privileged to visit with Yoshi both in Los Angeles and during his trips to Washington, where he was a tireless advocate for this prestigious medical center.

Yoshi is, to put it simply, a wonderful person and I am honored to express the gratitude of the community for his tireless service and to congratulate him on this recognition of his outstanding leadership.

RECOGNIZING EQUAL PAY DAY

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, while I am not proud about the gender disparity of wages in the United States, I am proud today to join with my colleagues as a co-sponsor of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

It is unbelievable that women still earn only a percentage of what men earn for comparable work. In the 21st century, women earn 72 cents for every dollar a man earns. In communities of color, the gap is wider: black women earn 64 cents for each dollar and Latinas earn only 55 cents for each dollar a man earns.

According to these numbers, the average woman must work an additional 12 weeks a year to make up the disparity in income. The pay gap has a significant impact on entire families; it is estimated that American families lose $200 billion each year. Both the AFL–CIO and the Institute for Women's Policy Research report that, if women were paid the same as comparable men, their family incomes would rise by nearly 6 percent. Poverty rates would drop by more than 50 percent.

Unequal pay is unjustified for equal work. It hurts individuals, families, and communities. We must do better to support hard working women and their families. We must pass the Paycheck Fairness Act; it is the only right and fair thing to do.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR A COOPERATIVE LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION PROGRAM

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to authorize a program to help states, local governments, and private groups protect open space while enabling ranchers and other private landowners to continue to use their lands for agriculture and other traditional uses.

The bill, entitled the ''Cooperative Landscape Conservation Act,'' is based on provisions that were passed by the House last year as part of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (''CARA'') but on which the Senate did not complete action.

I think the program that this bill would establish would be good for the entire country—and it would be particularly important for Colorado.

In Colorado, as in some other states, we are experiencing rapid population growth. That brings with it rising land values and property taxes. This combination is putting ranchers and other landowners under increasing pressure to sell lands for development. By selling conservation easements instead, they can lessen that pressure, capture much of the increased value of the land, and allow the land to continue to be used for traditional purposes.

That's why conservation easements are so important for our state. It's why the state and many local governments are interested in acquiring conservation easements on undeveloped lands. It is also why non-profit organizations like the Colorado Cattlemen's Agricultural Land Trust and the Nature Conservancy—to name just two of many—work to help ranchers and other property owners to make these arrangements and so avoid the need to sell agricultural lands to developers.

I strongly support this approach. Of course, by itself it is not enough—it is still important for government at all levels to acquire full ownership of land in appropriate cases. But in many other instances acquiring a conservation easement is more appropriate for conservation and other public purposes, more cost-effective for the taxpayers, and better for ranchers and other landowners who want to keep their lands in private ownership.

But while it is usually less costly to acquire a conservation easement than to acquire full ownership, it is often not cheap—and in some critical cases can be more than a community or a nonprofit group can raise without some help. That is where my bill would come in.

Under the bill, the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to provide funds, on a 50 percent match basis, to supplement local resources available for acquiring a conservation easement. For that purpose, the bill would authorize appropriation of $100 million per year for each of the next 6 fiscal years—similar to the amount that would have been authorized by the CARA legislation that the House passed last year.

The bill provides that the Secretary would give priority to helping acquire easements in areas—such as Colorado—that are experiencing rapid population growth and where increasing land values are creating development pressures that threaten the traditional uses of private lands and the ability to maintain open space. Within those high-growth areas, priority would go to acquiring easements that would provide the greatest conservation benefits while maintaining the traditional uses—whether agricultural or some other uses—of the lands involved.

The bill would not involve any federal land acquisitions, and it would not involve any federal regulation of land uses—conservation easements acquired using these funds would be governed solely under state law.

Mr. Speaker, the national government has primary responsibility for protecting the special parts of the federal lands and for managing those lands in ways that will maintain their resources and values—including their undeveloped character—as a legacy for future generations. Regarding other lands, the challenge of responding to growth and sprawl is primarily the responsibility of the states and tribes, the local governments, and private organizations and groups—but the federal government can help.

This bill would provide help, in a practical and cost-effective way. For the information of our colleagues, I am attaching a summary of its main provisions.

I also am attaching a recent article from the DENVER POST about how the Larimer Land Trust has helped ranchers near Buckeye, Colorado to assure that their lands, with their resources of habitat for a wide variety of wildlife

and many geographic and cultural treasures, will remain undeveloped and will continued to be used for grazing and other agricultural uses. I think this article shows the importance of the program that would be established by the bill.

DIGEST OF ''COOPERATIVE LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION ACT''

The bill is based on provision included in the House-passed Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA) legislation of the 106th Congress. It would provide federal financial assistance to states, local government, Indian tribes, and private groups working to preserve open space by acquiring conservation easements.

BACKGROUND: In Colorado and other rapidly-growing states, rising land values and property taxes are putting farmers and ranchers (and other landowners) under increasing pressure to sell their lands for development. By selling conservation easements instead, they can lessen that pressure, capture much of the increased value of the land, and allow the land to continue to be used for traditional purposes. The party acquiring the conservation easement would have an enforceable property right to prevent development.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO:

Program—The bill would establish the ''Cooperative Landscape Conservation Program,'' to be administered by the Department of the Interior. The program would provide grants to assist qualified recipients to acquire conservation easements.

Funding—Bill would authorize appropriations of $100 million/year for fiscal years 2002 through 2007. Funds would be used for grants, would be on a 50 percent-50 percent matching basis, for purchase of conservation easements on private lands in order to provide wildlife, fisheries, open space, recreation, or other public benefits consistent with the continuation of traditional uses by the private landowners. Up to 10 percent of annual funds could be used by Interior Department to provide technical assistance.

Priority—(1) Priority for grants would be to help acquire easements in areas where rapid population growth and increasing land values are creating development pressures that threaten traditional uses of land and the ability to maintain open space; (2) within those areas, priority would go for acquiring easements that would provide the greatest conservation benefits while maintaining traditional uses of lands.

Eligibility Recipients—would be agencies of state or local government, tribes, and tax-exempt organizations operated principally for conservation.

Enforcement—Only an entity eligible for a grant could hold and enforce an easement acquired with program funds; at time of application, state Attorney General would have to certify that an easement would meet the requirements of state law.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD NOT DO—

Bill would NOT involve any federal land acquisition.

Bill would NOT involve any federal regulation of land use.

[From the Denver Post, April 2, 2001]

RANCHER'S LEGACY TO STAY WIDE OPEN

(By Coleman Cornelius)

April 1, 2001—BUCKEYE—Chuck Miller gazed at his ranch from under the brim of a battered felt cowboy hat. His cows and their new calves lolled nearby, soaking in the sun. A spring breeze swept over a rocky ridgeline, open grazing land, an irrigated alfalfa field, a glittering lake.

''I never knew a day when I didn't want to ranch on my own,'' Miller said as he recently surveyed his land in the Buckeye community, 20 miles north of Fort Collins. ''I don't ever remember when that wasn't my goal in life.''

Miller, whose Sunnybrook Cattle Co., includes about 450 acres and about 100 Angus and Longhorn cattle, soon will mark his 80th birthday. So he has pondered the future of his land and has wondered whether his ranching lifestyle will continue in fast-growing Larimer County, where the population swelled by 35 percent in the past decade.

Miller's gaze switched east. He nodded to a cluster of big, new houses topping a distant hillside—a sign of development bearing down on this ranchland that once seemed remote.

''If growth continues as it is now, this whole country will be houses,'' he said.

Earlier this year, the specter of development persuaded Miller and the owners of two neighboring ranches to preserve some of their ranchland in northern Larimer County. Working with the Larimer Land Trust, the Buckeye ranchers have protected 500 acres through conservation easements, meaning the land can never be developed.

It's not a lot of land in this rugged and breathtaking territory, which is home to the county's largest cattle ranches. In several cases, ranches in the area encompass more than 10,000 acres, according to county records.

Yet the newly protected acreage is significant, conservationists said.

That's in part because it represents a growing alliance between ranchers and conservationists. These camps, often at odds in the past, want to save open land and a way of life that has waned as encroaching development has spawned tensions and has ratcheted up land prices.

''It's really clear that if you want to protect Colorado's open space, you've got to help ranchers and farmers stay on the ground,'' said Alisa Wade, executive director of Larimer Land Trust. ''If we don't start working together now it's going to be too late.''

The Buckeye ranchland is in the foothills of the Laramie Mountains and is part of an ecological hinge between the mountains and plains.

It hosts a rich variety of plants and wildlife, including deer, elk, pronghorns, bears, mountain lions, bobcats, coyotes, raptors and rattlesnakes. The land also holds geographic and cultural treasures, including fossilized dinosaur tracks and American Indian artifacts. Some of the West's first white settlers came through the area on the Cherokee and Overland trails; Miller once found an oxen shoe dropped by an animal pulling a pioneer's wagon.

The conservation project is significant, too, because it is a first step in what could become a vast stretch of protected ranchland.

''The Buckeye is one of the last remaining regions of large, contiguous ranchlands in Larimer County, so it's an important piece of long-term ranching viability in the county,'' Wade said.

The Nature Conservancy of Colorado, which owns a 2,000-acre preserve in the foothills of the Laramie Mountains, has identified northern Larimer County as a priority area for land conservation and contributed most of the money for the Buckeye project. The organization's leaders hope other ranchers will decide to preserve their land.

''We'd love to see some of those big ranches up there in some kind of conservation program,'' said John Stokes, the Nature Conservancy's northeast Colorado program manager.

Conservation easements increasingly are used to preserve valuable open lands, and the provisions vary from deal to deal. But most of these legal agreements have one thing in common: Acreage in a conservation easement has been stripped of development rights and must remain open space forever.

As part of the Buckeye project, the Larimer Land Trust paid participating ranchers for the development rights on their property. But because the ranchers believe in land conservation, they accepted about 30 percent of the value of those development rights and donated the remaining value, Wade said.

''The value of their donation is about $400,000. It's a significant donation,'' she said.

The Larimer Land Trust, which negotiated the easements, spent $234,000 on the Buckeye project, Wade said.

The ranchers still own their property, and its agricultural use—primarily for cattle grazing—will not change.

Like other private landowners, the participating ranchers may sell or bequeath their property. But the conservation easements remain even when the land changes hands; new owners cannot develop the protected property.

That means the land's eventual sale price would be reduced. And it assures the protected acreage, if used at all, would be used for farming and ranching, Wade said.

While the value of protected land drops, the ranchers have pocketed some cash and will reap tax benefits from the conservation easements. That's a satisfying financial trade-off, they said.

But more satisfying for these ranchers is knowing their land will remain undeveloped for the enjoyment of heirs or other future owners, they said.

''I'm sure we could make much more money if we sold the land for development, but we didn't want to do that,'' said Kathy DeSmith, 60, who raises hay and cattle. She and her ranching partner put 179 acres in an easement as part of the conservation project.

Miller, who protected 105 acres, said it pleases him to watch his 8-year-old granddaughter ride horses, climb apple trees, fish and wade in the creek on his ranch. He hopes others will someday find the same carefree joys on his land.

The rancher said he's been offered more than $1 million for his property. But the money did not entice him or his three children, especially because they knew development would almost certainly follow, Miller said.

''What would I do with a big pile of money, living in town with nothing to do? That doesn't suit me at all,'' he said. ''I don't make a great deal of money—cash—but look at what I've got.''

Edie Yates, 53, who with her husband owns the 530-acre Park Creek Ranch, agreed that she has found many rewards living on land that has been unchanged over time. The Yateses put 215 acres in an easement.

The couple knew they could profit from their land, but they ''couldn't swallow the idea of houses built all over it,'' Yates said. ''Your conscience falls in somewhere.''

As she led a tour of her ranch, Yates stood on a ridgeline and gazed at the striking landscape of canyons, meadows and towering rock formations.

''To me, to stand out here right now, it's good for your soul,'' she said.

EQUAL PAY DAY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Equal Pay Day. A woman would have to work until today, April 3, 2001 in order to earn the same salary of her male counterparts through December 31, 2000. Regrettably, the gap is even wider for Black and Hispanic women.

Perhaps even more troubling than the actual disparities are the poor explanations used to justify the situation.

Some blame pay inequity on women because they enter less lucrative professions. This assertion ignores the fact that traditionally female professions are purposely very underpaid. Professions such as teaching and nursing are undervalued and low-paying because they are traditionally female. Furthermore, the inequity exists within traditionally female fields. For example, female elementary school teachers still make 70 dollars a week less than men in the same position. Clearly, this reason is not a sound one.

Another popular justification assumes that equal pay for women translates into financial disaster and instability for the American family. This persistent myth states that equality will rob men of their jobs, lure women from their children, and is unnecessary for married women who benefit form their husband's salary.

Despite the calamity theories, equal pay is essential for working families. When we end pay discrimination against women, family incomes will rise. Working parents will have more to spend on household needs and more to save for their children's education and their own retirement security. Working parents may be able to spend less time at work and more time with their families, a very positive change for parents and children.

Many excuses and theories abound, but the truth overpowers every last excuse. There is no justification for pay discrimination against women. Let's rectify pay inequity this year, and render Equal Pay Day 2002 obsolete.

REINTRODUCTION OF HATE CRIMES BILL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2001, along with Representatives GEPHARDT, SKELTON, FRANK, BALDWIN, MORELLA, KOLBE, FOLEY, SHAYS and KELLY. As of today there are 180 orginal cosponsors.

In the year 2001, there are still too many messages to African-Americans and other minorities that we are not full participants in American democracy. Decrepit voting machinery in African-American communities disenfranchises our voters. Racial profiling continues unabated. Discrimination continues.

There have been over 50,000 hate crimes reported in the last five years, and nearly 8,000 reported last year alone. The gruesome, hateful murders of James Byrd and Matthew Shepard stand as symbols of the incidence of hate violence that has worsened since their deaths. Hate crimes don't only visit unspeakable violence on the immediate victims, but also send a message of a desired apartheid that its sponsors want to violently enforce. Today, organized hate and supremacist groups operate with greater sophistication, and across state lines.

While many of these crimes do and should get prosecuted at the state and local levels, many do not. Some local governments lack the resources to track interstate hate groups that perpetrate them. In other places, there may even be a lack of will. Ten states, for example, have no hate crime laws on the books, and another 21 have anemic hate crime laws.

If enacted, this legislation would give the federal government the jurisdictional tools necessary to assist local law enforcement in fighting the scourge of hate violence.

In instances where state and local governments do not have the capacity to prosecute such crimes, the legislation creates a federal backstop—the ability for the local U.S. attorney to ensure that justice will be done, deterring hate violence regardless of whether the victim happens to be engaged in a ''federally protected'' activity. And even in those cases, federal prosecution can only proceed if approved by the Attorney General.

Our primary desire is to see these crimes prosecuted by state and local governments more effectively. That's why the bill authorizes funds to support state investigative and prosecutorial efforts.

The bill is not and should not be partisan. There should be unanimous agreement that there will be ''zero-tolerance'' for the hate. This bill takes the first step in that direction.

HONORING RICO GIRON

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents who has demonstrated great heroism. This extraordinary individual is Mr. Rico Giron, of San Miguel County, who risked his own life to save the lives of two young drowning children. Upon hearing the cries of the drowning children at a lake, Mr. Giron raced his boat toward the younger brother and sister and dived into the water after them. After pulling the girl ashore, Mr. Giron plunged back into the water to rescue the other boy. Using every last ounce of strength and energy, Mr. Giron was able to pull the boy ashore before collapsing from exhaustion. Mr. Giron's valiant efforts saved the lives of these two young children. For this exceptional bravery, the Andrew Carnegie Hero Fund Foundation has awarded Mr. Giron the prestigious Carnegie Medal which recognizes those individuals who risks his or her own life to save or attempt to save the life of another person. Very few individuals are awarded the Carnegie Medal, hence this is a grand achievement and Mr. Giron deserves a hero's welcome. The quotation that adorns the Carnegie Medal truly describes Mr. Giron's act of bravery: Greater love hath no man than that a man lay down his life for his friends. Please join me in recognizing the generous actions of Mr. Giron.

BUY AMERICA LEGISLATION

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation drafted to help preserve the U.S. textile industry. This legislation would seek to clarify the existing ''Buy-America'' provision for the Department of Defense, commonly known as the Berry Amendment.

The Berry Amendment currently requires the Department to purchase clothing, specialty steel, textiles, and food that is produced in the United States by U.S. companies. The intent behind the legislation is to guarantee the U.S. military a ready mobilization base of U.S. apparel manufacturers—a critical component for rapid military mobilizations. The language has been a feature of defense procurement for over 50 years.

However, as my colleagues may know, the Berry Amendment has recently resurfaced in the media following the decision by the Department of the Army to make the black beret a standard issue item for all Army personnel. The decision was controversial and shortsighted in its own right, but became further troubling when the Defense Logistics Agency decided to waive the Berry Amendment and allow the procurement of the berets from foreign sources—including a substantial number made in Communist China.

The decision was not made because of a lack of existing U.S. suppliers to provide the berets. Nor was it made because of a lack of other textile manufacturers who might be willing to tool up to meet the demand. Instead, it was made because the Army wanted all of its personnel to have the berets by its next birthday. A date important to the Army and the Nation as it relates to the founding of that branch of service, but otherwise arbitrary as it relates to the purchase of berets.

That decision was not just a slap in the face to the men and women who will be wearing the berets made by a potential enemy, but also to the U.S. textile industry who have long supported our men and women in uniform.

This controversial waiver highlighted the need to review the current law and look for ways to improve its effectiveness. The legislation I am introducing today seeks to do just that. Specifically, the bill would add a requirement that for any waiver of the Buy American provision, the Secretary of Defense must notify the House and Senate committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Small Business. The legislation also requires that after Congress is notified, 30 days must pass before the contract can be let. Finally, the legislation clarifies and recodifies the Berry Amendment under the permanent section of U.S. code relating to defense procurement.

Although the legislation does not eliminate the possibility of procuring this category of items overseas, it will improve congressional oversight of any Berry Amendment waivers. By raising the visibility of these waiver decisions, it is my hope that the Department of