

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 2002

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong concerns about H.R. 476. I held the same concerns when I voted against this legislation during the 106th Congress, as did many of my colleagues in the House and Senate. No effort has been made to address the valid problems with this bill in the nearly three years since we last took it up on the House floor.

This restrictive legislation would isolate a young woman at a time when she needs support the most. I absolutely believe that young women should involve parents in important life decisions. In fact, most young women do involve a parent when making a decision about abortion, however, that option is not always available. Incest, abuse and other serious family problems are a sobering reality for many in our country. In that case, a young woman should be encouraged to consult another trusted adult, such as another family member, a medical provider or a religious counselor—this bill makes that virtually impossible and even criminal.

Under this bill, grandparents, older siblings, religious leaders, and other responsible adults could face prosecution, imprisonment, fines, or civil suits for coming to the aid of a young woman during her time of need. The true absurdity of this legislation can be summed up in this astonishing example: A father molests his young daughter and the young woman goes to her grandmother for help. Should the young woman obtain an abortion in another state, this bill could give the father standing to sue in a civil court and could make the grandmother liable for \$100,000 in damages and a year in prison.

In addition, this bill is dangerously overbroad. The law would apply to anyone having peripheral involvement in the minor's abortion, even if the person was not acquainted with the bill's legal provisions or even aware of the minor crossing state lines.

I supported a Motion to Recommit that would have sent this flawed bill back to the committee with the recommendation that the legislation exempt grandparents and adult siblings from the bill. This Motion would have provided young women with at least a minimal safety net of family members. It failed by a vote of 173–246.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to oppose legislation that will endanger young women's lives and health by isolating those who cannot involve a parent. We should encourage young women to turn to other family members when they cannot turn to their parents, and Congress has no business criminalizing that.

PHILIP E. RUPPE POST OFFICE
BUILDING

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 2002

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to express my thoughts about a gentleman of

distinction, who served his constituents from Northern Michigan for six terms. Philip Edward Ruppe was born in Houghton County, Michigan where his family lived since the 1870's. He attended Central Michigan University and the University of Michigan for two years after which he received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Yale University in 1948. He served our Nation as a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy during the Korean conflict.

After his service in the Navy, Mr. Ruppe became the president of the Bosch Brewing Company for ten years, served as director of the Houghton National Bank, the Commercial National Bank of L'Anse and R. L. Polk and Company.

In January 1967, the people of Northern Michigan elected Mr. Ruppe as their representative until 1979, when he ran for the United States Senate. As a member of the United States House of Representatives, Congressman Ruppe served on the Committee on Merchant Marines and Fisheries and was ranking member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. He dedicated his time to constituent services and economic development in the Upper Peninsula.

I want to recognize and thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) who thoughtfully introduced H.R. 1374, designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 600 Calumet Street in Lake Linden, Michigan, as the "Philip E. Ruppe Post Office". It is most appropriate to name a post office to honor Philip Ruppe who represented his constituents most ably during his tenure in Congress. Congressman Ruppe and his late wife, Loret Ruppe, who was a well-loved and respected director of the Peace Corps and Ambassador to Norway, were dedicated parents to their daughters and imparted the importance of public service to them.

I have been privileged to know both Loret and Phil. Phil still resides in Bethesda, Maryland, and I am delighted to have him as a constituent and wish him the best in life.

PENSION SECURITY ACT OF 2002

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 2002

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this legislation, and in support of the Democratic alternative.

Millions of working Americans are watching what we do here today. They are watching to see just whose side we're on. They want to see whether we will do something to prevent another Enron. They want to know whether their retirement savings are truly safe.

With this bill, we know who the Republican leadership would protect. This bill is a get out of jail free card. It doesn't protect pensions, it protects those who would prosper on the backs of their employees.

This bill keeps employees off pension boards. It limits the ability of employees to collect damages when the misconduct of company officials costs them their life savings. It forces employees to keep stock matches in 401(k) plans for three years after each match, while executives are held to no such limit. This bill even allows companies to offer investment advice from the same firm that administers the company's 401(k) plan.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the thousands of Enron employees who have worthless stock certificates to show for their years of hard work, this bill is an outrage.

The Democratic alternative provides real protection. Employees should have the same control over their retirement accounts as executives, and should have the same access to unbiased, independent investment advice. Our bill levels the playing field between executives and employees, giving employees full control of their retirement accounts. And, executives would be held fully accountable when they violate pension rights.

Mr. Speaker, you say you're on the side of the American people. But, as the saying goes, actions speak louder than words, and your bill hurts the working families of this Nation. Vote no on the underlying bill and yes on the Democratic alternative.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES
ON H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY
ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 2002

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Agriculture Committee Chairman COMBEST and Ranking Member STENHOLM for the skill and hard work they have put into crafting the Farm Security Act. I would also like to commend the Conferees of the House Agricultural Committee for their continued efforts to work toward agreement on a farm bill that is good for America's farmers. I want to thank them for the great sensitivity to and understanding of the needs of our nation's farmers.

This motion to instruct goes against that understanding and, thus, I rise in strong opposition to this motion and urge all my colleagues to vote against it.

The presentation of this motion is unnecessarily repetitive in nature. The Members of the House of Representatives have already voted on this issue. During House consideration of the Farm Security Act, an amendment containing this language failed by a bipartisan vote of 238–187.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I can count on hearing every time I return home is that our farmers need help this year. Our farming families put everything they have on the line every year to feed America. America's families never got the economic boon that swept the nation in the late 1990's.

This year, good weather worldwide has created commodity surpluses and driven down the price that farmers get for their crops. The U.S. dollar also remains strong relative both to our competitors and customers, making U.S. crops more expensive and less competitive. U.S. producers continue to compete on an uneven playing field, facing much higher tariffs on our exports to other countries than other countries face on their exports to us.

The goal of our farm policy should be to provide a safety net so the American agricultural sector survives through these difficult times. This motion to recommit would limit payments for commodity programs and is a slap in the face to those families.